

COUNCIL DIARY

Kept by

THE MOST REV. LEO F. DWORSCHAK
BISHOP OF FARGO

At the Four Sessions of

THE SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN
ST. PETER'S BASILICA
ROME

October 11 to December 8, 1962 - 73 pages
September 29 to December 3, 1963 - 63 pages
September 14 to November 20, 1964 - 92 pages
September 14 to December 8, 1965 - 75 pages

MEMORANDUM

This diary was kept for purely personal reasons. It is not intended for publication. My intention was merely to keep a day to day record of my activities during the Council, contacts with people connected with the Council, and my personal feelings about and reactions to what I saw and heard.

I wish to emphasize the following points:

1. I can not vouch for the accuracy of my reports on what Council Fathers said in public speeches during general assemblies. My knowledge of Latin is too limited to permit accuracy in my reports on speeches.
2. I reported everything I heard, including gossip, stories, jokes, etc. Much of this is sheer gossip, sometimes prompted by uncharitable motives. All such material has to be evaluated very carefully; I would say most of it has no value, except to indicate the "climate" in which the Council was held. No effort was made to give a complete account of all events in the Council.
3. Factual material, e. g., presiding officer of each assembly, number present, number and names of speakers, etc. would have to be verified through reference to L 'Osservatore Romano."
4. In general the diary has value only in giving a clue to the atmosphere in Rome during the Council as it appeared to me. It will help the reader to get the "feel" of the situation. It should be kept in mind that I was frankly partisan in my views on the subject matter under discussion and in my reaction to speeches and activities of prominent council fathers. I am sure that in many instances my opinions were not unbiased nor were my judgments really objective.
5. Finally, the diary was written daily, usually at night. Only occasionally did I get behind more than a day or two, and only once did I get as many as four days behind. As a consequence, my work on the diary was almost always done under pressure. Aside from three or four pages which I re-read to get information on one or two points, I have not looked at the diary since it was written. No corrections have been made, except at the actual time of doing the typing. Hence the material is all in the form of a rough first draft. I am sure there are many typing mistakes and many passages filled with bad grammar and worse rhetoric!
6. During the third and fourth sessions when NCWC provided an English summary of all speeches in the "Council Digest", I made no effort to provide a summary in the diary. I made an entry every day we had a general assembly except during the week I returned to the States for my sister's funeral (October 3, 1965) and the two days when I was not permitted to attend the General Assembly because of a severe cold.

Bishop of Fargo
January 24, 1966

COUNCIL DIARY - 1962

OCTOBER 6: Arrived in Fumacino at 2:30 PM after a perfect flight from Frankfurt during which we were airborne exactly one hour and thirty minutes. It was my first flight on a Caravelle and a pleasant one it was.

Monsignor Giovannetti, Father Ray Lessard and Father Gerry Potter met me at the airport. From the moment I stepped off the Jet it was quite evident that an ecumenical council was to be held. Bishops were in evidence everywhere and the officials of the air terminal went out of their way to provide for the comfort and convenience of the arriving prelates in every possible manner. Examination of the passport was purely perfunctory and the customs people didn't look at the luggage at all.

We went directly to Salvator Mundi Hospital where Fathers Lessard and Potter helped me to get unpacked and settled down in one of the guest rooms on the fifth floor of the hospital where I expected to make my home during the entire period of my stay in Rome for the Council. Father Lessard is occupying the room next to mine. I have every convenience in the room and with Father Lessard next door I should be most comfortably situated, much like at home.

OCTOBER 7: Said Mass in the Mother Mary chapel of the convent church, using the chalice which Cardinal Muench had first given to Msgr. Nellen and which was returned to His Eminence after Msgr. Nellen died. Many things remind me of the Cardinal here at Salvator Mundi where he lived during his short career in Rome. Almost every person I meet speaks of His Eminence. What a pity it was that he did not retain his health and vigor and live to see these historic days of the Council! This is my first visit to Rome without his being here at the same time. I miss him more than ever.

OCTOBER 8: Did some shopping. Rome is more crowded than ever and the traffic more hectic. Bought a radio which, however, was disappointing. I can not get the broadcasts by the American Forces Network in Germany which would provide a regular news coverage in English which is rather good. The difficulty seems to derive primarily from the interference caused by the lights, elevators and equipment here in the hospital.

Went to the office on the Via della Conciliazione to register and to get our ID (identification) Cards. The registration office was badly crowded, but we managed to register without too much delay. We were told that the ID cards would be issued to us across the street in an office at number 10. But that was the office of the press bureau set up by the Vatican to deal with reporters! They had no idea of where the ID cards would be issued. We went back to the registration office. There they were not in the least disturbed by the fact that they had given incorrect information. They merely said we should go to the third floor in the same building, not to No 10.

By this time the crowd of bishops and their secretaries had grown to a point where elevator service to the third floor was inadequate so we walked up the three flights of stairs. This I regretted very much later. The stories in the Vatican office buildings are very high and before I got to the third floor the leg muscles protested very much!

We discovered that the offices on this floor were the headquarters of Archbishop Felici, the General Secretary of the Council. He was delighted to meet us. He said that he hoped personally to meet every bishop who attended the Council. After the amenities were taken

care of Bishop Griffiths came to the very practical point of our ID Cards. The Archbishop explained that these were not yet prepared and that they would be made available to us at a place and time to be announced later! Bought a Roman hat to go with the Greca which was here when I arrived.

OCTOBER 9: Went to St. Peter's for the anniversary mass commemorating the death of Pius XII. Cardinal Masella was celebrant of the Mass while the Holy Father presided and gave the absolution. The Mass was offered at the altar of the Cathedral. Every available space was occupied in the apse and there was a great crowd of people in the transept. The main nave was closed off because of the seats which had been installed for the Council meetings. Bishop Hoch arrived while we were at St. Peter's. He came in directly from New York via TWA.

OCTOBER 10: Today was given over largely to last minute details which required attention before the Council opened. We went to the NCWC Center to get acquainted with the services they have to offer. Met Msgr. Emmenegger and Msgr. Marzinkus.

Today the last of the group that will live at Villa Salvator Mundi arrived. It makes quite a cosmopolitan gathering at mealtime in the dining room. The roster of our "colony" is as follows:

Francis Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna
His Beatitude, Maximos IV Saigh, Patriarch of Antioch for the Melchites
Archbishop Neophyte Edelby, secretary of the Melchite Patriarch.
Bishop George Hakim, Bishop of Akkat (Galilee and Nazareth)
Bishop Gabriel Abou-Saada Vicar for the Melchite Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
Archbishop Philippe Nabaa, Archbishop of Beirut for the Melchites
Archbishop James J. Byrne, Dubuque, Iowa, USA
Bishop William P. O'Conno Madison, Wisconsin, USA
Bishop Wilhelm Cleven, Auxiliary Bishop of Cologne, Germany
Bishop Lambert Hoch, Sioux Falls, S.D., USA
Bishop James Komba, Auxiliary Bishop of Perimia, Tanganyika
Archbishop Francis Jachym, Coadjutor Archbishop of Vienna, ("Sedi datus")
Msgr. Oreste Kerame, Theologian for Patriarch Maximos IV
Msgr. Shakour, Secretary to Patriarch Maximos IV
Msgr. Rudolph Bandas, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA, Council Consultor
Msgr. George Wiota, Secretary to Bishop O'Connor
Msgr. Giovanni de Toth, Theologian for Cardinal Koenig
Father Duckx, O.P., Theologian for Bishop Hakim
Father Cormack Coyne, SDS, Chaplain of Salvator Mundi Hospital
and Secretary to Bishop Ballo
Bishop Salvatore Ballo Guercio, retired and living permanently at Salvator Mundi
Father Raymond Lessard, Secretary to Bishop Dworschak
Bishop Leo F. Dworschak, Fargo, North Dakota, U.S.A.

Each time we gather for meals there is a veritable Babel of tongues; English, Italian, French, German, Spanish, Arabic, Latin, and even a bit of Swahili from Bishop Komba. Of the group, Cardinal Koenig is the most outstanding linguist. Besides his native German and the Latin, he speaks fluently in English, French, Italian, Spanish, besides having a scholar's knowledge of the biblical languages.

The atmosphere in the dining room is always most pleasant with a great deal of bantering and small talk interspersed with serious discussions of the problems connected with the coming

Council and exchanges of opinions on public affairs and reports on conditions in our respective countries.

Today the rains came! Light drizzle alternated with showers that were regular deluges. The thought in everyone's mind was: "What will this do to the solemn procession at the opening of the Council tomorrow?"

OCTOBER 11: Got up before five in order to celebrate Mass at 5:30. It was still raining though not quite as heavy as the day before. We left for the Vatican at 7:15 A.M. well protected with raincoats and hoping for the best. We entered the Vatican at the doors of the Museum and went up the famous spiral stairway built during the pontificate of Pius XI, passed through the Cortile de Segni into the Galleria delle Lapidi (Gallery of the Stones - collection of ancient and prehistoric utensils).

In this gallery there was a long series of cubicles, all neatly numbered into which we could leave our bags and raincoats after vesting in white cope and miter. The problem was that we had not yet received our ID Cards containing the serial number which was to be assigned to each of the Council Fathers and to be retained throughout the Council for purposes of quick identification. It had all been well planned, but the essential detail of the number was not provided as yet; so we had to take over whatever cubicle was not yet claimed by some other Bishop.

Surprisingly, there was not nearly as much confusion as might have been imagined. At least the various groups had gathered in the halls and rooms assigned to them and the procession began to form at 8:20 A.M. While the bishops and Archbishops were not exactly in the order of precedence as had been planned, the procession moved in an orderly and impressive manner down the Scala Regia, into St. Peter's Square, to the obelisk and then into the nave of the Basilica through the main door. The slowly moving line of Council Fathers marching six abreast seemed all the more dramatic because the sky had cleared, almost as though it were in response to a signal from the master of ceremonies just as the procession began, and we found ourselves in brilliant sunshine under cloudless sky as we emerged from the Porta Bronze.

The Holy Father reached his throne before the special altar erected ahead of the Confessio at 9:47, one hour and thirty-seven minutes after the procession first began to move from the Museum.

It is impossible to describe the scene that unfolded itself before our eyes as the ceremony progressed. The Council Fathers were all in white. Under the bright lights of the new system of illuminating the interior of St. Peter's, it was a magnificent sight to see tiers, rising from the floor and extending the full length of the nave. The ceremony of the opening session consisted of the Veni Creator, the Mass offered by Cardinal Tisserant dean of the college of cardinals, the obeisance of Council Fathers (All of the Cardinals and Patriarch, and two each of the Archbishops, Bishops and Abbots), profession of faith, first by the Holy Father and then by all Council Fathers and Periti, the prayers for the Council, the Litany of the Saints, the chant of the gospel in Latin followed by the Supplicatio Orientalis consisting of an adaptation of the gospel executed in a most striking manner. The function was completed with the allocution and blessing of the Holy Father, at 1:40 P.M., four hours and twenty minutes after the procession first started to move in the Vatican Palace!

We returned to Salvator Mundi for a good long sleep after the late lunch. In the evening we drove down to St. Peter's Square to see the dome and the statues above the columns of Bernini illuminated. We had also expected to see the torchlight parade, but were too late. The Holy Father had specially selected the Feast of the Maternity of Mary for the opening of the Council, since he wanted to have one of the major feasts of Our Lady as the opening date. It is most likely that the first session will conclude on December 8. It is an ancient tradition in Rome to have a torchlight parade the night of the feast on which the dogma that Mary is the Mother of God is observed. This goes back to the fact that at the Council of Ephesus the people of the city in their joy over the definition of this dogma to a man joined in a torchlight procession.

OCTOBER 12: With the conclusion of the grand liturgical opening of the Council some of the "practical" aspects of this historical meeting came to the fore. Before leaving the Basilica yesterday we were each handed a packet containing a book of instructions for routine matters of the meetings to come and a printed list of those who had served on the various preparatory commissions or who were consultors and a booklet to serve as ballots in the election of the members of the Conciliar Commissions. The latter gave us a bit of a shock. There are to be ten such commissions. Each commission will have twenty four members. Of these, sixteen members are to be elected by the Council Fathers and eight to be appointed by the Holy Father. The first item on the agenda of the first "Congregation" to be held on October 13, tomorrow, is to begin the election of the members of the commission. It dawned on me that there are ten Conciliar Commissions with sixteen names on each ballot. That means 160 names will have to be filled in on the ten ballots.

Then everybody began asking himself what names to put on the ballot. How could we possibly vote intelligently for 160 commission members when we knew only a relatively small fraction of the Council Fathers. I know approximately 200 of the Bishops from the USA who are here. Outside of the States, I know a number of Canadian Bishops, about half of the German Bishops, two or three from England.

I know some of the bishops from other parts of the world by reputation. That is all. How can one vote intelligently under such circumstances? I could not vote for more than one or two American Bishops on each commission) because in all fairness representation on each commission should come from all parts of the world so that their various areas with their special problems could have a spokesman when different questions are considered. Furthermore, there is a great deal of national feeling causing bitter resentment when there is not a representation on their commissions in proportion to the number of Catholics in the different areas.

Father Lessard had already indicated a year ago that there was a definite line of cleavage between the Roman Curia and the Italian Bishops on the one hand and the Bishops of Northern Europe and North America on the other hand. Immediately I sensed this feeling, especially between the Italians and the Germans. There was a suspicion that this rather anomalous situation relative to the voting for the commissions was more or less deliberately permitted by the Curia if not actually planned in order to control the makeup of the commissions.

Whatever the motive or cause, the reaction was immediate! Cardinal Koenig spoke to me at lunch about the problem. He asked whether there was any concerted action being taken by the American Bishops in order to inform their colleagues about whom to support? The German

and Austrian Bishops, he told me, had been meeting for several days at the Anima in order to effect a more or less uniform policy on various matters. What had the Americans done along that line, if anything? The Cardinal seemed almost panicky. He spoke to me with great emphasis about the importance of the Conciliar Commissions. There are probably 2,800 Council Fathers. The sheer weight of numbers and the physical problems connected with the size of the meeting place in St. Peter's would preclude any real discussion and effective debate on disputed points. The Cardinal felt that most of the effective activity of the Council would be in the meetings of the various commissions. Hence the personnel of the various commissions was a matter of tremendous importance. He insisted that we must do everything possible to secure the right composition of each of these commissions.

Cardinal Koenig asked me who was the head of our bishops' conference. Would it be possible to establish contact in any way with some responsible members of the US hierarchy to exchange information about desirable candidates for the various commissions? Could I give him the name of representative members of our group so that he could circulate those names among his group, and would I circulate such a list among the American Bishops if he provided me with the same?

I did not want to take any initiative in this matter. Obviously, I could get myself into a delicate situation if I assumed the authority of practically acting as a nomination committee of one; at the same time the Bishops could easily take offense at efforts on my part to promote support of a German slate of candidates. I told Cardinal Koenig that Archbishop O'Boyle of Washington was the chairman of the Administrative Board, NCWC. At that time the Administrative Board was in session at the North American College. I asked Father Lessard to call the NAC to see if Archbishop O'Hare was there and to have him call me if he was free. Cardinal Koenig said he would be in his room between 3:00 and 4:00 P.M. and would welcome a call from Abp. O'Boyle.

The Archbishop was badly tied up in the meeting and did not call me back. I called the NAC again and asked once more that the Archbishop be asked to call me. A half hour later I called a third time and asked one of the students to take a message directly into the meeting of the Administrative Board telling the Archbishop that it was important for him to call either me or the Cardinal directly. I called the Cardinal and told him he might expect a call from the Archbishop.

Archbishop O'Boyle did not call me back till after 6:00 P.M. when they had concluded their meeting. He had spoken to Cardinal Koenig but had not given him a definite answer until he had an opportunity to discuss the matter with other members of the American hierarchy. This he had done, and he now wanted to know where he could reach Cardinal Koenig. I told him I would try to reach the Cardinal and have him call.

Father Lessard called the Anima to see whether the Cardinal was still there in meeting with the German Bishops. He had just left for a reception at the Austrian Embassy. Father Lessard called the Embassy and asked that the Cardinal call me as soon as he arrived. After about a half hour the Cardinal called and I asked him to call the Archbishop at the Michael Angelo Hotel. They arranged to consult back and forth on the whole question of the election of Commission members.

OCTOBER 13: Saw Cardinal Koenig at breakfast. He told me of his conversation with Archbishop O'Boyle the evening before. But, he said, that the German bishops had decided it

was impossible to be ready for voting intelligently at the first congregation this morning because there simply had not been time enough to communicate with the various groups and effect an exchange of lists of nominees. Hence they had agreed to move for postponement of the voting until the next scheduled congregation on Tuesday, October 16. He said they had conferred with the French and South American groups as well as the Spanish and Americans. They all agreed to support such a motion. Such a delay would make it possible to have every group get organized and exchange names of nominees for the guidance of their respective members. That seemed like a master stroke to me and I am greatly relieved, because intelligent voting that morning was simply out of the question in so far as I was concerned, even if I had a list from the Germans and whatever other groups could have been gathered yet that morning before going to St. Peter's.

We left for the Basilica at 8:15 A.M. The weather was foul. The water came down in sheets and did not let up when we arrived in St. Peter's Square. They took us to the Porta Bronza and we entered St. Peter's from the first landing of the Scala Regia. It was amazing to see that all seats were occupied, in spite of the pouring rain.

The signal was given promptly at 9:00 A.M. for the Mass to begin. This was a very promising sign. I hope they will always begin the sessions that promptly. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Hermenigildo Florit of Florence. The PA system worked perfectly and the Archbishop's voice carried beautifully so that the dialogue Mass went perfectly.

Cardinal Tisserant presided at the meeting. Before any other matter could come up Cardinal Achille Lienart of Lille took the platform and proposed that the voting for the members of the commissions be postponed until the next regular congregation scheduled for next Tuesday. Cardinal Joseph Frings of Cologne spoke. He stated that he was speaking on behalf of Cardinal Franziskus Koenig of Vienna and himself and seconded the proposal of Cardinal Lienart on the grounds that the Council Fathers were totally unprepared to select the Commissions at this time.

There was a rather tense atmosphere in the whole assembly as everybody waited for the response of the Chairman to the proposal. The nervous buzzing ceased abruptly as Archbishop Felici, the General Secretary called for order with the words: "Audiant omnes." He then announced that the Chairman had ruled on the motion and that the elections would be postponed as proposed. The applause after this announcement was even more spontaneous and louder than after the speeches by Cardinals Lienart and Frings. There was no mistaking the sentiments of the vast majority of the assembly regarding the postponement of balloting.

Archbishop Felici then went on to say that the time until next Tuesday could be used by the Council Fathers to select their candidates for the various commissions and could prepare lists for the guidance of other national groups.

Then quite suddenly the meeting was adjourned and the announcement made that the next congregation would be held on Tuesday, October 16. For a moment everyone seemed quite surprised that the Chairman did not proceed to some other phase of the preparatory steps that needed to be taken. But the meeting ended with a prayer and we were on our way before 10:00 A.M. Obviously most of the Council Fathers were pleased over the postponement of the balloting. At the same time the buzzing was going on everywhere as rumors began to fly about high pressure methods that had been contemplated by the Holy Office and the General Secretariat in order to secure a composition of the different commissions which would provide action favorable to the policies of the Roman Curia right down the line. There were a number of

strange things which happened regarding the selection of the candidates for the commissions. The ambassador to the Holy See from Nationalist China prepared a list of names, one for each commission consisting the Cardinal Tien, Bishop Yu Pin and a number of Phillipino bishops! It was also stated that the ambassador from India did the same.

OCTOBER 14: Had planned to go to the flea market this morning, but the weather was not favorable so the idea was dropped.

Msgr. Albert F. Giovanetti, of the Secretariat of State called to see me at noon. As one of the periti, he attended the congregation yesterday morning. He reported that Archbishop Felici was quite unhappy about the postponement of the balloting. He also related that he sat next to Monsignor Amleto Tondini, in charge of the Secretariat for Briefs' who seconded Cardinal Bacci as the expert Latinist. When Cardinal Lienart spoke at yesterday's meeting, Msgr. Tondini turned to Msgr. Giovanetti and asked: "Did you understand what the Cardinal said?" Giovanetti said "No. Did you?" The answer from the expert Latinist was: "Not one word." Msgr. Giovanetti went on to say that there had been much criticism within the Roman Curia itself of the ruling that Latin only would be permitted in general meetings. The problem was not so much how well the individual Council Fathers know the Latin, but how they pronounce it when speaking. Generally the French and the Spanish can not be understood at all, while the Germans are understood very well. There was no problem in understanding Cardinal Frings or Archbishop Felici.

Giovanetti also said that there had been a great debate about the place of holding the working sessions of the Council. The arrangement in St. Peter's is impressive, but it is utterly impractical for use by a deliberative body. Most Council Fathers can not see the chairman or the speaker. The PA system, however is quite satisfactory. There had been a strong feeling that one of the large auditoriums should have been arranged for the working session. There are at least three such places in Rome, one on the Via della Conciliazione right close to the Vatican. But the traditionalists insisted that all meetings must be in St. Peter's.

This afternoon, just as Father Lessard and I were going out for a ride Archbishop Hallinan called to ask if I could come to the Michael Angelo to see him. A nominating committee appointed by Cardinal Spellman that morning had prepared a list of names for each of the ten commissions. His name and mine were put down for the liturgical commission. Archbishop Young of Tasmania and Father Fred McManus were in his room and they were working a complete list of 16 names for this commission. He wanted me to join them and later have dinner with Archbishop Flahiff of Winnipeg. Rather reluctantly I went. I am not at all anxious to be on any commission. Once the Council activity gets into full swing there will be enough to do just attending the regular congregations. Membership on a commission could mean practically doubling the amount of work. I can not understand why they dropped Bishop Reed and Bishop Waters, especially the latter. The original American list had only four names of US bishops for each commission, without making an effort to fill the entire slate with names from other countries. This morning they decided that such tactics could backfire since the impression might be created that we were using high pressure methods to get a lot of Americans on the commission without regarding to representation by the rest of the world. So they left only Archbishop Hallinan's name and mine on the list, and also only two names on the list for the other commissions.

I went to the Michael Angelo and we spent about an hour going over the names which they had selected before I arrived. We then proceeded to the Hassler Hotel where Archbishop Flahiff joined us for dinner. Archbishop Flahiff stated that the Canadian bishops had drawn up

their own list and had placed Bishop Joseph Albert Martin of Nicolet on the Liturgical Commission and himself on the Commission for Religious. After some discussion, we came to the conclusion that it would be folly on our part to have our list different from that of the Canadians on that particular point.

The dinner was delightful, mostly because Archbishop Young is such a delightful character. He is a deeply spiritual man, well read, mentally very keen. Father McManus spent some time this summer in Tasmania lecturing to clerical and other groups on the liturgical apostolate. He said that the Archbishop seemed to be an excellent administrator also because he had planned and executed an extensive program of building in his archdiocese. His conversation was most stimulating.

Came home from the Hassler in a pouring rain which started just after we had gotten to the hotel. Rome certainly can not boast of its weather in October this year.

OCTOBER 15: Said Mass for the Cardinal this morning. It is the twenty-seventh anniversary of his episcopal consecration.

We had the first sessions of the annual meeting of the bishops in the auditorium of the North American College. Archbishop Hallinann and I planned to submit our list for the Liturgical commission to Cardinal Spellman before the meeting opened. By accident we saw Archbishop Cody and Bishop Griffiths and were pleasantly surprised to find that they had not only prepared a full slate for the Liturgical Commission but also for the other nine commissions. Their slate of candidates for the Liturgical Commission was almost identical with the one we had prepared! We had wasted the afternoon yesterday.

OCTOBER 16: The second general congregation was called to order promptly at 9:00 A.M. The trip to St. Peter's was made in the rain again. Archbishop Gonzales was celebrant of the Mass. I had not made any entries on the pamphlet containing the ballots yesterday because it got very late before I got through with my breviary. Therefore I had to use the few minutes before Mass to fill in some of the ballots. Then after Mass I proceeded to complete the entries. I paid little attention to the proceedings which were very brief. First Cardinal Ottaviani took the floor and proposed that the rules for the election be modified in the interest of saving time. If the rule of canonical elections requiring an absolute majority of the first two ballots were adhered to it would take very long before the full membership of the various commissions could be elected. He therefore proposed that a simple plurality only be required, thus requiring only one ballot. In this way the 160 candidates with the highest number of votes would make up the membership of the ten commissions, with each of the 160 candidates being assigned to the commission for which he had received the greatest number of votes. It is not too clear to me whether they would count the total votes a candidate received or only the votes he received for a specific commission. The logical procedure would be to count all votes. We will see how the Secretariat of the Council determines this point.

Cardinal Roberti rose to object to this plan proposed by Cardinal Ottaviani. He stated that the rules for the Council had been approved by the Holy Father and could not be changed without his consent. The chairman of the meeting ruled that this matter had been cleared with the Holy Father at the audience which he granted to the Chairmen of the Council. Therefore the plan proposed by Cardinal Ottaviani was approved.

It was then announced that the Council Fathers could fill in their ballots and leave as soon as they had turned them over to the tellers. Those who preferred to return home to fill in their

ballots or wished to change their votes could request a new ballot form from the ushers. But all ballots must be delivered to the General Secretariat Office before 6:00 P.M. today.

An announcement was made of the appointment of four undersecretaries of the Council. Archbishop Krol of Philadelphia was named one of these undersecretaries.

It is interesting to note that the announcements made at the Congregation were repeated in several languages. I hope this indicates that more vernacular will be used in the meetings.

I completed the entries on my ballot, and by 10:00 A.M. we were on our way home. The next Congregation was announced for Saturday, October 2.0

During the lunch hour we got a great shock. Father Lessard came to me at table to say that Bishop Burke of Buffalo was brought to Salvador Mundi at about 2:15 P.M. suffering from a heart attack. He passed away about a half hour later. He apparently had not had a history of heart trouble. He was at the Bishop's meeting yesterday but did not feel well this morning and therefore remained away from the Congregation at St. Peter's. His auxiliary, Bishop Smith called the doctor at noon who brought him to the hospital. This is the second death of a Council Father. One died on the way to the Council when he reached Naples.

OCTOBER 17: Attended the second day of sessions in connection with the Bishops' meeting. The L'Osservatore Romano for today carried a complete and detailed report of what transpired at yesterday's General Congregation. It is very difficult to know what exactly is covered by the rule of secrecy. Apparently it will be general policy to announce what transpired in the General Congregations. When the time comes for discussion of specific items of the Schemata, it will be interesting to see just how much the Vatican Radio and Osservatore will disclose of the debates.

OCTOBER 18: Went over to Santa Susanna's for the funeral Mass of Bishop Burke. The Mass was celebrated by Bishop Leo Smith, Auxiliary at Buffalo, and the absolution was given by Cardinal Spellman. The Mass was at 8:30 A.M. It was a low Mass in order to permit departure for the States on a morning flight. Besides the American Cardinals, Cardinals Cicognani, Marella, Koenig, Browne, and a reported 200 bishops and Archbishops were present. The church was packed, with practically all seats taken by the Bishops and Archbishops.

We went directly from Santa Susanna's to North American College where the concluding session of the Bishops' Meeting was held. The last action taken by the Bishops was to set up an organization of the US Bishops to function during the entire period of the Council. The general plan was proposed by Bishop Primeau after the issue was brought up by Archbishop Schulte. Ten committees paralleling the Commissions of the Council are to be set up and a plan is to be developed for meetings by these committees along with regular meetings of the entire body of bishops each week, or at least not less than once in two weeks. This is an important move. It will be interesting to see how seriously it is followed through. If done well the project could be of tremendous help to us. The Committee to set this up is Archbishop Shehan, Bishop Primeau and Bishop Reh.

Today was Bishop O'Connor's 76th birthday. We had a grand party for him in the evening. Besides the people living here in the house, the members of the hierarchy from the Wisconsin Province were invited. The Sisters really put on a big meal for the occasion.

OCTOBER 19: Went downtown to do some shopping. Among other things, I ordered a suitable box to use in presenting the ring to the Holy Father, which I plan to give to His Holiness as a memento of Cardinal Muench. The ring is rather large with cabachon cut green stone and six small genuine rubies. The lady at the shop where the box is to be made was very emphatic in stating that the stone is a melchite and not a jade as had been stated at the Crescent Jewelers in Fargo where I had it appraised.

I also got a different radio, this time a Phillips transistor. This works much better, apparently because it operates on four flashlight batteries and therefore is not plugged into the regular current line.

Father Lessard attended a reception last night before Bishop O'Connor's party given for one of the Catholic news correspondents just arrived in Rome. There he met Msgr. Lally of the Boston Pilot who told of a meeting Cardinal Cushing had with Cardinal Bea. Bea went into great detail to explain what the Secretariat for Christian Unity is trying to do. He emphasized that he is getting direct clearance from the Holy Father for everything which he says publicly and is doing in his committee. Cardinal Cushing is quite excited over this whole program and expressed a wish to visit with Cardinal Koenig. Father Lessard told Msgr. Lally that Cardinal Koenig is living here at the Salvator Mundi and that he has a chance to see the Cardinal practically every day at meals. Father Lessard spoke to the Cardinal and the meeting has been arranged tentatively for tomorrow afternoon, October 20.

This noon our dining room took on an additional international air when Archbishop Emilio De Brigard Ortiz, Titular Archbishop of Disti, senior auxiliary to Cardinal Concha of Bogota was a guest along with his secretary. Archbishop sat at our table. There was a very interesting conversation between Cardinal Koenig and the Archbishop concerning conditions in Columbia. Apparently the conditions of the Church in Columbia are not nearly so critical as in other South American countries. Yet, the Archbishop indicated there are parishes with 30,000 souls and only one priest. One wonders how all these people get to Mass and the sacraments as regularly as the Archbishop says with such a shortage of priests! Of course, much help is given by the religious. There are 147 parishes in the Archdiocese of Bogota, 204 diocesan priests, 525 religious and 1,650,000 Catholics. They have a total of 150 students in one major and two minor seminaries. Fargo, with 90,000 Catholics, has 130 seminarians in one major and two minor seminaries!

The Archbishop's secretary ate at the other table along with Father Lessard and others. He indicated that Bishops of South America are organized for the Council, but there are a number of crosscurrents among them in so far as different questions are concerned. There was only one point on which the secretary was emphatic, almost vehement: resentment against the Roman Curia. He maintained that all South American Bishops were united on that point.

Bishop Hayes of Davenport dropped in to see Archbishop Byrne today. He said that on the boat coming over the Apostolic Delegate Archbishop Vagnozzi strongly urged the Bishops of the US to organize some kind of concerted support of candidates for the various commissions. He indicated that other groups were doing the same. As it turned out, that had to be done in the end, though the American Bishops were not too much enthused over the matter in the beginning.

OCTOBER 20: Bishop Janssen of Rotterdam celebrated the Mass at the General Congregation this morning. Cardinal Lienart presided at the meeting. Immediately upon being

called to order we were told that the Holy Father had dispensed from the rule requiring an absolute majority in the election of the Commission members. This dispensation was granted at the request of the Presidency in order to save time. The membership of the first seven commissions were to be announced at this meeting and the other three will be announced next Monday. Counting of the votes for the latter has not yet been completed. Then followed the announcement of the seven commissions. The atmosphere was very tense as Abp. Felici read off the names and the number of votes received by each of the 16 candidates who received the highest number of votes. Will mention more about this election later when I get the complete list. All I want to say now is that I was greatly relieved not to have been elected to the liturgical commission for which I had been nominated by the Archbishops and others who formed the nominating committee. This committee operated somewhat on the quiet. I believe that Cardinal Spellman named that committee, but I am not sure.

After all names of those elected to the seven commissions and also the names of those appointed to the liturgical commission by the Holy Father were announced, the assembled Council Fathers were taken somewhat by surprise when they announced that a press release would now be read. Abp. Felici read the press release (Nuntius). Then they distributed copies of the release to each of the Council Fathers and we were told that we would be allowed 15 minutes to read it over and make notes of any comments we wanted to make. My first reaction was that poor psychology was used in the second paragraph when they announced to all the world that in the Council we had the body of successors to the Apostles united under our head, the Pope. Obviously, this statement is true; but it is also unnecessary just at that time. It certainly is not a captatio benevolentiae. If we were addressing ourselves to the Catholics alone, it would be quite appropriate, but since we are addressing ourselves to all nations and peoples, this paragraph will be offensive to the non-Catholics who resent our claim to being the only true Christian church. This paragraph is particularly out of place since we later say that the Church was founded, not to rule but to serve. This release is quite different in its approach than the Holy Father took in several recent addresses and public statements. He had promised that the Council would present Catholic truth in an appealing light.

The debate on the statement seemed endless and was prolonged much beyond what was necessary. Yet, it gave evidence of a policy that everyone would be given a chance to speak his mind, I did not count the Fathers who spoke, but I would guess there were at least 35 to 40. Very many different opinions and criticisms were expressed, from the change of only a word or two to a statement that the whole thing should be dropped now until the Council had really accomplished something of note that would assure a hearing. Two statements made were noteworthy: First, the plea by Abp. Parente of the Holy Office that the release contain a terse and direct emphasis on three points indicating that the teachings of the Church alone represent the truth and offer the only possible solution to the world's problems. This attitude is characteristic of the Holy Office. Secondly, one of the German bishops followed him with the sentences "Nuntius est nuntius, non profession fidei!" The debate went on for an hour or more after which the members of the Presidency conferred briefly. Abp. Felici announced the changes that were accepted from among many suggestions that had been made. They included a reference to the Blessed Mother and changed two or three words in two places! Every other suggestion was ignored. They called for a standing vote. The favorable vote was almost unanimous. I still felt that the release was illadvised and therefore voted against the same. I hope this is not a bad sign indicating that I will feel constrained to vote "non placet" frequently!

The meeting adjourned at 12:45. It was a very long session and is an indication that there may be many longer ones in the future. The next meeting was announced for Monday, October 21

at 9:00 at which time discussion of the liturgy would begin. The time had expired for submission of a request to speak at Monday's session.

OCTOBER 21: Another beautiful day in prospect. Woke up feeling well, after having had a sore throat the night before. The Dr. had prescribed medications which seemed effective.

Went to the North American College for a meeting of the US Bishops called to set up a working arrangement to have regular meetings as a means of obtaining more information on the matters coming up for discussion at the General Congregations. Settled on a setup paralleling the Council organization: A Presidency of five members, a Secretariat of three members, and a committee of seven members corresponding to the then commissions. Bishop Primeau was also designated as an executive assistant to the Presidency. There was some urgency about the election of the liturgical committee since discussion of that section of the agenda was to begin tomorrow morning. This brought about a somewhat tangled situation. The committee consisting of Abp. Shehan, Bishop Primeau and Bishop Reh which had brought in the recommendations for this whole setup had also submitted their nominations for the various positions. Cardinal Spellman stated that he felt this was out of order, especially since he thought the list of nominees for the Liturgical committee was "stacked" to use his own expression. More than a half hour was spent in what amounted to little more than wrangling as Cardinal Spellman tried to evade reading the names of the nominees presented by the organizing committee. In the end the bishops by a vast majority insisted that the names be read and that other nominations be invited from the floor. In the end the following were elected, names given in the order of the number of votes received: Myself, Bishop Buswell, Bishop Reed, Bishop Issenman, Bishop Waters, Bishop Russell and Bishop McDevitt. The meeting then adjourned after Cardinal Spellman asked Bishop Waters as senior member of the elected committee act as temporary chairman to arrange for the organizing meeting. We met for two minutes after the general meeting to decide on holding the organization meeting at the Hotel Tiziano Monday afternoon at 4:30 P.M.

An interesting sidelight of our meeting (general). Cardinal Spellman suggested at the beginning that the Apostolic Delegate be invited. This was voted by acclamation. The Delegate appeared in a matter of three minutes, obviously having come to the College expecting this invitation! The delegate spoke three times during the meeting. He explained the matter of secrecy (but his explanation was not entirely clear). He cleared up the matter of holding such group meetings as ours. He spoke more at length about the Liturgical section of the agenda. He stated in confidence that this schema was printed just as presented by the Preparatory commission. This was through error. It seems that when this schema was presented to the Central Preparatory Commission, it was turned over to an individual to be studied and suggestions to be made to the Central Committee. But this person left town and in the end the schema was printed without emendation! That may explain why the schema is so liberal. In any case, the liturgy will stir up heated discussion. At this stage I have a feeling that a great many (majority?) of the US Bishops will not go along with many things in this schema. We will see.

OCTOBER 22: Archbishop Jaeger of Paderborn was celebrant of the Mass. His voice sounded a bit thin and shaky. He is not the vigorous man I first met at Regensburg in 1949. Cardinal Gilroy presided at the General Congregation. He did the best job of any of the presiding officers so far.

The personnel of the other three Council Commissions was announced. Was glad to see that Abp. Flahiff was elected to the Commission on Religious. Of the US bishops McShea and

Daly were elected to serve on Religious, O'Boyle and Cody on Seminaries, Reh and McGucken on Sacraments. It is interesting to note that Abp. O'Boyle received the highest number of votes of any member on any commission. He received over 2400 votes.

The rescript appointing the original Committee for the Unity of Christendom was read and attention called to the fact that this Secretariat would continue with the original personnel and that no elections would be held.

The question of the liturgy was introduced at about 10:00 A.M. Cardinal Larraona, Secretary of the Congregation of Rites and Chairman of the Preparatory and also now the Conciliar Commission on the Liturgy made a brief introductory speech and then Father Antonalli of Rites read the complete report. The latter spoke a bit fast at first, but then settled down and made an excellent presentation. The speakers were instructed to turn their manuscripts over to an usher after they finished so that it could be given to the General Secretary. I understand that all these papers will be printed, but do not know when or even if they will be made available to all Council Fathers.

It was announced that 25 had asked and received permission to speak on General Principles enunciated in the Schema. Cardinals and Patriarch would speak in order of seniority, archbishops and bishops "sine ordine."

Frings was the first to speak. He has lost his eyesight to a point where he can read nothing. Yet he spoke fluently with flawless Latin and perfect enunciation. He spoke for the proposed decrees and constitution. Rufini objected to the fact that the Ambrosian and Oriental Rites were not included in the plan. Surprisingly enough he did not object to the schema as such. Maybe his ammunition is saved for later use when details will be discussed. Lercaro approved the schema subject to certain needed emendations and corrections. Montini also favored the schema. Spellman first objected to making more changes because for years we have had changes, some major, presented to us almost every year. Then he attacked the whole idea of liturgy in the vernacular, using all the old stock arguments which here been current ever since the issue was first raised. Doepfner very obviously had coordinated his remarks with those of Frings, taking up where the former left off. In reality his remarks were very much of a reply to Spellman, as though he had known beforehand what Spellman would say. Vagnozzi attacked the whole thing sharply - theological language is inexact referring #5 on page 181. He proposed that the whole schema be referred to the Holy Office to expurgate theological errors. Ungarelli talked too long, so the chairman interrupted by saying "satis!"

The next speaker started talking about the proemium. He was interrupted by the chairman before he finished the first sentence and told that today the discussion is confined to general principles only.

This morning Bishop Facchini of Alatri just south of Rome died very unexpectedly. He started for the meeting at St. Peter's, riding a street car. He took sick on the street car and was dead before they reached the hospital with him. That is the second Council Father to die since the opening on October 11.

Attended a meeting of the Liturgical Committee for our US group in the Hotel Tiziano. Bishop Waters was elected chairman and Bishop McDevitt Secretary. Bishop Waters is to attend a meeting in Archbishop Boland's room at the Excelsior Hotel tomorrow night. Since that is the meeting of the Presidency of our group, we will learn more about our function. We did take action to recommend to the Presidency that they invite Father Fred McManus to read a brief

paper at the meeting of the Bishops next Sunday, giving a summary of all major papal documents pertaining to the liturgical revival or apostolate from St. Pius X down to the present time. This is to serve as a background against which the bishops could form their judgment on the details of the schema on which the Council is now acting. We also decided to intimate to the Presidency that one of their number should preside at the regular weekly meetings of all Bishops at the North American College. He decided to invite Bishop Wright to meet with us informally and brief us on the theology of the Liturgical matters proposed in the schema. Regular meetings were to be held at 4:30 P.M. each Monday, if possible at the NCWC center.

OCTOBER 23: Archbishop Krol celebrated the Mass and Cardinal Spellman presided. It was a very poor job of presiding, the poorest so far) because his enunciation of the Latin was very poor. Most names were scarcely intelligible. Abp Felici announced appointment of commission members to replace those who were elected but who were ineligible because of other positions held by them in the Council. Abp Morris of Cashel in Ireland was named to replace Wyszynski. Abp Kavukatt of India was named to replace the Abbot Nullius of Santa Maria in Grottaferata on the Secretariat for Christian Unity. The Secretary General read instructions concerning working rules governing the speeches during General Assemblies. The Council Fathers seem to find it hard to confine themselves exactly to the section of the agenda under discussion and to limit themselves to the allotted ten minutes. Cardinals are most frequent offenders! Quote from Osservatore "The first speeches of the assembly once more touched upon the projects on the Sacred Liturgy as a whole in which there was diversity of opinions expressed. The different tendencies reflect different schools of the liturgical movement, different experiences and problems, which reveal, however, an identical concern for affirming the intrinsic value of the liturgy and to make it the living and real expression of the worship which the universal Church renders to God."

Ottaviani spoke first. Asked for use of precise terminology. Principal proposal was same old story: check the schema for dogmatic content; objects to exaggerated statements by liturgists and asks for moderation in expression; wants it remanded to the theological commission i.e. practically, to Holy Office.

Cardinal Ritter did a splendid job. His voice carried perfectly, his script was in good, simple, direct Latin. He spoke of the doctrine of Mystical Body as part of deposit of faith. Liturgy needs reform and renewal. Church has always adjusted to need of time and place. Rigid uniformity contradicts the nature of the Church which serves so many nations in every place and every age. Such uniformity is an insurmountable obstacle to pastoral work of Church. Ended with fulsome praise of the schema. Ritter's only fault was that his speech was somewhat long. (When I returned to Salvator Mundi for lunch, Cardinal Koenig was already at table. He had seen Ritter after the session adjourned before he left St. Peter's. Ritter told him that Spellman upbraided him for giving such strong endorsement to liturgical renewal as proposed in the schema!)

Archbishop Fares of Cantanzaro, Italy, stressed need of unity in Church today, and especially in the liturgy. There is one language Latin as sign of unity.

Bishop Volk of Mainz spoke strongly in support of schema.

Discussion then began on the Proemium. A note of humor entered when one bishop's name was called four times. He finally came to the microphone to say that he hadn't asked to speak and had nothing to say! Rufini, like the Curia people and ultra conservatives or traditionalists

attacked the schema on doctrinal groups, and on grounds of overemphasis. In the seminary every branch should be studied, not only liturgy! He even questioned the right of the Council to talk about it at all, because Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* had stated emphatically that the right to introduce rites into the liturgy belong to the Holy Father alone - "uni Summo Pontifici!" The Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro replied in the next speech that this is a discussion of liturgy and dogma.

Cardinal McIntyre made an impassioned speech in defense of the Latin. As usually happens when he speaks even in English, he got so wound up with his subject that he stumbled all over his words. His Latin was poor to start with; it was terrible in the garbled form in which he read his paper. (Someone said: "The most impassioned defense of Latin was made in the poorest Latin spoken thus far in the Council") He went to great lengths (quite beyond allotted time) to indicate that a most precise language is needed to express dogmatic truth; that can be done only in Latin. It is not a dead language generally known among educated. He came back again and again to the same statements. He ended with a grand eulogy of Latin and said a change would endanger the stability of dogmatic theology. Mass must remain in Latin for the same reason.

Cardinal Leger followed McIntyre and by contrast was most effective with his calm and measured discussion of the need for reform of liturgy as a pastoral measure. That can not be deferred for a long time because pastoral needs are grave now.

Cardinal Godfrey took an out and out traditionalist position, though he made an excellent presentation of his thesis. He tried to counteract pressure from the missions by pointing out that drastic changes would create confusion in mission countries where there are many tribes. Cardinal Browne spoke for Bacci; but it seems that he got confused with notes Bacci handed him. Hesitated and paused often.

Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh, our friend from here, spoke in French. His remarks were unfortunate because they were an intemperate attack on Latin as a dead language. He pleaded for use of living languages only in the Church. The feeling with which he spoke and the impractical suggestions he made were certainly harmful to the spirit prevailing in the Council. Feelings are strong on both sides of this discussion, but on the whole great restraint has been exercised in presenting views.

At supper this evening a phone call came for me which Father Lessard took. Father Gy OP, director of the wellknown Institute for Pastoral Liturgy, sponsored by the French Hierarchy in Paris, asked whether I would see him and Bishop, Andre Pailleur, Auxiliary Bishop of Rouen. They came at 8:30 P.M. After my first feeble effort at French, Father Gy explained that Bishop Pailleur spoke English. He did, much better than my French. I had met Father Gy (this is not a typing error, the name is Gy, pronounced gee) at the time of the Liturgical Conference at Assisi in 1956. He is one of the outstanding liturgists in France in so far as promoting liturgical apostolate is concerned.

They came to find out if it were possible to exchange some meetings between the American Bishops and the French hierarchy. They are most anxious to exchange ideas to encourage support of the Liturgical Schema under consideration now and also to consider questions related to other matters to come up in the future especially in the dogmatic section and that on the episcopate and government of dioceses. I explained that I was not chairman of our episcopal committee on the liturgy but merely a member. I suggested to them that they get acquainted with Bishop Waters and promised to refer the matter to Bishop Waters also

tomorrow morning. I explained to them that we were working up programs to provide for information for our bishops in their regular Sunday meetings, but that we were still in the formative stage in connection with our organization and that I could give no definite word on what the possibilities are.

OCTOBER 24: Called Bishop Waters this morning and told him of the call from Bishop Pailleur and Father Gy. He was displeased with the information and indicated that he had a good meeting last night at the Excelsior Hotel with the members of Presidency and Secretariat as well as chairman of committees. The program has been arranged for next Sunday. It is planned to have it last only 11 hours. Fred McManus is to talk as I had suggested, on the documents pertaining to the liturgical apostolate. A special meeting of our committee is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon at NCWC headquarters.

Archbishop Aston Chichester of Southern Rhodesia collapsed this morning in the narthex of St. Peter's on his way to attend today's General Congregation. He was dead upon arrival in the hospital. He was 83 years old and was retired. This the third sudden death among the Council Fathers in little more than a week! Actually this is no more than the average number of deaths reported in the Osservatore, which lists all deaths in the hierarchy throughout the world.

The Mass opening the General Congregation this morning was in the Byzantine Rite. Celebrant was Archbishop Philip Naaba of Beirut, who lives here in Salvator Mundi. He was assisted by two priests and a deacon. A commentary was given in Latin for our benefit by Archbishop Edelby, who also lives here and eats at our table. The singing was beautiful and the rite is very dramatic. Cardinal Play y Daniel of Toledo, Spain presided. It was very difficult to understand him, as is the case with most Spaniards when they speak Latin. 2337 Council Fathers were present.

They distributed the calendar of the working session during the months of November. Nineteen General Congregations are scheduled, which will be a big load. However, there will be no session in November until the fifth. This is due to All Saints and All Souls Days, plus the fact that on November 3 there will be no session to permit the necessary preparations for the solemn anniversary Mass on November 4 commemorating the fourth anniversary of John XXIII's coronation. Who would have thought on November 4, 1958 that we would be in session at an ecumenical council only four years later.

Cardinal Tisserant gave an historical sketch of the liturgical languages in the Church and drew the conclusion that there is nothing in the history of the Church to prevent introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy of the occidental Church. Cardinal Gracias spoke in his usual gracious manner. He handled the Latin remarkably well and showed that he is as much of an orator in Latin as in English. He emphasized the fact that the liturgy refers primarily to the life of the parish. He has long pleaded for more vernacular and remained a "vox clamantia in deserto" He patiently waits for action in this field. Those who say "'festina lente" want the situation to remain "sicut erat in principio et in aecula saeculorum." The pastoral needs require action now.

Cardinal Bea asked for better coordination of the schemata. There is much overlapping among the liturgical, theological, Oriental schemata with that of the Secretariat for Unity also. He also expressed high praise of the ecumenical movement. He warned that we should not now close the door to possible action in the future. No sweeping rule should be made concerning introduction of different rites in the future because we are not in a position to

foresee the circumstances obtaining in future generations and therefore should not try to legislate for those future ages.

As might be expected, Bacci advanced several points concerning the vernacular. He grants no vernacular in the Mass. I didn't get his reasons clearly, but he did use Rossini, the "rebel" as an example of what can happen. Rossini considered the Latin as an obstacle between priest and people. Then he proceeded to quote Trent! This has a bit of a humorous touch. The favorite story making the rounds of the Council is attributed to Leger. At a press conference before leaving Montreal he spoke very seriously about his work in the Council and the tremendous effect the Council would have on the future of the Church. Then he said "off the record" that some of the Council Fathers in Rome or converging Rome were on their way to the Council of Trent: yes, some of them are even going to Ephesus! A shorter version is usually told. Ottavinni and Rufini were missing from some meeting before the opening of the Council. Someone asked "where are they?" The answer was: "on the way to the Council of Trent!" Bacci made much of the argument that there are countries in which there are more than one official language as in Switzerland and Canada. He was not quite so strict on the matter of vernacular in the sacraments and sacramentals. But he did quote Pius XII on use of Latin.

Cardinal Meyer gave what was in my opinion the best speech of the Council so far. Apparently Gracias had said some things he had on his manuscript. He said that he would not repeat what Gracias had said. He then said that #24 regarding Latin as the official language of the Western Church, and the quote from Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* was well put. He emphasized that the people all over the world expect something from the Council in this matter. The least they hope for is more vernacular. A *via media* must be found between the two extreme views expressed in the Council to achieve the pastoral objectives of the scheme and meet the pastoral needs of our day. He suggested that #34 of the liturgical section should be modified. The ordinary is responsible for pastoral questions in his jurisdiction and the machinery set up to implement the decrees of the Council must safeguard this point.

Bishop Van Lierde suggested that a new definition of the liturgy should be composed. He wanted clearer expression of the connection between the liturgy and the spiritual life.

The chairman did not control the meeting too well. Several speakers went much too long. He did call a halt to one and correct another who went off into the second chapter of the Liturgical section, though we were limited today to the Proemium and the first chapter. As a consequence we were somewhat late in getting out - nearly 12:30 P.M.

OCTOBER 25: Day off today. Went over to the American Consulate to cast our absent voters ballot. Bishop O'Connor was along. We were agreeably surprised that acting American Consul in Rome is a Mr. Hummel from Gackle, N.Dak! I believe he was as pleased to see a fellow North Dakotan as I was.

There was a meeting of the Liturgical Committee for the American Bishops attending the Council. The meeting was held in the NCWC offices. In addition to the members of the committee, Bishop Wright, Father Gy, OP, and Father McManus attended. Father Gy gave us a run down on the organization set up by the French Hierarchy, covering not only the Liturgy but also Catholic Action, Education, etc. Judging from Father Gy's description the French hierarchy seem to be the most closely organized hierarchy in any major country in the world. It was interesting to note that while the organization and programs are planned for the whole country each ordinary promulgates each specific program or regulation in his own territory.

Bishop Wright discussed the theological implications in the schema on the liturgy. He said it was his considered opinion that the schema is basically a pastoral document and that there is absolutely no foundation whatsoever for the attack being made on the same on dogmatic grounds. Such attacks have been made by Ottaviani, Rufini, Vagnozzi, Staffa, etc. There is a well founded suspicion that the attacks made on dogmatic grounds are simply an effort to sabotage the entire schema and to prevent any of the liturgical reforms which are proposed on pastoral grounds.

Considerable time was spent in making up a list of bishops who would be qualified to serve on the various committees. The Presidency and the Secretariat have prepared a tabulation of the preferences expressed by the different bishops for committee assignments. It is planned to elect some, if not all committees next Sunday.

Bishop Waters announced the program for next Sunday. I told the group that Cardinal Koenig had spoken to Karl Rahner about addressing our group sometime in connection with the theological schema, and that such men as Schmidt and Jungmann would also be available. The members of the committee felt that this should be discussed before the whole body of bishops before action is taken.

Bishop Wright told of his contacts with the Observers. Professor G. H. Williams who is substituting for Prof. George B. Caird of Oxford (Williams is from Harvard) seems to be very favorably impressed by the whole procedure. He is a good Latinist and probably follows the proceedings more intelligently than most bishops! He mentioned that the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church in Russia maintain a very reserved and distant attitude towards the observers from the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia whenever they are in public. Williams said that on one occasion he rode in an elevator with both groups. As soon as the elevator door closed all reserve was dropped and they exchanged greetings in a typically Eastern effusive manner, embracing each other and chattering away excitedly. When the elevator stopped and before the door opened they instantly resumed their cold and reserved manner!

Cardinal Koenig dropped into my room for the nine o'clock news again tonight. He is much disturbed by the Cuban situation and is anxious always to get the latest news concerning Kennedy's arms embargo against Cuba. After the newscast he remained for a few minutes. He asked whether the offer to have Karl Rahner address our group was accepted. He then went on to express his concern about the theological schema. It is much too negative in its approach. It may be proper for the Holy Office as defender of the purity of faith to be negative in its approach; but that certainly is not the proper approach for the Council. He was very emphatic in stating that Ottaviani had no right to block the Council from considering the whole question. He said the First Vatican Council rejected some schemata and insisted that we should do the same in connection with the theological schema this time. I told him that I thought it was improper for the Presidency to rule for postponement of the balloting and the switch in order of considering the schemata; that we should have voted on the question and not be governed by a mere ruling of the presidency. Koenig agreed.

OCTOBER 26: It is interesting to note that the news release on the Council given over Vatican Radio and in Osservatore today said: "After the brief recess of Thursday, Oct. 25, which was used by many Fathers for regional and national meetings..." First we were given to understand that such meetings were frowned upon and permission for our Annual Meeting was given reluctantly and with limitations. Now the official attitude is that such meetings are to be encouraged.

Mass was celebrated by Bishop Dieudonne Yougabare of Koupela, Upper Volta. He is the first colored bishop to celebrate an opening Mass. Cardinal Frings presided at the session. Owing to his poor vision (almost total blindness) he had great difficulty in the recitation of the opening prayer and also in announcing the names of the speakers. Several Benedictine Abbots General from different countries and congregations who spoke today. They uniformly praised the schema. 2393 were present.

The story is making the rounds that word has gone down from above that members of the papal diplomatic service should not speak at the General Congregations. It seems that the speech made by Vagnozzi at one of the earlier sessions created a bad reaction. Archbishop Linus Zanini's name had appeared on a list of those who were given an opportunity to talk, but later he did not talk. Zanini is in the diplomatic service.

This brings up the matter of Vagnozzi's appearing at our meeting last Sunday and speaking in such blunt terms about the dogmatic implications of the schema, a line that has been followed consistently by Curia personnel. There is very much resentment among the bishops of the US (and from other countries) that Vagnozzi is so obviously promoting the Curia line. It should be remembered that Vagnozzi was ordained as a sacristan of St. Peter's. He was brought into the career through the influence of Ottaviani and is completely a creature of the latter in so far as advancement in the career is concerned.

In the meeting of the Liturgical Committee yesterday there was some blunt talk about the manner in which Vagnozzi threw his weight around in our General meeting last Sunday and his blunt speech in the General Congregation earlier this week. The hope was expressed that he would not continue to attend our Sunday morning meetings.

I saw Archbishop Alter and Archbishop O'Boyle at this morning's session. I spoke of Cardinal Koenig's hope that there will be some opportunities for men like Karl Rahner, Schmidt, Jungmann, etc. to appear before our group in connection with the liturgical and Dogmatic schemata. They suggested that I speak to Archbishop Roland who is the chairman of the Presidency of our own group. He will be pretty much in charge of our Sunday morning meetings. Alter intimated that there might be some difficulty in bringing such men in because of Spellman and McIntyre. It seems that both are particularly adverse to bringing in German experts, as from the fact that they are ultraconservative on most issues whereas it is taken for granted that all German theologians and bishops are ultra liberal.

The question of who should preside at the Sunday morning meetings also came up. Roland plans to preside, since the presidency was organized to provide a rotating chairmanship similar to the Council. It is feared that if Spellman presides there will be little free discussion. Both Alter and O'Boyle said they would support the chairmanship by the members of the presidency and not the Cardinals. This is not the NCWC but a study group for purposes of being briefed on the Council.

OCTOBER 27: Archbishop Miranda of Mexico City celebrated the opening mass. There were 2302 Fathers present. Cardinal Ruffini presided. 23 Council Fathers spoke, many among them being from Spain and South America. At the beginning a strong appeal for brevity in the speeches was made by Felici. He added that 39 names were on the list yet to speak on the Proemium and first chapter. This appeal had no effect on the speakers! They droned along as dully and were as repetitious as ever.

Archbishop Eugene D'Souza of Nagpur, India, had a good speech, though he talked much too long. He was particularly vocal on the subject of the authority to be given to local conferences. Bishop Peter Arjkata Kobayashi of Sendai, Japan gave an excellent speech in good Latin. He stressed the fact that the unity of the Church derives from her nature and her teachings. Her unity would be very fragile if it depended entirely upon externals like language.

A rather humorous situation developed when one of the bishops refused to stop when Ruffini interrupted at least three times! He finished his speech in spite of Ruffini's efforts. Bishop Conrad DeVito of Luchnow, India spoke of the many dialects in his territory. Vernacular would not help unify them and would be useless. What the people need is unity of faith achieved through thorough instruction in their religion.. He even went so far as to suggest that Sanskrit be used as the liturgical language in his area rather have a dead language or classical language rather than multiplicity of vernacular languages. We need pastoral zeal to meet our problems. Bishop Joseph Shoiswohl of Seckau, Austria suggested that the Council Fathers judge this whole matter from the viewpoint of the pastor who stands before a congregation Sunday after Sunday. He said he had suggestions to make which he has put in writing and will file with Secretariat. Latin language qua talis is not a bond of unity, was the substance of the next speech. The whole schema should be accepted substantially as it is and implemented immediately. The whole meeting came to life suddenly when one bishop (didn't get his name)suggested that the whole debate be terminated and that remaining speakers simply file their statements with the secretariat. This suggestion received thunderous applause from the group. Ruffini, however, stated that every individual bishop can forego his opportunity to speak, but that according to the rules promulgated by the Holy Father he had a right to speak and could not be deprived of this right. This bit of by-play had no visible effect on the speakers that followed!

The meeting closed with the announcement that a message of congratulations would be sent in the name of all Council Fathers to the Pope on occasion of anniversary of his election.

Bishop Hoch and I gave a dinner Saturday night for Archbishops O'Neill of Regina; Pocock of Toronto, Flahiff of Winnipeg and Bishop Klein of Saskatoon. The Sisters put up an excellent meal and the whole occasion was delightful. As might be expected, there was an exchange of jokes concerning the Council, especially on Ottaviani.

Bishop Baumgartner has come into the hospital yesterday. Tonight his condition became grave to a point where he was not expected to survive the night. He had been anointed in the afternoon, but was unconscious by late evening. We were not permitted even to step into the room. I sent a cable to Charlie Muench.

OCTOBER 28: The weather was threatening again, so we did not even try to get to the flea market. The meeting of the US Bishops was held at NAC on schedule. Archbishop Boland presided. Cardinal Ritter was the only cardinal present. He sat in the audience with the bishops, a row ahead of me. The meeting was a rousing success. Archbishop Krol spoke about fifteen minutes on the functioning of the Council, giving us interesting and valuable information about how we are to proceed if we want to talk at the General Congregation. Father Fred McManus spoke on the background of the Liturgical Apostolate, giving a succinct and complete analysis of the papal documents associated with the growth of the liturgical revival from Pius X's motu proprio of liturgical music down to the present time. He was very well received. Archbishop Hallinan brought us up to date on the Liturgical Commission. They had met daily during the week, but spent their time on procedural matters since nothing had been referred to them as yet on the scheme which is un Council

The only sour note entering the meeting was injected by Bishop McShea. He said that he had it on unquestionable authority that the schema on the liturgy was printed and distributed practically as received from the preparatory Commission on the liturgy by the Central Preparatory Commission. He reported the same story that Vagnozzi had told the week before, only adding greater detail. He used the expression, "scuttlebutt" around Rome". His story was that the Central Commission had discussed the draft submitted by the Preparatory Commission on the Liturgy and had decided on many more or less radical changes. Father Bugnini was secretary of that preparatory commission. He was instructed by Cardinal Larraona Chairman of the preparatory commission to incorporate these revisions and emendations into the schema which was to go to the Council Fathers. Father Bugnini was supposed to have neglected to carry out these instructions, so that the draft was printed pretty much as received from the preparatory commission! Larraona went to the States and was reported to be furious when he returned and found that the schema contained the original draft from the preparatory commission and not a draft revised according to the action of the Central Preparatory Commission. Bugnini was supposed to have been removed from his teaching positions in Rome and he was supposed to be the only secretary of the preparatory commission who was not appointed to the same position in the Council Commission. (Actually I believe the secretaries of the Council Commissions are all bishops.)

McShea's statement was resented very much by the Bishops. Archbishop Hallinan said that Larraona made no reference whatever to any such incident in the meetings they had the past week nor did he indicate any disappointment over the scheme. Father McManus stated that he had a copy of the report which the Preparatory Commission on the Liturgy made to the Central Preparatory Commission. He stated that extensive changes were made by the Central Commission. He said he could not go through the whole report, but he did read the paragraph pertaining to concelebration and pointed out the extensive changes which had been made. It was quite obvious that the story repeated by both Vagnozzi and McShea was not accurate. At this point Bishop Buswell stated bluntly that he felt we should not be wasting our time with the "scuttle around Rome" and added that he thought it was poor taste to introduce it into the meeting. That was that.

It was announced that the next meeting would be held on November 5 at 4:00 PM in the NAC, owing to the fact that the celebration honoring the Holy Father on the 4th anniversary of his coronation on November 4. I expect that a motion will be made at that meeting to have all our meetings on Monday afternoon. There is much dissatisfaction with the Sunday morning hour. After the regular meeting we had an impromptu meeting of the liturgical committee. We decided always to have our meeting the day after the General meeting. Bishop Waters asked me to try to get Father Jungmann to come to our meeting on Tuesday. That I did.

This afternoon Father Lessard, Archbishop Byrne and I took a drive out to the "New Rome" started by Mussolini as counterparts of Pagan Rome and Christian Rome. Much of the project was completed during Mussolini's time, but only a small part of what is there now. It really is magnificent. Some fine specimens of contemporary architecture. A luxury city is growing up in the neighborhood, in the form of fabulous private homes.

On the way home we drove by St. Paul's Outside of the Walls and then went to the Reda. This is a new building. Fr. Lessard called for his friend Mr. Mills, an American business man who had a successful cleaning establishment here in Rome. He is now a student at the Reda. He introduced us to Mr. Angus McDonald, originally from East Grand Forks, Minn. From there on our visit was a riot. McDonald knows Abbot Baldwin well and also some of our priests who

were contemporary students at St. Thomas and St. John's. He is a good storyteller and entertained us royally. Mr. Mills seems to be a rather extraordinary character. He had started three years ago, but had to drop out because the Italian whom he left in charge of his business proceeded to wreck it promptly. So he returned for three years to take charge of his business again and arranged for a former associate to take over. The near Beda building is very interesting as a specimen of contemporary institutional architecture, though I do not like the chapel.

OCTOBER 29: 2277 were present at today's session. The Archbishop of Nagasaki celebrated the Mass and Cardinal Caggiano of Buenos Aires presided. The message received from the Holy Father in response to the message sent to him was read. Sixteen spoke on the first part of the schema on the liturgy. (Before the speeches began, the remaining names were announced for the various commissions. Leo Binz was appointed to the commission de episcopatu and John Cody to the commission on Seminaries. That raises the number of Americans on the Commissions to 20). Bishop Simons of Indore, India spoke. He hurt his own cause by asking for too much. Archbishop Benedetti of Lodi in Italy, extremely old, spoke as a true conservative. He spoke well eloquently, but I hope he is speaking for a lost cause. One of the speakers (I did not get his name or position) spoke on the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and the scapular. He was called to order by the chairman and told to stick to the subject.

At long last we moved to the second chapter of the schema on the liturgy. Spellman, Ruffini and Leger spoke first on this section. They were true to form. The only point in which Spellman seemed to want some change was a shortening of the form used in distributing Communion. Ruffini definitely is living in the 16th century. He just wants no change, period. Leger made a good appeal on the basis of pastoral needs.

Went shopping this afternoon with Bishop Hoch. We should have stayed at home because the weather became foul as we got downtown.

OCTOBER 30: Bishop Jacques Manger of Oslo celebrated the Mass this morning and Cardinal Alfrink was the chairman. 2257 Fathers were present and 23 Fathers spoke. Cardinal Godfrey objected to common prayers after the gospel and sermon. He objected also to any prayers in the vernacular by the priest. He was very much opposed to communion under both species, relying primarily on the practical arguments. He even referred to the problem of the lipstick used by the women in connection with the difficulties in distributing communion under both species. Cardinal Gracias pointed out that it will be difficult to settle anything in regard to the remaining chapters on the Liturgy until the question of the Episcopal Conference and their authority are settled. All adaptations in the liturgy are subject to these conferences in the schema. Hence that is the key issue in the whole subject. He suggested that we define the status and competence of the National Episcopal Conferences before going farther.

In the notes I took at the session I stated "Ottaviani made a fool of himself. He became so engrossed in his speech, one might say "agitated" that he became quite unintelligible. He launched forth in an attack on Cardinal Alfrink, the chairman who had spoken ahead of Ottaviani in his capacity as Council Father and not as chairman. Alfrink had placed much stress on the scriptural account of the institution of Eucharist when speaking of distributing Communion under both species. Ottaviani made several statements with which he drew a scattered laugh, though the atmosphere generally seemed to be tense. He went on and on in this vein. Everyone was quite surprised when suddenly the Chairman (Alfrink himself) interrupted Ottaviani and told him that he had already spoken fifteen minutes. This was the

one and only time so far that a Cardinal had been stopped when he went overtime. It seemed that at first Ottavinni wanted to make some reply, but after a pause he simply left the microphone and returned to his place. This incident was the talk of the town for the day. Ottavinni did much harm to his own cause. He had also brought up the question of the extent to which the Central Preparatory Commission was ignored in the printing of the schema. Bea followed with a very precise, calm and well steadied resume of the subject. It was a great contrast to what Ottavinni had done. Bishop Dwyer of Leeds in England gave a very conservative speech. He wanted all vernacular excluded except in the foremass. He spoke rather bluntly. He did not want to be part of any Council which presided over the liquidation of the Latin language as the official language of the Church, and of the Roman Rite.

Had a meeting of our liturgical committee tonight. Father Jungmann talked to us. He would have been much more effective if Bishop Waters had allowed him to talk in Latin. In the evening there was a dinner for the bishops of the St. Paul Province at Archbishop Binz's room in the Michael Angelo. A most pleasant evening with Bishop Rowley in great form with ??

OCTOBER 31: Archbishop Lemieux of Ottawa celebrated the Mass. He was the first Dominican to be celebrant. It was a bit confusing in the beginning, Cardinal Tisserant presided. They announced the Mass to be celebrated in St. Peter's next Sunday morning. We are to wear mantelletta, just as we do during the General Congregations. 25 Fathers spoke on the second chapter of the liturgical schema today. The biggest discussion is on the question of holy communion under both species and concelebration. It is a pity that these two points which from the practical pastoral standpoint in my opinion are secondary are allowed to obscure the central issues. Lercaro spoke first and gave his support to the whole chapter. Cardinal Koenig spoke for the first time. His voice is not too good for the microphone, but he spoke slowly and deliberately which helped put his speech across. He made two brief points: 1) the authority of the Episcopal Conferences should be clearly and distinctly defined in relation to the adaptations that are to be made in the Mass. 2) he endorsed what Cardinal Bea had said in connection with concelebration. He cautioned particularly having the Council close the door to concelebration. He emphasized that the schema in permitting concelebration is not making it obligatory but leaves it optional. He implied that he could not understand the violent opposition to concelebration since it is not being made obligatory for anybody.

Archbishop Hallinan spoke on the whole second chapter and made a good presentation of the case, though his pronunciation of the Latin was not too distinct. (At table this noon after the session Cardinal Koenig said with a laugh: "Cardinal Spellman just turned pale while Archbishop Hallinan spoke."). He made a good presentation. We are hearing more and more criticism of the US bishops because aside from the Cardinals, Bishop Helmsing and Archbishop Hallinan are the only ones who have been on their feet. And then Bishop Helmsing yesterday did no more than say he would pass because someone else had anticipated what he wanted to say. The impression is getting around that the American Bishops are indifferent to the question of the liturgy. The real fact is that most of us feel there has been too much talking with constant repetition and that there would be more harm than good coming from any addition to the number of those who insist on talking. The longdrawn out debate is wearing on the patience of many, many Council Fathers. But I have an idea that there will be more Americans talking as time goes on. Another reason why most of the US bishops do not talk now is, in my opinion, the fact that not too many have formed solid convictions on the points under discussion. Hence they are not too well informed on the subject and can not make a scholarly presentation. Actually the average US Bishop could do as well as the average speaker that has made himself heard.

NOVEMBER 1: We had planned to take advantage of the holy day by making a trip to Tusculanum and then Viterbo. But when we got up this morning it was raining and the sky looked as though it would keep on raining all day. Then suddenly at about 9:30 the sky cleared completely and Father Lessard called Father Potter and by 10:00 Father, Lessard, Father Potter, Bishop Hoch and myself were on our way to Subiaco. We chose this trip rather than the other because of the late start. We got to Subiaco at 12:15 and were guided through the entire building at Subiaco. It was my first trip there. I found it quite fascinating because of the rich Benedictine lore of the place. The 12th and 13th century frescoes are remarkably well preserved.

On the way back we had dinner at Ristorente della Rocca in Tivoli. It had started raining when we left Subiaco and was still raining when we finished the dinner, which was very good. So we gave up all thought of seeing the Villa d'Este and its fountains.

NOVEMBER 2: Today was a perfectly glorious day, providing a break in the bad weather we have had for some days. Did considerable shopping this forenoon and tried to get things together for Christmas. Made some progress.

Msgr. Giovannetti was here for lunch. He went into considerable details concerning Ottaviani's speech the other day when Alfrink stopped him. There is much buzzing in Rome over that incident. The repercussions may be extensive in connection with that incident.

NOVEMBER 3: Spent the entire forenoon going to the Vatican with Bishop Hoch, and then down town finishing (?) my Christmas shopping. Bishop Hoch had an amusing experience in the Secretariat of State. He had applied some time ago for some papal honors for four priests. Msgr. Giovannetti arranged to have Bishop Hoch meet the man in charge of the briefs. He said these documents were all ready and he would get them. He returned in a few minutes with a whole bundle of documents for at least twenty different people! Bishop Hoch was mystified until he noticed that the documents were for people in Diocesis Siopolitana (Sioux City) instead of Diocesis Siouxormensis (Sioux Falls!)

Monsignor Giovanelli was here when we got back from town and had lunch with us. He invited us to come to Mone Rotondo for tea in the late afternoon. The weather was beautiful and the drive to Mone Rontondo and back was delightful.

NOVEMBER 4: Attended the Mass in St. Peter's commemorating the fourth anniversary of the coronation of John XXIII. The Mass was celebrated in the Ambrosian rite by Cardinal Montini. He was chosen to be celebrant because he was the first cardinal appointed by John XXIII. The ceremony lasted for two hours of which 1/2 hour was taken up by addresses in Latin and Italian by the Holy Father. The Ambrosian rite is quite impressive, though the ceremony today had to be varied somewhat from its authentic form because it was celebrated coram summo pontifice. I was not too much impressed, however, by the chant. It seems to be a bit on the weird side with many odd intervals.

Even though the weather is still beautiful, we went nowhere this afternoon. Everybody seemed more interested in getting a good sleep.

Bishop Bartholome, Bishop Soenneker and Father Yzermans called for a visit after supper. It was a very enjoyable evening. I was more than surprised to learn how much Bishop Bartholome has become interested in the "liberal" attitude towards the matters coming up in

the Council. He is not only interested in the reform of the liturgy as outlined in the schema, but has become quite aggressive in supporting the cause!

NOVEMBER 5: The Mass this morning was in the Antiochan Maronite rite. The language used was Syriac, the modern descendent of the Aramaic spoken by our Lord. The General Assembly (the accepted English word for "Congregatio" in the Latin) was presided over by Cardinal Lienart. An announcement was made of the addition of ten prelates to the Administrative Tribunal. Bishop Begin of Oakland and Bishop Furey, Auxiliary of Philadelphia were among the ten. The attendance today stood at 2196.

Cardinal McIntyre spoke again today. His appearance was much poorer than his first. He suffered from a cold and found extreme difficulty in making himself understood. He told of the excellent attendance at Mass in the States, both on Sundays and weekdays. His adamant opposition to change of any kind was very apparent again. He indicated that the schema on the liturgy, if adopted, would be a scandal to the faithful and claimed that active participation would be a distraction to the people!

The weekly meeting of the US Bishops took place at the North American College at 4:30 P.M. Archbishop Boland presided again. It was decided that all future meetings would be held on Monday at 4:30 P.M. Father Stransky, a Paulist Father spoke to the group on the work of the Secretariat for Church Unity. He has been attached to that Secretariat ever since it was originally organized. He is young, energetic, extremely well informed on the whole history of ecumenism, especially in its relations to the Catholic Church. His speech was very well received and he was kept on his feet for quite a while answering questions. It is very obvious that the bishops generally are very much interested in this topic.

Father Stransky came to Salvator Mundi for supper. I had told Cardinal Koenig that Father Stransky would be here for the evening meal. Contrary to his usual practice, he came down for supper in order to have an opportunity to hear the story of the Secretariat for Unity. He remained at the table till nearly 8:30 P.M. Then the Cardinal came with us to my room and remained here for about an hour. Father Stransky and everybody from the fifth floor along Msgr. James Finucan remained here and kept the conversation going till nearly 11:45 P.M. The longer we talked the more I became impressed by Father Stransky's ability and personality. He is deeply interested in and dedicated to his work.

It was inevitable that considerable time would be devoted by Father Stransky to telling us about the opposition which was manifested in the Curia to the very thought of having the Secretariat for Unity, to say nothing about the obstructionist tactics employed to impede its work. The Secretariat was compelled to submit separate schemata on topics which normally and logically should have been made parts of other schemata. And then there was difficulty in getting such schemata through the Central Commission. The opposition of the Holy Office and other branches of the Curia was simply blind. They wanted no observers; they wanted no official recognition that other groups, whether Eastern schematics or Western Protestants, even existed. The work, step by step, was supported by the Holy Father. In fact the whole idea of the Council was fought tooth and nail; but the more it was opposed the more insistent the Holy Father became and the more pressure he exerted to get the matter followed through!

Much of the conversation was devoted to Father Stransky's contact with the Observers. He had a busy time of it, acting as one of the interpreters at each General Assembly and meeting with them regularly in briefing sessions at other times.

The process of arriving at a decision as to whether observers should be invited, and then, who should be invited was long and at times tortuous. In the first Vatican Council there were no observers, possibly because the invitations were issued in a manner that was most insulting. If it had not been for the patience, persistence and fearlessness of Cardinal Bea, the matter would probably have been handled in the same manner this time if observers had been permitted at all. Many delicate situations had to be faced before they could even decide how many invitations should go out. In the beginning they expected that the dissident Eastern Church would be the simplest. They would simply issue the invitation to the Orthodox Patriarch, Athanagoras at Constantinople who in turn would pass it on to the other Orthodox groups! In the end that became the most delicate situation. There is no unity among those groups, and they had to approach them individually. In the end the Russian Orthodox, both from Moscow and from the Russian Orthodox outside of Russia came; many of the other Orthodox groups among the Copts, etc., came; but the Greeks did not come. The Greek papers stated that they were not invited, which was not true. Pope John had been particularly interested in the Orthodox groups.

With regard to the Protestant groups, there also were many delicate problems that had to be solved. After much study and consultation it was decided to extend invitations only to international groups as were maintained by some Evangelicals, the Anglicans, Presbyterians, etc. The only exception was the colored Baptist from the South in the US. It was simply impossible to deal with all of the headquarters of the multitude of sects which were so common in the US. The large white Southern Baptist conference was also invited, but they refused, very probably because of their violent opposition to the Church in the Latin countries.

Naturally, we were more interested in Father Stransky's report on his actual experience with the observers. In the first place, the different groups were very, very careful in whom they sent as representatives. The matter was not finally settled in several instances until it was so late that top men could not be obtained for the first session. Dr. Skysgaard is an example. He is to be one of the observers for the Lutheran group; but he could not come this year because he was already committed to teaching in a seminary this year. He will be here for the second session. Other groups also had to send men who remained only for a while or will remain only during the first session. But in every instance where one of the men left, someone else replaced him immediately.

Furthermore, the men who come are highclass and seriousminded men. Almost all of them know Latin, many of them better than the average bishop! They are generally well trained theologians who have a background of historical and theological knowledge which equip them admirably for their task. Then, they are open minded and serious.

The reactions of the observers are interesting. The first great impression was made on them by the fact that they were invited. This was the first time in centuries that formal invitations had gone out to any non-Catholic group to attend a council or any such similar meeting on a national or regional level. They appreciated the historical importance of that fact. They frankly admitted that they agreed among themselves to do everything in their power to prevent anything happen the first time observers were present at a Council becoming the last time!

The Observers were deeply impressed, not so much by the pageantry of the opening session, something which the Protestants especially would not consider very important, but by the regular working sessions the fact that it wasn't just a talking business session, but a combination of worship and work, opening with the Mass, closing with prayers, complete dedication of the sessions to discussion of religious affairs. Strangely enough, one point

spoken of most frequently was the dialog Mass in which over two thousand bishops from every race and speaking every language, could unite in an act of worship!

They were very much surprised by the frankness and the freedom of the debate during the opening sessions. Many of them had the Blanchard idea of the monolithic structure of the Church which permitted no diversity of opinion and made anything like debate simply impossible. We can imagine their surprise when the discussion of the Liturgical Schema began. The Cardinals spoke first. They couldn't believe their ears when they heard several Cardinals rising to speak, each obviously in utmost sincerity expressing views which at times were diametrically opposed to views expressed by others that proceeded or followed. And so on, through every session they heard real debate. It took a while for them really to understand the fact that in a Council such as this bishops are brought from all over the world to form a consultative and legislative body, each of whom is to contribute the benefit of his wisdom and experience towards an effort to form a working policy calculated to meet the needs of the Church in our day. This factor made a good impression.

The observers appreciate the confidence that is placed in them. They are not bound by the secrecy of the Council Fathers, officials and experts; they are admitted to all General Assemblies in which the debates take place, they were not tied down by stringent "ground rules." They appreciated that they were invited as guests and are treated as guests, and that in ordinary courtesy they should not abuse this confidence. Hence so far there have been no unpleasant incidents such as could easily occur if they gave interviews to sensation or scandal seeking reporters.

Some of the observers are guests of the Holy See; most of them pay their own way. They are not confined in their coming and going, nor are they set apart in a ghetto. Father Stransky said that up to this point they feel the whole thing is working out well and producing immense good for the future.

NOVEMBER 7: The Mass was celebrated by Bishop Endre Hamvas of Casnad, Hungary. Cardinal Tappouni presided. He had difficulty in reading the names because of poor eyesight and lack of knowledge of Latin * he is Oriental. 221 Council Fathers were present. 28 speakers were announced, and then all were asked to submit manuscripts in duplicate, for the commissions and council archives.

Discussion continued on the third chapter of the Liturgical schema. Bishop Zauner of Linz, Austria did an excellent job. We had a bit of a show when Bishop Antonio Pildain y Zapiain, Bishop of the Canary Islands, Spain spoke. He was cut off by the chairman after he had spoken about six minutes. The chairman rang the bell three times, but the good bishop kept right on going. They cut off his microphone. It was really a bit ludicrous when the bishop started arguing with the chairman, who of course, couldn't hear a word or even see the bishop. The latter pointed to his watch apparently intimating that he still had four minutes to go! I got a good view of this whole incident because the bishop was directly opposite me.

Then the General Secretary announced that the Holy Father had seen fit to grant to the Council Presidency the faculty of proposing to the General Congregation that the discussion on a given chapter be brought to a close when in their judgment the matter had been sufficiently discussed. The remaining speakers who were thus cut off would be permitted to submit their manuscript

as though they had spoken. This announcement was received with ringing applause. The chairman proceeded immediately to propose that the discussion of the second chapter be closed. A standing vote revealed that the ayes had practically 100% of the votes.

We then proceeded to the discussion of the third chapter of the schema. 20 Council Fathers spoke on that chapter today. It is interesting to note that, in so far as I could follow the discussion, there was no objection even from Cardinal Ruffini to the ideal of a ritual in the vernacular. There were many points raised concerning the different proposals for the various sacraments and sacramentals. In fact I feel that this subject has been discussed about as thoroughly as is needed.

One speaker drew a laugh when he went on and on in a droning voice talking about general considerations in connection with the ritual. Then he said: "Nunc ad rem" and proceeded to discuss point after point in the schema until he had exhausted his time and was called to silence. Another Council Father was interrupted three times and reminded that he was talking about the chapter we had just finished before he was cut off entirely.

Father Schmidt from the Gregorian was here for dinner today along with Father Essen, the vice rector of the Casa Santa Maria. This was an interesting visit. Bishop Vincent Waters, Chairman of our Liturgical Committee was also here. The discussion started at the table and then was adjourned to Father Lessard's room till about 3:00 P.M.

I had expected to discuss the liturgical schema with Father Schmidt, but we soon got off on the subject of Father Bugnini's connection with the Liturgical schema. As stated by the Apostolic Delegate and Bishop McShea in our meetings of US Bishop's, Bugnini was supposed to have goofed in the preparation of the Liturgical schema, and was punished by not being named secretary of the Liturgical Commission and removed from his teaching position. I asked Father Schmidt about the accuracy of these rumors or allegations.

He stated that Father Bugnini was the secretary of the Preparatory Commission on the liturgy. As such he was the workhorse in the preparation of the schema. Schmidt stated that Bugnini was given three days time to amend the original schema turned over to the Central Preparatory Commission according to the changes voted by the said commission when acting on the draft received from the preparatory commission on the liturgy. It was a physical impossibility to consult with all the consultants of the preparatory commission and also with the members of the commission within a three day period. So Father Bugnini did the best he could, referring doubtful questions to those in Rome whom he could reach.

It is completely inaccurate to say that the schema received from the preparatory Commission was printed without giving effect to the action taken by the Central Preparatory Commission. I know that statement of Father Schmidt's to be true because I have had an opportunity in our Liturgical Committee meetings to compare the text of the original schema submitted by the preparatory commission with the schema we received. There are many differences, some of them rather striking. For instance in the paragraphs on concelebration, the number of occasions recommended for concelebration is drastically reduced. In the chapter on the breviary, the provision for recitation in the vernacular under certain conditions was dropped, and no word left in the schema to provide for recitation of the breviary by priests when saying the office privately. All of the declarations of the original schema were dropped.

At the same time it is true that some points were left in the schema on which there had been much debate in the Central Commission. Father Schmidt explained that Bugnini did this on

the advice of the people whom he could consult in such cases where the vote of the Central was practically divided evenly between placet and non placet. They did not feel that a practically tie vote should be made the basis of decisive action by the Commission. It was a case of being damned if you do and damned if you don't. In cases of such close votes Bugnini left the schema as it was.

The schema was printed immediately and action taken to distribute it as soon as possible because of the rapid passage of time and the approach of the date for opening the Council. Immediately a storm broke over the head of Bugnini. Even though he acted with the advice of all consultors he could reach in three days time, he personally was made the scapegoat. Practically all points involved had been supported by the "liberals" and opposed by the "traditionalists." The traditionalists involved are in high places and exercise much power in the Curia and the Universities. Bugnini was deprived of his teaching position in the Lateran. He had been the top man in liturgy there. Bishop McShea had stated that Father Bugnini was the only secretary of a preparatory commission who was not named secretary of the corresponding commission for the Council. That not accurate. So far as I know, none of the council commissions have anybody outside of their respective membership (all Council Fathers) as a part of the commission. The consultors are merely called in as needed. And Bugnini is one of the consultors for the liturgy.

As an interesting sidelight it should be mentioned that Bugnini was immediately engaged by Cardinal Agagianian to teach Liturgy at the Propaganda! Agagianian is one of the "liberals" who was on the Central Commission. The Benedictines at San Anselmo have also asked Bugnini to join their staff at the Liturgical Institute sponsored by the Benedictines at San Anselmo. Father Bugnini said that he would be happy to do so, but suggested that they wait a year or so, because the Liturgical Institute is under the direct supervision of the Congregation of Seminaries and University Studies. Since they are as ultra-conservative as the Holy Office, Bugnini felt they might be hurt if they picked him up too soon. Events proved how accurate Bugnini was in sizing up the situation. Father Marsili, President of the Liturgical Institute gave the second of a series (following Father Schmidt) of weekly conference on the matter under discussion in the Council. He was immediately called on the carpet at the Congregation and criticized for some of the things he had said!

Father Schmidt spoke rather freely about the developments which are taking place somewhat sub rosa in building up the Lateran as the dominating force in the field of seminary education. It is the front for all the conservative forces in the curia. He referred to the whole matter of the controversy between the Lateran and the Biblical Institute. Romeo had published an article severely attacking the Biblicum, etc. Apparently Romeo is just a front man who is not always composed and was used as a tool.

Father Lessard took Father Schmidt and Father Essman home. When he returned he said that Father Schmidt wanted to talk to me again about my taking some steps to counteract the damage done to Bugnini's reputation by the statements made by

NOVEMBER 8: Cardinal Gilroy presided.

The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Paul Nguyen van Binh of Saigon, Vietnam. 2214 Council Fathers were present. The Secretary General announced that after the completion of the third chapter on the liturgy today, the fourth chapter on the Breviary would be taken up. After that the remaining four chapters on the liturgy would be considered as a unity. He also announced that after completion of the schema on the liturgy, the Council would proceed to consideration of the Dogmatic schema of which the first chapter is "De Duplici Fonte

Revelationis." Twenty bishops spoke on the third chapter; seven who had signed up to speak renounced their privilege and filed their speeches with the secretary.

Bishop Firenze Engelini, who is in charge of the hospitals in Rome proposed that Extreme Unction be administered to all patients who are to submit to major surgery; and that the unction normally be performed on the forehead and the hands only.

Archbishop Eugene d'Souza of Nagpur, India gave the best speech of the morning on the third chapter. He is an Indian, but he spoke perfect Latin with good enunciation which made him very easy to understand. He made an earnest plea for a liturgy that throughout would be intelligible to the people. He expressed fear that the National or Regional Episcopal Conferences might restrict the local mission areas too much in making adaptations to local needs and circumstances. He wanted everything in the vernacular. He feared that if the sacramental form and the actual blessing were in the Latin it would look like some magical formula to native peoples who are accustomed to seeing the rites of witch doctors.

Bishop Alcides Bendoza Castro, an auxiliary from Abancay, Peru suggested that the Credo, Pater and Ave be said before the confirmation rather than after. He also suggested that only one sign of the cross be used in the form and that the words of the form be revised in order to overcome the difficulty of repeating the present rather difficult sequence of words in the form which become so hard to pronounce properly when there are large classes to be confirmed.

Joke for the day: quotation from Archbishop John Murphy of Cardiff: "Eo minus habentes eo major loquentes!" (The less they have to say, the more they speak.)

Cardinal Frings started the discussion of the Fourth Chapter on the Divine Office. There was a tenseness in the atmosphere when he began speaking and the crowd remained unusually quiet throughout his talk. He suggested that there be a reform of the text of the psalms so that they could be recited more intelligently, distribute the scripture readings more judiciously so that it would make their reading by the priest meditative prayer and give the local ordinary authority to permit reading of breviary in vernacular. This was based on the fact that so many vocations come from schools where Latin is not taught adequately or at all.

Ruffini took everyone by surprised when he suggested that at least some psalms would be permitted in the vernacular. Re #74 he denied that any recitation of the office by nuns could possibly be considered public prayer; the same in #75 concerning prayer of breviary by lay people. Only the priest can have part in public prayer of the Church.

Valeri raised the question of the obligation involved in private recitation of breviary. He used the example of the Orientals. The burden of his talk was that the good priest will say his breviary when reasonably possible; and by implication, the bad priest would not say it regardless of the nature of obligation.

Leger gave a somewhat lengthy, but very earnest speech. He would restrict the obligation of the breviary in private recitation to Lauds, Vespers and the lessons. He attached much importance to the lessons; they should be arranged so as to be really spiritual reading and should be required not on the basis of quantity but time. For other hours, pastors of souls should not be obliged to recitation. Their pastoral work is their observance of canonical hours!

NOVEMBER 8: This morning the anniversary Mass for all Cardinals who died in the last twelve months was celebrated in St. Peter's. Cardinal Ferretto was the celebrant and the Holy

Father presided and gave the absolution. The attendance was very small, due no doubt in a large measure to the foul weather this morning. There were storms generally all over Italy yesterday and today, with some snow in northern areas today. Father Lessard went to do some shopping for me while we were in St. Peter's. He said during that time he got caught in the worst shower of rain he ever saw in Rome. The wind howled like a North Dakota blizzard at times.

Because of the bad weather we stayed in all afternoon. Along towards evening I was in Father Lessard's room, both of us in shirt sleeves, when who should step off the elevator but Cardinal Spellman. He called at the hospital to see Bishop Flannelly and others who were sick, and decided at the same time to see the "boarders" on fifth floor.

The formal opening of the scholastic year at the Gregorianum was at 5:00 P.M. today. I didn't go because of the danger of a terrible traffic jam. Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop Jachym, Archbishop Byrne and Bishop Comba from this house attended. Bishop Comba had to walk home most of the way because the traffic jam was worse even than anticipated. They reported that there were between 20 and 30 Cardinals present along with an estimated 500 archbishops and bishops. Since in an ordinary year only a dozen cardinals and fifty or sixty bishops would be present, this was a grand demonstration. Of course, much of the increase in the attendance was due to the fact that so many prelates are in Rome. But the striking thing is that the number at the Gregorianum was more than twice that at the Lateran. This is interpreted as a grand demonstration of loyalty to the Jesuits at the Greg during the present efforts of the Lateran to expand and dominate the field.

NOVEMBER 9: Cardinal Frings presided at this morning's assembly. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Ettore Cunial, Vicegerent of Rome. 2216 were present. All discussions of the day were in connection with the section of the Breviary. Twelve Cardinals and seven bishops and archbishops spoke.

Spellman spoke in favor of permitting priests the option to use the vernacular. The arguments against vernacular in other ceremonies do not apply here. There can be no question of scandal to our people since this applies only to private recitation.

Cardinals Wyszyński, Lefebvre and Godfrey opposed use of vernacular for various reasons. Godfrey insisted that there was too much exaggeration regarding the burdens of the pastoral ministry. He spoke of the "heresy of the active ministry," meaning that activity in pastoral work could never be substituted for the official prayer of the Church. Doepfner spoke rather long, but very well. He agreed with Frings and Leger, both with regard to the use of vernacular and in the matter of the structure of the office. Meyer spoke briefly and very directly. He agreed to the use of vernacular, but expressed opposition to the idea of having the matter decided by National Episcopal Conferences. He wanted the matter regulated by episcopal conferences in Rome. This is a general position that he has taken, and I suspect He will bring it up again when we come to discuss the schema on "De Episcopatu, etc." Bea gave a scholarly talk, recalling all the work which has been done on the breviary by the committee appointed by Pius XII, the Congregation of Rites, the Preparatory Commission for the Liturgy and the Central Commission. He asked that all this work should not be thrown lightly aside, and that the job should be completed.

Bishop Connare spoke very well. He appealed for vernacular, speaking on behalf of 90% of American hierarchy. He stressed the points a) spiritual life of the priest more meaningful prayer and b) pastoral efficacy in better position to bring God's word to the people. Bishop

Reh appealed for a special breviary for use in private recitation. He argued against Note #5 on p. 188 of the schema. He spoke very well, handling the Latin in an excellent manner, both in composition and delivery.

There were several bishops who spoke for the status quo; and two of them received scattering applause.

There was an interesting postscript to the report on the Council assembly in which attention of the Correspondents was called to pages 32 to 35 of "A FEW THEMES DISCUSSED IN THE CENTRAL COMMISSION OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL. This was the first reference to this document in the Osservatore. By coincidence the November 3, 1962 issue of THE TABLET has an article from its home correspondent entitled "A CURIOUS DOCUMENT." For anyone who wants to get any understanding of the workings behind the scene by the Curia reading this article is a "must". It is even more important that he secure and study a copy of the document itself. I am trying to get a copy of the complete document if at all possible. It is supposed to be and is described as "A DOCUMENTATION PREPARED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF PRESS OFFICE." The Tablet says: "The first half of it, treating of the Sources of Revelation, the Deposit of Faith and the Moral Order, bears clearly the stamp of a single author. The second half divided between the Liturgy and Press and Entertainment is less homogeneous and less objectionable." This is a quotation from the documents: The field then is intense, as one can readily see: above all is that field in which swarm the pet and diverse errors of various situations in today's modern world: its technical progress, styles of life, increased means of advertising and propaganda. " Again: "...this deposit of faith does not appear as an inert collection of dustcatching backflies but rather as a continual spring." Obviously this document was written in Italian and somebody did a "dictionary job" of translation into English. Apparently the whole document is in a tone which is in flat contradiction to the tone which Pope John XXIII has adopted from the beginning. The way the TABLET described the document, it seems that the writer hasn't heard of an idea newer than the 16th century. The only reference to science is "... the pseudo scientific claptrap."

Bishop Cleven told me at table that the German, French and Dutch theologians are going to make an effort to have the whole dogmatic schema discarded and to substitute for it an entirely new schema having a positive approach. He said: "The Curia is trying desperately to get the Council to put its stamp of approval on everything that the Holy Office has said and done in the last fifty years." In my opinion Bishop Cleven isn't far wrong.

NOVEMBER 10: Cardinal Ruffini presided. The Mass was celebrated in the "Bragan" rite of Lusitania in Portugal Bishop Francesco Maria Da Silva, Auxiliary Bishop of Braga. This rite is only slightly different from the Roman rite. It dates back to 561. 2172 Council Fathers were present.

Before starting the program Ruffini once more called attention to the rule that no applause is to be given any speaker. He noted that this rule was always violated by the younger bishops sitting at the further end of the Council chamber. Since they probably did not hear previous announcements because they are so far away he was making this announcement with emphasis! He said they must insist on the rule against applause because it would not be fair to permit applause in favor of the points made by the speaker without permitting the "explosiones" of those who are opposed.

Ruffini also made a brief speech in defense of the "minutanti" in the Roman Curia. Whatever they do, is done under direction from the superiors in the respective offices. These men work

hard and their labors should be appreciated. This was very obviously a reply or rebuke to the criticism of the Curia made on November 8 by Bishop D'Souza of Nagpur. Eighteen bishops spoke on the breviary.

Bishop Cesare Vielmo, Vicar Apostolic of Aysen in Chile proposed that there be three breviaries: for use in monastic institutions, choral recitation by seculars, and for private recitation. Even at that, each of these forms of the breviary needed great improvement aside from the adaptation to the various purposes. Bishop Joseph Reuss of Sinope was most emphatic that spiritual life of the priest is impossible without prayer. He wanted the vernacular in the recitation and proposed some extremes in the limitations on the breviary to permit more time for other forms of prayer along with the pastoral labors. Bishop Leven, Auxiliary of El Paso pleaded for making the vernacular optional in the breviary. His reasons, he said, were not an argument against Latin or condemnation of lack of knowledge of Latin. It is simply a matter of pastoral work. Nothing touches the heart of the people so much as a direct and intelligent presentation of the Word of God. Priests can do this much better if he becomes thoroughly familiar with the scriptures through the breviary in vernacular.

Bishop Luigi Carli of Segni says that the psalms and other scriptural parts of the breviary should be based on the Vulgate or other ancient Latin versions and not the Hebrew or Greek. He used soso arguments against use of the vernacular that were almost asinine. E.G. the people would be scandalized to learn that priests have to pray only fifteen minutes a day whereas they spend much time in church visiting the Blessed Sacrament themselves (as though it were suggested even by the extremists that the priest devote no time to prayer or spiritual reading aside from the office!) He also tried to answer the argument of Cardinal Frings and a few others that there is difficulty in giving the desired Latin training to the many candidates for the seminary who received their secondary education in state schools which even in Europe are no longer so thorough in their Latin courses. He merely said, Well, the law of the Church requires the training of priests in seminaries where there are theological faculties and not in state schools!

After 18 had spoken on the breviary Ruffini called a halt and asked approval of the Fathers to the ruling by Presidency that debate on the 4th Chapter be terminated. That was given unanimously among applause which was not confined "to the young bishops at the other end of the Council Chamber." It was then announced that the remaining chapters (V though VIII) be treated as a unit which would complete discussion on the liturgy. Cardinal Spellman was the first to speak on these chapters. He said only about two sentences indicating that he was opposed to any further changes in the calendar of the Church.

Bishop Peter Cule of Moster, Yugoslavia brought about a few lighter moments. He complained of the loss of so many feasts during Lent like St. Thomas, St. Benedict, and others of special interest in his diocese. He spoke with great emotions and seemed on the verge of tears most of the time. Finally Ruffini interrupted him and reminded him that his remarks were aside of the point. He asked him to terminate his pious sermon on St. Joseph since we all recognized the strong faith of Yugoslavians in spite of their persecutions. Archbishop Frederic Melendro of Anking, China went off into a long and eloquent sermon. Ruffini finally interrupted him by sayings "Omnes episcopi sunt praedicatores; et praedicantibus non praedicatur." With that the meeting was ended, and Ruffini added a special invocation to St. Joseph in the closing prayers for the day! Went to the Finns (Mrs. Finn is Fr. Lessard's cousin) for dinner. Delightful!

NOVEMBER 11: Couldn't go to the flea market again because of rain! I went to Bob Piser's for dinner that evening. Archbishop Thomas Roberts, formerly of Bombay and Bishop Vincent

McCauley of Fort Portal were there also for dinner. Was surprised that Mrs. Piser is Sue Mulcahy from Minneapolis and had been a good friend of Beth White all through Holy Angels and St. Catherine's. They were in the same car pool. Just as we sat down to eat Father Gustave Weigel, Father McCool, Father Thurston Noble Davis (Editor of America) another Jesuit Bishop and a young Jesuit Father whose names I did not get dropped in. Father Weigel was nothing like what I expected. He is a tall rawboned individual, has a deep and somewhat loud voice. He is a marvelous story teller and the whole evening was a bit hilarious. There was no pretense at any discussion of serious matters. The good Jesuits obviously had called just to relax for an evening; everybody did. The Pisers themselves are delightful. I hope I can see them again before leaving Rome. Bob is the religion editor for Time magazine and does a good job. At the moment he is crowded more than usual because the head of the Rome bureau for TimeLife was killed in a private plane accident a few weeks back.

Before I left Bob told me he just had a phone call (caller unnamed) who had an audience (presumably private) with Pope John this morning. The Holy Father told him that the schema on dogma would come up for discussion before the week is over and that the one presented to us would be discarded and another substituted for it! That would be quite extraordinary, and I told Bob so. In a kidding way I say: "I am keeping a diary and I try to be accurate. Can I depend on this and put it into the diary?" He said: "Check with me on this and when the time comes you will see that I am right. But in the meantime, this is confidential." We will see. I know that the German speaking group in conjunction with the French, Dutch, Belgians and probably the majority of the Africans are working on or will support just such a move. In fact Cardinal Koenig told me at table at breakfast that they will move to drop the original schema and substitute the one they have prepared. I asked him whether they felt they could get a 2/3 majority on a vote. He wasn't too sure.

In any case, I am curious about who is Bob's informant, but he gave no clue.

NOVEMBER 12: It was announced today by the Secretary General that the second session of the Council will convene on May 12, 1963, the fourth Sunday after Easter, and will end June 29, the last Saturday in June. It was also announced that the Conciliar Commissions will continue their work during the intervening months. Cardinal Antonio Caggiano of Buenos Aires presided at today's session. The Mass was celebrated by Bishop Josip Arneric of Sibenek, Yugoslavia using the Latin rite but the Old Slavonic missal. 2185 Council Fathers were present.

There was much discussion of the calendar, some going into long and complicated explanations of the calendar. They seemed to overlook the fact that the schema proposes no more than that the Council goes on record as being willing to have the Church cooperate with any efforts that public bodies like the UN might make to simplify the calendar and prepare a perpetual calendar. There were many comments in opposition, usually based on unwillingness to change anything. The schema did place only one condition for cooperation namely that the week of seven days must be maintained. 21 speeches were made. The last speaker used an unusual device as a *captatio benevolentiae*. He stated that being assigned as the last speaker of an assembly is difficult and dangerous, but that he would face the situation! This remark was prompted by the fact that in previous assemblies there always was a great deal of buzzing going on as the last speaker took the floor because the Council Fathers would make preparation for leaving. His device was very effective. There was almost dead silence during his speech.

The regular weekly meeting of the US bishops was held as usual at NAC at 4:30 P.M. The weather was bad and there was violent thunder during the meeting.

Archbishop Hallinan gave a very brief report on the work of the Commission on the Liturgy. He was due at a meeting of the commission at 5:00 P.M. A regular log jam was developed within the commission. Of eight meetings already held, seven were devoted exclusively to procedural matters. He had made a motion at the meeting to have the commission proceed with the emendations of the schema proposed from the floor as fast as they received them from the General Secretary. This was ignored. For the next meeting he secured the signature of 13 of the 25 members of the Commission asking for the same thing. That too was sidetracked with the comment that there was no need to hurry. He said "we have rolled out bigger artillery for the meeting today and we hope to get some action." He felt that something would be done to permit voting on the schema by the General Assembly, possibly by Wednesday or surely before the end of the week. At the moment there seemed to be no grounds for his optimism. He stated that about the only constructive move they got through was authorization to distribute the declarations which were a part of the report of the Preparatory Commission to the Central Commission. It will be interesting to see whether we actually get these early enough to be of some help as we ballot on the emendations.

Bishop Wright then spoke on the dogmatic schema. Some parts of the schema he never got to see. These were printed in the schema as they were received from the subcommissions and never referred to a full meeting of the Preparatory Commission. It is doubtful whether the Central Preparatory Commission saw all parts of the dogmatic schema. There may be some explanation for this. They were all in such a hurry to get their preparatory work done in order to meet the deadline of the opening date set by the Holy Father, as was the case with the liturgical schema. As a consequence not all matters were submitted to the full commissions before going to the Central Commissions and not all points discussed by the Central Commissions got proper consideration by the secretary when he had the final draft of the schema printed. The interesting thing is that Bugnini got the ax insofar as it could be wielded by the Holy Office for such slip-ups in the Liturgical Commissions whereas Father Tromp, S.J., secretary of the Dogmatic commission got by. The difference is that Bugnini was "liberal" in liturgical matters whereas Tromp is the safest of the safe in dogmatic matters, by Ottaviani's standards.

Bishop Wright reported that in his opinion the dogmatic schema leaves much to be desired. The majority led by Ottaviani held out for the old form of condemnations whereas the minority representing modern theological thought wanted a positive approach which would provide a presentation that took pastoral needs more effectively into consideration. The minority got no satisfactory hearing. As a consequence the schema as finally presented to the Council Fathers represents little more than a repetition of a second rate text book fifty years ago, in the mind of many Council Fathers. This is true primarily of the German, French, Dutch and Belgian group.

Bishop Wright complained that some of the old problems which are no longer pertinent receive much treatment whereas the word "secularism" which is such a great problem in the English speaking world isn't even mentioned. The nature and the rights of Christian conscience are scarcely touched upon from the viewpoint of modern problems. The function of the teaching magisterium of the Church in the formation of conscience receives very inadequate treatment. Bishop Wright strongly suggested that Father Hering be heard by as many Council Fathers as possible. The great work he has done in theology was completely ignored by the majority of Preparatory Commission. The conservatives were particularly afraid of Father Herring's

treatment of marriage and virginity, referring to it as a mystical approach to marriage which down graded virginity. This again is a question of proper balance.

Bishop Griffiths, as usual spoke with wit on his part in the Preparatory commission. He started out by making some reference to the letter to THE NEW YORKER covering the Council. Some of the "liber" theologians who were supposed to have been excluded from the preparatory commissions actually were present as consultants and played an active part. Hence that letter was not accurate in all details.

Griffiths stressed the fact that there were really bitter, if not violent arguments on the subject of "de Ecclesia." It is interesting to note that in the 20 centuries of her history and in the twenty ecumenical councils, the exact nature of the Church has never been defined. The whole matter of freedom of conscience for those outside of the church and the rights of nonCatholics -questions which are such acute problems in the US received no consideration that is acceptable to our circumstances.

The article in the November Tablet on the "Curious Document" made much of the fact that the schema gives much attention to the problem of spiritism, and ridicules that fact. Griffiths pointed out that spiritism is a much more serious problem in Latin America than communism if that is possible. The practice of spiritism is a tremendous problem there and certainly deserves consideration.

He also reported that a point blank accusation was made in a subcommission meeting that we in the US actually encourage mixed marriages because we feel it is a source of converts! Griffiths countered by telling the story of mixed marriages in the States and that only one bishop back in 1882 had made some vague remark to that effect. He added that the laws forbidding marriage with communists was completely ignored here by comparison to our mixed marriages. There is some innocuous reference now to marriage with "unbelievers."

Neither Griffiths nor Wright made any reference to the efforts which are very obviously being made to drop the present dogmatic schema or at least parts of it and substitute therefore something with a positive approach. In view of what Bob Piser said last night I thought I might hear more in the matter; but there was nothing said.

November 13: The big news in this session was the announcement made by Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, in the middle of our assembly that the Holy Father had ordered the name of St. Joseph to be included in the Canon of the Mass, immediately after that of the Blessed Virgin in the Communicantes. This is to become effective on December 8 and the Congregation of Rites was ordered to issue the proper decrees immediately. It was stated this step was taken in response to the many requests of Council Fathers that this be done. Actually there were not so very many formal requests, though several Council Fathers spoke at length on the subject. The Council had taken no formal steps in the matter.

Cardinal Alfrink presided at the General Assembly. 2209 Council Fathers were present. Today is the first time Ottaviani put in an appearance since Alfrink stopped him when he talked too long some days ago. His staying away was made the subject of a front page story in "Il Tempo" last Monday. The Mass this morning was celebrated by Archbishop Manuel je Jeans Serrano Abad of Cuenca, Ecuador.

There were 22 speeches, mostly on art, music and the calendar of the Church. The last several speeches touched on the matter of fasting and abstinence. There were two or three

good sermons preached on that subject, one of which would have been a marvelous conference at a priests' retreat.

After the last man spoke, Alfrink put to a vote the proposal that the discussion on the last four chapters of the liturgical schema be terminated. The vote was practically unanimous. He then stated that tomorrow the Constitution on "De Fontibus Revelationis" would be proposed for discussion.

November 14: At breakfast this morning Cardinal Koenig seemed quite depressed. He told me of the meeting of the Commission on Dogmatic Truths last night. He stated that Parente called practically everybody a heretic! Apparently Ottaviani et al. were determined to meet the threat of different schemata proposed as substitutes for that proposed by the Preparatory Commission head on. From the way the Cardinal spoke, the meeting must have become a bit rough. Cardinal Leger provided the climax when he stated openly in the meeting of the Commission that if the right of free discussion were denied "he would go home." The Cardinal elaborated no more on the matter.

This reminded me of the visit with Msgr. Giovannetti last night. He had come for supper and then he remained here in my room till after 10:00 P.M. Bishops Hacker and Treinen dropped in at about 8:00 also. I mentioned to Giovannetti that the introduction of the dogmatic schema would mark the beginning of a real debate alongside of which the discussions of the liturgy were tame. He said: "No! There will be little discussion of this schema because it pertains to dogmatic questions; the Council Fathers will be afraid to intervene in these matters because they will fear that they might be called heretics!" I answered: "Monsignor, if the Holy Office is counting on that, they are due for a rude awakening." That subject was dropped.

The nineteenth General Assembly was opened by Cardinal Tisserant. The Mass was celebrated by Bishop Joseph Cheng Tien-Siang of Kaosing, Cina-Formosa. We were pleasantly surprised to have the Kyrie, Sanctus Agnus Dei chanted beautifully in Gregorian chant by a male group. The entire assembly sang the Credo after Mass before the Adsumus. One of the speakers yesterday had suggested that we have a daily chanted Mass with the Assembly singing the Mass in Gregorian. I don't know whether this is a permanent arrangement or not. I certainly hope so, because we are getting quite tired of the Sistine Choir with its total disregard of all rules concerning liturgical music.

The meeting started with some excitement when the following announcement was made in the various languages: "With the completion of the discussion of the project "De Sacra Liturgia" it is proposed to proceed to a vote on the following Order of the Day:

1) The II Vatican Council having seen the project "De Sacra Liturgia" approves its directive criteria which are intended to render, with prudence and comprehension, the various parts of the liturgy itself more vital and formative of the faithful, in accordance with present pastoral requirements."

2) The amendments proposed in the conciliar discussion, as soon as they are examined and compiled in due form by the Council Commission on liturgical matters, should be submitted without delay to the vote of the General Congregation, so that its votes may serve for a final rendition of the text."

We then proceeded to the first formal vote of the Council. The result was announced shortly before 12:00 noon. A total of 2216 Council Fathers were present. A total of 2208 voted, 2162 placet and 46 nonplacet. The overwhelming approval of the subject to the emendations, took every one by surprise a pleasant one for most of us.

The size of the vote indicated that there is a great deal more interest in the liturgical apostolate than had been suspected on the basis of the speeches made. As I look back over those weary hours of endless speeches, I recall that while there are very many emendations proposed, there were practically no suggestions made to throw the whole thing. The big question now remains: "What will the voting on the emendations do to the schema as a whole; and what will we have left?" Another big question is "What will be the effect of the action of the Liturgical Commission on the schema? Just how much can they do to eliminate much of what the Council Fathers proposed?" After all, it will be an extremely difficult job for the Commission to bring order into the great number of emendations suggested and leave an overall document that makes sense.

Concurrently with the voting there was more drama taking place during this nineteenth General Assembly. The proposed constitution of "De Fontibus Revelations" was opened to discussion.

Ottaviani took the floor before the formal discussion was opened. Instead of merely presenting the schema, which was his job as Chairman of the Dogmatic Commission, he prefaced the report with a discussion of several points in defense of the schema. He referred to four points a) several "rival" schemes were being proposed to supplant the official schema which his committee had prepared. He quoted Canon Law which stated that the Holy Father has the right to propose the matter for discussion (He did not, however, state the full truth, namely, that the Holy Father has the right to propose the "subjects" for discussion; but that does not imply that the matter should be predigested as he want the Commission to do.) He said the Holy Father had seen and approved this schema, which, therefore is official. To reject it would be an act of disrespect to the Holy Father. (Incidentally, the Belgian hierarchy was received the Holy Father last night. He was quoted as saying that with the introduction of the dogmatic scheme, the "real battle of the Council would begin!"

2) Ottaviani insisted that the tone of the schema was really pastoral in nature. But the essence of pastoral work is teaching divine truth. The schema states the truth is "stylus conciliaris." which is traditional. It is not the function of the Council to preach a sermon. 3) his third point fielded up to this: he just doesn't like the language of modern theology. 4) he finally referred to the hard work which had been done in this matter. He didn't want it wasted.

Msgr. Salvatore Garofalo did a good job reading the explanation of the project which lasted 16 minutes. In this introduction the attitude of which the conservative element dominated by the Holy Office had been accused became very apparent. This schema is dogmatic, not disciplinary; hence it must agree with the defined truths of the past. Hence there can be no changes in the schema. Absolutely no room was left for discussion. This introduction practically told us to go home since there was nothing for us to do!

Some of the speeches that followed: Frings, Lienart, Leger, Koenig, Alfrink, Suenens, Ritter and Bea left no doubt in anyone's mind about their intention to speak out. They spoke out very strongly. And from the tense atmosphere it was quite apparent that a deep impression was being made. At the same time, Ruffini, Siri, and in a much lesser degree Cardinal Palacios left no doubt that they intended to stand for this schema. There is no doubt but that there will be some more fireworks before the matter is voted; though actually they have said everything of importance already, and what will come is bound to be repetitious. Just how they will proceed to a vote remains to be seen. Will the motion be to accept this schema or reject it? If the former, then the conservatives must get a 2/3 majority; if the latter, then we must get such a majority. I believe that a 2/3 majority can not be mustered by either side; so much depends on

how it is presented. Theoretically, my opinion is that the present schema is official, and we must get a 2/3 vote if we want it thrown out!

November 15: The day off from a general assembly was devoted to a public consistory at which the formalities of announcing the dates of canonization for saints were taken care of. The ceremony lasted only about an hour. It was shortened somewhat because a little disturbance was caused when Cardinal McGuigan fell down the steps of the Cardinals' tribune when going to make his obeisance to the Holy Father. The Holy Father cut his usual allocation for such an occasion down to only a minute or two. Three of the saints will be canonized on December 9 and the fourth, Vincent Pallotti, will be canonized on January 20.

On the way out after the Consistory I spoke to Cardinal Rugambwa and to Cardinal Agagianian. The former was a bit reserved but did speak with a bit of feeling when he mentioned that he had been a patient at Salvator Mundi hospital. Cardinal Agagianian was very cordial and continued an animated conversation with Abp. Byrne and myself all the way out of St. Peter's until he got to his car.

Tonight Father Lessard and I went to dinner along with Father Potter and Mr. and Mrs. Piser at the Wiener Restaurant on the Via della Croce. The Pisers are delightful company and the food at the Wiener is delicious, provided you like the German type cooking in which they specialize. Naturally much of the conversation almost all of it centered around the Council. Bob is now engaged in the preparation of a story for TIME on Karl Rahner. He mentioned that he had one of his Italian "stringers" (part time helper or runner who gets information for him from Italian sources) arrange for an interview with Msgr. Spadafora on Karl Rahner. (More of Spadafora at a later date when I refer to his article attacking the Biblicum.) Spadafora described Rahner as theologically superficial. He said that R. never gives reasons for his positions, especially on inspiration. R. is not an exegete in any sense of the word and his teachings generally as a theologian is "damnosa", i.e. harmful. The fact is that Rahner at the moment is under a cloud and the Holy Office has prohibited him from publishing any theological works without prior censorship by his Roman superiors. (He is a Jesuit.) He is one of the victims of the Holy Office campaign to eliminate from the picture all advanced thinking in the field of speculative theology and exegesis. The Jesuits are the prime targets. (More of this at other occasions when this whole question enters the debate in the Council.)

Bob said that he really is working hard on the Rahner story. He has had lunch with him twice in the last week and has been reading and talking to people who know Rahner for a long time. This next week he has to run down a story in Trieste for a few days. But he will be back soon, to work on his prime story, on Rahner. He told of a big story for LIFE on the Council for which he had written the script which was shelved because of the sudden emergence of the Cuban crisis some weeks ago. He was obviously disappointed, both that this crisis developed and that his story was lost in the shuffle.

George Dugan had a story in the NEW YORK TIMES a few days ago on the Roman Curia. Similar stories were carried in other papers. It was an effort to get the Curia off the spot in which it finds itself now. Msgr. Henry Cosgrove of the Holy Office staff gave the information on which this story was based at a regular press conference in the Bureau sponsored by NCWC. Father Lessard was surprised and disappointed when he heard that. It is entirely out of line with his usual conversation on the subject of the Curia. But Bob said that the story was very definitely prompted by Cosgrove's remarks. In fact Cosgrove had not attended any of these conferences before. He was added to the list of "official" panelists at these conferences, his name being written on the margin on the sheet giving the panelists for the benefit of newsmen.

At this particular conference he injected the subject into the discussion even though it had no special bearing on the line of questioning of the correspondents. Father Lessard was wondering what was behind it.

Father Potter brought a story from the Casa Santa Maria. Cardinal Cushing supposedly asked the Biblicum to prepare a statement covering the "De Fontibus Revelationis" in the dogmatic schema, especially in its effects on modern exegesis. He would be willing to read this critique at the General Assembly in which the chapter would be introduced. Because of his health which cannot stand much of the Roman weather he returned to Boston before this chapter of the schema was opened for discussion. The rumor, however, is that this paper was the one read last Wednesday by Cardinal Ritter; the latter was to have said precisely what the Biblicum had prepared for Cushing. There is no verification of this story in so far as I know. I must try to get the facts.

We started for home relatively early - 10:30 P.M. But when we got to Salvator Mundi Bob passed up the gate and took us to his apartment for another sip of cordial and more conversation. We did, however, got home by 11:30.

November 16

Cardinal Lienart presided over the twentieth assembly. The Mass was in the Armenian rite and celebrated by Archbishop George Layek of Aleppo. The music was beautiful. (Incidentally the Gregorian chant done the other day was by a schola from St. Anselmo's on the Aventine.) 2212 Council Fathers were present for the Assembly.

The debate on the schema in general continued all during the session; ten Cardinals and eleven other Council Fathers spoke. The traditionalists repeated the same pretty much all day long: we can not reject the schema because it is the one approved by the Holy Father, and any such action would be offensive. It is official. Some offered a weak defense on the grounds that it is pastoral, since it is essential to be exact and precise in what the truth is when discharging the teaching office, essential to the pastoral office. But most of the time was devoted explaining that the schema may not be perfect; it can however be perfected by emendations. That is the job of the Council Fathers; not their right to reject what the Holy Father had approved and made official. This was pretty much the line of Cardinal Cerejeira, Cardinal Camara, Cardinal McIntyre, Cardinal Caggiano, Cardinal Santos and Cardinal Urbani. McIntyre started out a little better in reading his script, but before too long he started stumbling over his words again as he usually does even when talking English as he becomes excited over his subject.

Actually the best defense of the schema was made by Archbishop Florit of Florence. He prefaced his remarks by an appeal for restraint and charity in the discussion. This seemed to me to be a rebuke administered to Bishop Joseph Battaglia of Faenza. He said that the arguments against the schema are "fallacia et inania!" Florit's appeal to charity were very probably directed at this remark. (I gained the impression that Battaglia in his statement that truth must be solemnly and formally stated, could think of no other form of solemnity than that provided by fist.)

Florit had a well reasoned and calmly stated thesis in favor of the schema. He referred to the historical method in the evaluation of the scriptures, tradition and the Fathers. We must proceed with extreme caution in using such a method. He also referred to the dangers of Existentialism, which is a more "present danger" in Europe than in the States. He ended up by

answering the arguments of those who attacked the schema on Wednesday. We must deal with principles not opinions.

Of course, the supporters of the schema were not quiet. Among the Cardinals only Tisserant was very outspoken in criticizing the schema. Archbishop Dengsch, Bishop Reuss, Bishop Hien of Vietnam, Archbishop Guerry of Cambrai, and Abbot Christopher Butler of Downside were very strong in their attacks on the schema. Reuss was introduced as the Bishop of Mainz. He corrected chairman to say that he was only the auxiliary. Lienart came back by saying *Hoc est praeter rem!* That was the only light note in the whole meeting. Abbot Butler has a very pronounced "English" accent and spoke haltingly, but with perfect Latin. He spoke *ex tempore* and gave an excellent speech and forceful defense of a direct approach to the definition and teaching of dogmatic truth.

During the Assembly they distributed printed copies of the Proemium to the Constitution on the Liturgy. This was printed in parallel columns, showing the copy of the Proemium as it appeared in the schema on the left, the revised copy with changes in italics on the right. This will be voted on tomorrow, or soon thereafter. The procedure of the voting is not yet clear to me.

Coming back to the debate on the schema of *De Fontibus Revelationis*, it seems to me that the defense of the schema has rested in most cases on the statement that it has been approved by the Holy Father and therefore is official. Beyond that every single speaker admitted that it needed emendations, but insisted that it should nevertheless be the basis of discussion. Something could be made of it. This all reminds me of the "me too" type of campaigning followed by Dewey and Eisenhower some years back. Florit is the only one who made a real defense.

I saw Archbishop Alter before the meeting. I mentioned the need of supporting the Germans et al who are making the very strong fight to get rid of the negative type of approach advocated by Ottaviani and the Holy Office and to substitute for it the more positive approach. We are as much interested in this and as vitally concerned as those who are carrying the ball. I mentioned that we will need their help when the matter of Church and State and the freedom of conscience comes up. I said, "this matter is practically ignored in the dogmatic schema."

Alter corrected me on my statement. He said the matter was not ignored in the Preparatory commissions. He said that it was hotly debated in the commission he was on and ended in a deadlock. I believe he said the vote actually was 21 to 21. In the end a separate schema on the matter of freedom of conscience was submitted by Ottaviani and one by Bea. We will hear much of this on the floor.

I did suggest to Alter that the American Bishops will have to prepare for this debate. We should have a good brief prepared on the subject and then assign about five members of the hierarchy to make the presentation, section by section, since the whole subject can not be adequately treated in one ten minute speech. He seemed interested.

My feeling is that we are utterly lacking in the type of leadership which could make our opinions be really felt on the floor and our needs given due consideration. What men like Frings and Alfrink are doing is an indication of what can be accomplished. As a group, we are just not making ourselves felt in the Council even though we got more than our share of representation on the commissions. Probably the fault lies in the fact that Spellman and McIntyre are trying to lead in the conservative direction; but they have no following. Ritter and

Meyer have made good speeches but they are not aggressive leaders. Somebody must emerge as a leader from among the archbishops and bishops.

NOVEMBER 17:

Cardinal Gilroy presided at the twenty-first General Assembly today. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Antoni Baraniak of Poznan, Poland.

After announcing those who had requested permission to speak, the General Secretary read the revised Proemium to the Liturgical Constitution, calling attention to those parts which were amended. Cardinal Lercaro and Bishop Joseph Martin of Nicolet in Canada explained that all observations and proposals made by Council Fathers were carefully studied, weighed and then accepted or rejected by the Commission. These reports illustrated the method followed by the Commission and the criteria on which the final draft included or excluded the emendations that had been proposed. Ballots were distributed immediately for a vote on the first paragraph; and then collected in a few minutes. Immediately the next ballots were distributed and collected as soon as the Council Fathers could vote; and so on until all four paragraphs had been voted on. This process of balloting went on during the progress of the debate on the question of revelation.

By 11:00 A.M. all ballots had been cast. The report on the result was made before 12:00. About an hour and a half was required for the entire process of distributing and collecting the ballots for each of the four paragraphs, voting, mechanical tabulation of the votes and announcing the results. This all went on with practically no delay of the process of debate. The votes on the four paragraphs were as follows:

Total votes	Required majority	Placet	Non Placet	Invalid	
I Par. 2206	1471		2181	14	11
II Par 2202	1468		2175	26	1
III Par 2203	1469		2175	21	7
IV Par 2204	1468		2191	10	3

The L'Osservatore tonight gave some interesting statistics. Fifteen General Assemblies were devoted to discussion of the schema on the Liturgy. The written proposals submitted to the General Secretariat numbered 625. This included 329 speeches delivered during the meeting. This means that there were an average of 22 speeches during each of the 15 sessions! That will explain why the words "Liturgia" and especially "lingua vernacula" almost caused nervous prostration of some Council Fathers every time they were repeated towards the end of that discussion.

Each of the proposals was registered and classified by content in the General Secretariat and turned over to the Liturgical Commission. The whole thing consists of 33 pages of text divided into 105 paragraphs.

During the process of voting and processing of the votes, the debate on the question "de Fontibus Revelationis" was going on. It got a bit rough at times when speakers, especially the Cardinal (!) spoke bluntly and pulled no punches. Seven Cardinals and eleven Archbishops and bishops spoke. The pattern was pretty much the same all along: viz., the Curia men, Italians, and Spanish speaking practically all endorsed the present schema with many reservations; while the others general asked for a new schema with a different approach.

Cardinal Doepfner: the whole schema should be discarded and new one drafted along the lines suggested by previous speakers (German, French and Belgian and Dutch). He told the story of the manner in which this subject was brought up in the meeting of the preparatory commission and central commission, and how they got little hearing. Tremendous work had been done on developing a positive approach to the question; we owe it to the theologians to have this matter discussed publicly in the Council. He also referred to the schema prepared by the Secretariat for Unity, which in the end was admitted also. He really hit hard when telling of the manner in which so many vota were completely ignored and the viewpoint of the Holy Office given sole consideration. He referred to the fact that the defenders of the schema made much of the approval given by the Holy Father to the schema. It would be an act of disrespect to reject a schema approved by him. Doepfner quoted the *ORDO Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Celebrandi*", page 33 Art 33 #1 : *Quivis Pater verba facere potest de unoquoque proposito schemate vel admittendo, vel reiciendo, vel emendando, suae orationis summa Secretario generali saltem trest ante dies scriptis exhibito."*

Ottaviani had not been on the list to speak today, but he was given the floor a while after Doepfner (two other speakers between). He announced bluntly that he wanted to answer Doepfner. This he did simply saying that what Doepfner had said was not true. It is not true that there was not adequate debate or that he and the Holy Office alone made the schema. He claimed that there was a majority on every point in the schema. This obviously could not be true since, as Bishop Wright reported last Monday, the Full Commission did not get to see a great deal of the material prepared by sub-commissions. Ottaviani practically called Doepfner a liar. He referred to him as *Carrisimus frater*; but called him a liar nonetheless.

After Ottaviani spoke Gilroy read Art. 33, #1 quoted above, for the clarification of this point. Still the next speaker came back to the same point.

Parente rose to speak at this point. (At this time they just completed taking the last of the four ballots on the Proemium. Almost like a mass movement there was a great exodus from the council hall to the coffee bar. The voting had held many of them up for an hour beyond schedule!) Parente gave a long lecture on inspiration and the history of the theology of the subject. He spoke much too fast and was difficult to understand. He was called by the Chairman for running over time. He asked and was granted permission to summarize his conclusion.

Frings then took the floor. The whole atmosphere became very tense because I (and I gather from conversation, many others) feared that he was going to answer Ottaviani's rather vicious attack on Doepfner. He announced that he wanted to clarify some misconceptions of his remarks made last Wednesday in the speech of Parente. Frings restated the position he took, and explained some of the misconceptions occasioned by his remarks. He apologized because his statement had not been clear enough. He repeated that there was one revelation of the *Verbum Divinum* through a twofold channel, scripture and tradition.

I was a bit disappointed that at the end of the session the Chairman did not rule that debate be terminated and ask for a vote. It seems to me that just about everything has been said that need be said to secure an intelligent vote. But nothing was done. I hope that some such action is planned before we reconvene next Monday. In my opinion further debate will generate no more light but a great deal more heat.

The US Bishops were received in audience this evening at 6:30 in the Clementine Hall. The Holy Father was in great form. He looks better than I had seen him in a long time. He showed no such signs of fatigue as were so obvious on October 11. He had a prepared speech which he read, but he spent as much time on extemporary remarks as on his manuscript. Archbishop John Cody was the interpreter.

The Holy Father did not say anything startling, merely things that were quite obvious: he was happy to receive such a crowd of American bishops; praised the church in the US as he learned of its great extent from the Catholic Directory; praised our schools, hospitals, charity, and above all vigorous parish life. The latter evidence of loyalty of people to priests, priests to bishops, and all to the Holy See.

Cardinal Cicognani was there for the audience. He received as much applause when he made his entrance fifteen minutes before Holy Father, as the latter received on his entrance.

The whole experience was a real thrill. There was no mistaking the genuine affection of the Holy Father for the Church in America. Spellman made a brief response - and invited the Holy Father to come to the States. I wonder what we would do if he ever did come!

November 18:

Spent practically the whole forenoon getting some letters written. Archbishop Conrad Bafile, Apostolic Nuncio in Germany came for dinner. He arrived at 12:30 and remained until 2:30 P.M. It was fortunate that Bishop Cleven of Cologne knew him well; and the Nuncio was very obviously pleased to see Bishop Cleven here. The Nuncio speaks French perfectly, German very well though at times lost for words and English fairly well. The visit was very pleasant.

In the afternoon Father Lessard went to the North American College to see Archbishop O'Connor. It is now definitely settled that Ray is to go to the Casa Santa Maria next year as Vice Rector with the implied agreement that he will remain four years. He will try to get a doctorate in Canon Law during his stay there and it is understood that his schedule will be arranged to make the work at the Gregorian possible. Ray will assist me again at the second session of the Council and he and I will return to the States by boat early in July. He will return to Rome to take up his duties at the Casa some time after the middle of August.

NOVEMBER 19:

The pouring rain continued this morning. The traffic jam at St. Peter's was something to behold as all cars tried to get as close as possible to a covered entrance. There were showers off and on during the day.

Cardinal Spellman presided at today's session. He did a good job, aside from the difficulty which practically everybody has pronouncing the unfamiliar names of prelates and places. Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Matthew Beovich of Adelaide, Australia. 2197 Council Fathers were present. Six Cardinals and twelve other Council Fathers spoke. I was disappointed that no steps were taken to hurry the action on the question of the Dogmatic Schema covering "De Fontibus Revelationis." Gilroy stated that no schema could possibly satisfy all of the more than 2000 Fathers. He pleaded for charity in the discussion. He asked that the schema be accepted in principle and then amended to bring it into proper form. He described in the detail the process by which the schema was prepared.

Cardinal Gracias stated that so many emendations would be required to make the schema acceptable that the same could not be substantially preserved. For that reason he would vote

non placet. He also answered the argument that it should be accepted because the Holy Father approved it. This is not so; the Holy Father merely transmitted it to the Council to be a part of the agenda for our approval, emendation or rejection. He stressed that no commission has complete and perfect knowledge of any subject. Cardinal Meyer spoke briefly, as usual. He stated bluntly that the schema simply is not in line with the spirit of the opening Allocution of the Holy Father and the Message to the whole world which the Council Fathers issued at the beginning. He asked that we meet the challenge of the world with a united front. That simply cannot be accomplished with the present schema. He asked that we follow the Lead of Pope John and have confidence in the exegetes. Bishop Aloysius Henriques, auxiliary of Caracas in Venezuela, spoke in the name of all bishops from that country. He suggested that we drop this schema and draft another, *audito commissione et Instituto Biblico*.

While Bishop Griffiths spoke the crowd listened more intently than to any other speaker today. As he usually does, he began to speak in a subdued voice which is a trick to get them quiet - a common trick with him which worked exceptionally well this morning. He quoted a number of scripture texts which were apropos. He stated that many contradictory opinions have been expressed; and there have even been direct attacks on both sides. Let us discharge our pastoral duty and meet the issue. Our controversy is becoming a scandal to the world. He pleaded for "Claritas, Caritas et super omnia Veritas." He also asked that the Council meet its responsibility to prevent excesses by those who are not the biblical and theological scholars, but who are second rate teachers in colleges and seminaries and even more so, those who are "popularizers" of various theories. The difficulties and scandal that have developed are not the result of real scholars. His speech was very effective.

Bishop Emilio deSmet, Bishop of Brueges spoke in the name of the Council for Unity. His address was a masterpiece clearly showing the influence of Cardinal Bea. It was an excellent statement and defense of the program of the Secretariat for Unity - the best I have seen. He answered some of the arguments used by the defenders of the schema. Then went on to say that we have gone on for centuries stating our teaching, the teachings of the Church, in a rigid and outmoded formula, ignoring the needs and the attitudes of the times. As a consequence we have accomplished little or nothing in penetrating the outside. We need a new method - "methodus aecumenicus." He then explained that new method of approach. We must clearly and precisely and positively state what we believe; study what they believe; what they think of us, correcting misconceptions of our teachings. He also hit hard at the Theological commission, stating in so many words that they sought to cooperate with that commission in the preparation of a single schema on the subject; but for some reason unknown to him the commission merely answered "nolumus." He ended by saying "quod schema (doctrinal) notabiliter deficit in spiritu ecumenitatis." He said Theological Commission not only did not give them any assistance, but was a positive obstacle to their work. I have asked Father Lessard to call Cardinal Bea's secretary, a friend of his, to secure a copy of deSmedt's speech if at all possible.

The Archbishop of Toulouse suggested that the Commission for Theology and the Secretariat for Unity get together and produce one single schema. That, of course, is wishful thinking, because Ottaviani could no more get along with Bea than with Kruschew! But the fact that such a suggestion was made is an indication of how feelings are beginning to mount over the prolongation of this debate.

Bishop Hurley of Durban in South Africa suggested that a schema on this subject be prepared by Secretariat for Unity and published immediately. Apparently he wanted to circumvent the commission entirely! He was pretty rough on the Commission. Those who edited the schema

had an entirely different concept of the word "pastoral" than those who proposed the emendations. As a consequence we have a schema which represents a complete misconception of the objectives of this Council.

Bishop Alfred Ancel, Auxiliary in Lyons, France stated that it was entirely vain to hope that on the basis of what has been said in this council chamber any revision of the schema can be made which would obtain a 2/3 favorable vote; at the same time there never would be a 2/3 vote supporting a proposal to discard the same. We must find a basis of "moral union." That basis can not be an attitude of "Victores et victi". The Pope should appoint an independent committee of theologians and exegetes representing the different viewpoints expressed (basically only two) and have them draft a new schema.

The debates have been going on so long that the most popular word used in the whole session was "dixi!" On the way out I ran into Archbishop Roberts. His comment: "It seems the primary function of this Council seems to be to make the Holy Office HOLY!"

The Council Presidency remained for a meeting immediately after the General Assembly was concluded. We probably can expect some action tomorrow. Bishop Cleven indicated that Frings will preside tomorrow and that Ruffini will move for continuation of the debate, but no longer on the schema in general but on the details of "de Fontibus Revelationis." That vote very probably can get a 2/3 majority. There may be some discussion as to whether the motion can be worded in such a manner as to require a 2/3 vote against it to defeat it. In that case Frings will offer a counter motion or proposal. We shall see.

The regular weekly meeting of the American bishops Father Barnabas Mary Ahern, C.P. spoke on the question of modern exegesis. He gave a quick run-down on the matter of literary forms and their various effects on the interpretation of the new Testament (Gospels) as they have been applied to the O.T. for some years. He gave an excellent speech, keeping his audience completely spell-bound. During the question period I asked whether the quotation in the famous letter to the NEW YORKER on Council in which a passage from Divino afflante Spiritu and an article by Ruffini was accurate; and whether Cardinal Ruffini's article was, as the author of the letter implied, a contradiction of the encyclical. Father Ahern rather reluctantly admitted that this actually was the case.

The Apostolic Delegate again took the floor at the end of the meeting speaking very critically, even patronizingly, of the things Father Ahern had said. Since time was up, Archbishop Boland was going to close the meeting; but there was a general protest from the floor, so Father Ahern was given an opportunity to answer the Delegate's QUESTIONS. This he did with utmost tactfulness and with devastating effect. It was very obvious that Ahern is a master in his field, whereas the Delegates questions were not based on any real knowledge of the field.

NOVEMBER 20:

Cardinal Frings presided at the session this morning and the Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Carlos Rodrigues-Quiros of Costa Rica. 2211 were present at the session.

Archbishop Cabana of Sherbrooke, Canada was the first speaker. This was the third time his name was called at the beginning of a session. They finally got down to him. He referred to the fact that for 30 years he has been in dioceses in which there was a goodly number of non-Catholics. He found from experience that the best approach to them was a direct and clear statement of Catholic teaching. This brought the best results by way of converts. He said that

we dare not resort to a false irenicism in this matter. His whole line was extremely conservative and went right down the line with the dogmatic schema as it is.

Thirteen of the Council Fathers spoke on the schema in general. Frings cut off three of them when they ran overtime. Archbishop Enrico Nicodemo of Bari was quite strong in his defense of the schema. He said that to reject a schema means that we declare it as erroneous. In the first place this is an entirely unwarranted conclusion. The schema is not attacked for being doctrinally inaccurate. No speaker made such an accusation at any time. The schema has been attacked solely because of its approach to the subject. Practically every speaker in defense of the schema admitted that it needed emendation; thus they themselves admitted it was defective and in need of restatement. But there was no talk of doctrinal error.

At this point the discussion was interrupted when Frings said that the General Secretary had an important announcement to make. He said that a vote was to be taken on a proposal of the Presidency. The proposal was "that the discussion on the general merits of the project be ended and that the examination of the single chapters of the project be continued. However, since a number of the Fathers (a prize understatement as the later vote disclosed) had declared themselves against the formulation of the project, the Council Presidency had considered it fitting to ask for a vote of the whole assembly, so that each Father might in conscience express his own opinion as to whether or not the study on the project of the sources of revelation should be continued. The Fathers were instructed to vote 'placet' if they wanted to discontinue the discussion and go to another; they were instructed to vote 'non placet' if they wanted to proceed to the examination of the five chapters of the project." (Osservatore, 21 November, 1962) The L'Osservatore went on to say: "The results of the ballot, which were made known shortly before the conclusion of the assembly, indicated that the discussion of the single chapters of the project will continue in the following days."

I am sure that this ballot will be the subject of much discussion for years to come; probably more than any other phase of the Council up to this date. In the first place the vote on the project was approached in such a circuitous manner which led to so much confusion in the minds of the Council Fathers that repeated explanations were required, first by the General Secretary, then by the five sub-secretaries who read the statement in the various languages, then by Cardinal Ruffini and finally a repetition of the whole thing twice more by the General Secretary. Many Fathers who had marked their ballots, asked for new ballots because they had not understood their vote properly. The resolution was also worded in a manner to cause such confusion. A positive vote (placet) meant rejection of the schema; retention of the schema was indicated by a negative vote (non placet). This was done, no doubt, to take advantage of the Council rules which require not a simple majority or absolute majority, but a 2/3 majority. In this way the matter maneuvered so as to require the two thirds majority in order to reject the schema. Furthermore, they did not use the word, "reicere" in the resolution but merely to discontinue the discussion of the schema. Apparently that was done to save face in the event the schema was voted out.

The result of the voting was as follows: Total number, 2209; required for 2/3 majority, 1473; placet 1368; non placet 822; invalid 19. Hence 38% of the Council Fathers are imposing their opinion on the remaining 68%. The Osservatore made no mention of the number of the votes cast against the schema. They may regret their shortsightedness in not giving the tally because all papers will undoubtedly get that information and print it. They will make the Vatican Press Bureau look sick.

Went to the reception given by Ambassador Reinhardt to honor the American Cardinals. They invited all American Bishops, many members of the diplomatic corps and news correspondents. As usual I ran into some of the "professional party goers". The matter of the Council Assembly was discussed a great deal by the Bishops. I am sure that will be the occasion of many bitter comments as time goes on. The big question seems to be: now what?

The Bob Pisers were there. I spoke to them just for a minute. Bob was very anxious to get around to see as many people as possible. He told me that the copy of TIME with his story on Ottaviani hit the Roman News stands tonight. He told me that he had cleared the story with Msgr. Cosgrove before turning it in. I am curious to see just what the story will be like.

NOVEMBER 21:

This was a big day, and before I get through making a record of it much space will be required. In the first place, I saw TIME for November 23, 1962 Atlantic Edition. Bob's story on Cardinal Ottaviani was there, as he told me last night at the reception. As Father Ulric, OSB remarked this was a bit of tendentious writing. Of course, it must be kept in mind that TIME regularly is tendentious; it is a news magazine and not a daily paper. It summarizes and evaluates news rather than merely reporting what takes place. Anybody who reads TIME must recognize that he thereby is exposing himself to influence on his viewpoint, unless his viewpoint already agrees in general with the editorial policy and the viewpoint of TIME. They have attacked Ottaviani in the past, e.g. early this year when Ottaviani refused to permit a TIME photographer to take his picture. They reported the incident in a manner which was almost vicious. But to come to Bob's article. The title is "THE CARDINAL'S SETBACK." This would convey the impression that the efforts of the so called "liberal" or "progressive" group in the Council are directed primarily if not solely against Ottaviani. He starts out by commenting on Ottaviani's coat of arms and motto: SEMPER IDEM! The story is not accurate in saying that Ottaviani "has opposed reform as vigorously as he once opposed the idea of holding the council."

It may be true that Ottaviani once opposed holding the council, even as Tardini was accused of doing. But it is not fair to say that he opposed the council (even if it is true that he did so) and that he now opposes "reform" simply because he is opposed to reform. I do not agree with Ottaviani's viewpoint on many things; but I am convinced that he is not only very able, but is also dedicated to the service of the Church. He is the "undisputed leader of conservative opinion at the Second Vatican Council." But he is that because of honest convictions. He honestly considers many tendencies in modern speculative theology and scripture study as dangerous, if not actually heretical. He does adhere to the old pattern of expression which has been followed by the Holy Office and in General Councils for centuries; he believes that truth can be defended only by stating it in "conciliar language" with threats of excommunication and all. In so far as he is trying to observe that thought pattern and mode of expression, he is at odds with the great majority of the Council Fathers. But I don't feel that for this reason he should be criticized. That is his viewpoint, and he is entitled to present it in the Council. As to his methods, there will be something to say later.

Bob reports a direct quote from the Holy Father. I wonder how he came by this. If I see him before I leave Rome in December, I will ask him, though I don't expect an answer. The report on the debate on the dogmatic schema is rather good - at least more accurate than L'Osservatore!

There was a rather glum atmosphere at St. Peter's as we gathered for today's General Assembly. (Maybe this was merely subjective; it really was my own feeling and I may have read it into the atmosphere!)

At least the Assembly started out on a beautiful note. The Mass was in the Byzantine-Ukrainian rite celebrated by Archbishop Gabriel Bukatko, Coadjutor of Belgrade in Jugoslavia

The Archbishop is tall, thin almost to the point of emaciation. He has a flowing white beard. He wore white vestments. He had a wonderful voice, between baritone and tenor. When he stood before the altar (facing us) arms outstretched and head back, singing as though inspired, one was reminded of an El Greco done in white rather than in the dark colors El Greco favored so much. The whole scene was simply glorious; the venerable celebrant, the two concelebrating priests, the deacon, and the choir doing the chant in polyphone - it was a picture that one would never forget. Here was real participation by the choir which normally would be the congregation!

Cardinal Ruffini presided and there were 2185 Council Fathers present. The small number that was present may be explained by the reaction to what took place yesterday. As I expected, the newspapers carried a report of the numbers voting yesterday. The headline in the MESSAGERO for 11/21/62 was: Lo "Schema Ottaviani" salvato dal regolamento. Here is a case substantiating what I said above, viz., that the whole conservative cause has been identified with Ottaviani. The story went on to say that there were 1300 votes against the schema. 800 votes for it. Today's New York Herald Tribune, (Paris edition) was more specific. They not only gave an accurate account of what happened yesterday but gave the exact number of votes, even to the number of ballots that were void. They called attention to the fact that the vote fell only 106 votes short of the 2/3 majority required to throw out the schema.

The Herald Tribune had much more information than merely the vote; and it was accurate information. They said: "However, some Council Fathers criticized the manner of voting with vehemence and said it was unthinkable to continue discussion on a schema when a clear majority had stated it was against it. Some said they were making a direct appeal to Pope John XXIII." This is very true; the subject of conversation at the reception last night among the bishops reflected deep resentment against the tactics that were used by the conservative group (usually they merely said "by Ottaviani."). I was quite sure that this protest would be wide and in some instances very loud.

Well, it didn't take long to find out how quick and how effective the protest had been - so quick that it caught most of us by surprise and almost took our breath.

Before beginning the regular work of the Assembly the General Secretary made the following announcement; by order of the Cardinal Secretary of State: "Taking into account the fact that the opinions expressed in the speeches of the past few days gave indication that there should be a laborious and prolonged discussion on the project on the Sources of Revelation, it was thought useful to have it reviewed by a special commission before continuing with its examination.

"By wish of the Holy Father, therefore, this Commission will be composed of several Cardinals and members of the Theological Commission and the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. It will be the task of this Commission to rework the project on the Sources of Revelation, making it shorter and placing greater emphasis on the general principles of Catholic doctrine already treated by the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council. The

commission will submit in due course the new project for the examination of the Council fathers."

When Felici rose to speak after Ruffini stated that there was an important announcement to make, the whole assembly was as still as death! After he finished, there was a suppressed bit of applause which was quickly restrained. But you could just about hear the collective sigh of relief (and probably the groan of the conservatives.) There is no doubt in my mind that this action of the Holy Father has saved the Council. After the method employed yesterday the resentment became bitter and there is no doubt but what the debate would have been endless on the present schema.

It is true that the Holy Father's action has prevented the Council foundering immediately on the rocks of conflicting opinion; the fact still remains that the matter is not automatically settled with the designation of a new commission. The real struggle has merely been transferred to a smaller committee room; but I am sure that the struggle will remain as bitter and the in-fighting will be as fierce as if it had continued on the Council floor. It will be interesting to see just who is appointed to the new commission. I don't think they will dare to stack the commission against any possible action along progressive lines. If they come back from this commission with a schema that is a rehashing of what has now been rejected, the vote against it will be even stronger than it was yesterday. On the other hand, I would be very much surprised if the new commission were given members who would vote two thirds for the type of schema on which the opposition is insisting. As Father Ulrice mentioned here tonight, the task of this new commission is going to be extremely difficult.

After the announcement by the General Secretary, they turned back to the old schema and asked the remaining Fathers who had requested permission to speak to do so. Fifteen Fathers actually spoke and the discussion was concluded by 12:00 noon. This discussion seemed quite pointless. As someone said, it was just like having a doctor continue working over a cadaver!

Bishop Dunne's (my neighbor, auxiliary of Dublin) said that Ruffini sounded like a tired or broken-hearted man as he presided at the meeting today. No doubt he along with the ultraconservatives generally felt that the intervention of the Holy Father was a great defeat for them; besides, it would seem that it is a rebuke from the Holy Father for the methods used. Maybe it is a rebuke to the whole Council, telling us to get down to business and produce something positive and constructive.

So far the only conclusive action taken by the Council is to adopt the Proemium to the Constitution on the Liturgy! That document is innocuous enough; but when are they coming through with some of the decrees for us to vote on? Is there a deadlock in the Liturgical Commission? The farther we get along in this matter, the more relieved I am not to have been elected to the Liturgical Commission.

NOVEMBER 22:

Thanksgiving Day. Twelve guests from the outside were here for dinner today.

Bishop Hoch left for home this morning because of the death of his brother.

The Messagero this morning had another classic headline: Lo "Schema Ottaviani" bloccato da un intervento del Pontefice. The "schema Ottaviani" has been blocked (scuttled, torpedoed?) by the intervention of the Holy Father! The story gave all details of the vote on Tuesday. It is

an indication that the revulsion of feeling following upon that vote was more general and more intense than appeared in the beginning. The story is that Cardinal Meyer got to the Pope on Tuesday night to protest the manner in which the voting was conducted that morning. It is said that after Cardinal Meyer left, the Holy Father summoned Ottaviani and Bea at 9:30 P.M. ordering the surprise action which was taken on Wednesday. I have not been able to verify this story as yet, but certainly will try to do so.

NOVEMBER 23

Bishop Cleven told me at breakfast this morning that he had seen Cardinal Frings. He maintained that Frings and Ruffini met Monday afternoon or evening to work out a compromise on the dogmatic schema which would provide for a vote on the matter on Tuesday morning. Frings presided at the Assembly on Tuesday. Since he is blind he could not read the announcement which Ruffini placed before him. Frings asked the General Secretary to make the announcement and then learned to his surprise and chagrin that the wording of the announcement differed from the text which he and Ruffini had agreed upon the previous evening! This seems a bit difficult to believe; but that is Cleven's story which he claims to have received from Frings directly. Since he is auxiliary to Frings he certainly would be on close terms with him.

Cardinal Caggiano of Buenos Aires presided at the Assembly today. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop James Tredici, Bishop of Brescia who observed the 60th anniversary of his ordination today. There were 2135 Council Fathers present, the lowest number present at any of the 25 General Assemblies held so far.

The Secretary General announced that upon completion of debate on the project of Communications Media we would proceed to a consideration of the decree on the Unity of the Church entitled "Ut Unum Sint" in the forist series of schemata. This will be followed by consideration of a special constitution on our Blessed Mother entitled "De Beata Maria Virgine." This schema is in the next series of schemata which was distributed today. It contains the schema on "De Ecclesia."

Cardinal Cento, Chairman of the Commission in charge of the Apostolate of the Laity and Communications Media remarked that the schema on communications had been prepared by the Commission presided over by Archbishop O'Connor and which had been combined with that on the laity.

Archbishop Stourm of Sens in France was the relator and read the printed report on the schema which had been distributed before the assembly was opened. The General Secretary read the names of eighteen who had asked to speak. There were actually 17 who spoke today, which raises the hope that this schema will be disposed of completely early in tomorrow's assembly. There was nothing controversial in the schema. It was praised generally, though almost every speaker said it was too long. Apparently that criticism had been voiced in advance because Archbishop Stourm anticipated it and tried to answer it in his relatio.

Bishop George Beck of Salford in England departed somewhat from the specific points in the schema by making some excellent suggestions about the necessity of more rapid communication of important acts or decisions of the Holy See to the local ordinaries. He gave various examples, placing most stress on the experience we had when the rules of the Eucharistic fast were put into effect without any prior notice to ordinaries. The change not only

was announced through the secular press, but the effective date was set within a few days after the announcement. Bishops were in the embarrassing situation of having lay people call them about the announcement in the paper before the bishops had even seen the papers. Usually secular announcements are inaccurate and bishops have no chance of correcting any mistakes because they usually do not get the AAS until weeks or even months after a matter has become effective. Hence they are left in the air because they have no access to official copies of the decrees.

Archbishop Eugene D'Souza of Nagpur spoke again with his usual clarity and directness. He reminded the Council of the problems regarding human rights. We have rights; but so do other people who are not members of the Church. We must not only recognize such rights theoretically, but also in practice. (This is a forewarning of some of the arguments which will come up under "De Ecclesia.")

Archbishop D'Souza also made a good point about cooperation with others. We should join with others in defense of rights which are recognized as basic by Catholics and Protestants and others alike. There are many such points of common interest: peace and war, food supply, human rights of different races, etc. etc. There is so much that we have in common; this provides a marvelous opportunity for collaboration with all groups in matters of public interest.

Archbishop Albert Soegijapanata of Semarang in Indonesia made another point concerning rights. The Church has a divine right to teach; but we can not go to the extreme of saying that she has a divine right to the use of every possible means of communication in her work of teaching. He did not think that the divine law can be injected to that extent into civil jurisprudence. He was talking of a situation where all public means of communication are owned and operated by the government.

Had a tremendously interesting experience this evening at 6:00. Msgr. George Wirtz, Father Lessard and I went to the Vatican Press office for an interview by DR. OSCAR CULLMANN, one of the Observers at the Council.

Since I have an English copy of the interview with other papers pertaining to the Council, I need not summarize what Dr. Cullmann said. The interview was in French which proved something of a handicap for me. But I did understand a great deal of what the Dr. said. He spoke with a very obvious sincerity, slowly and distinctly. There was a bit of the professorial manner about him; but I would say that added to his effectiveness. He must be an excellent lecturer in a class room. He is on the staff of the University of Basle in Switzerland and the Sorbonne in Paris.

Hearing Doctor Cullmann was one of the more impressive experiences at the Council for me. I am delighted that I went. Even though I wrote something about the Observers in the December issue of CANews, I plan to take up the subject again, touching on phases that Dr. Cullmann stressed today and which I hadn't mentioned in the previous article.

NOVEMBER 24:

Cardinal Alfrink presided over the 26th General Assembly. Bishop Francois Charriere of Lausanne, Switzerland celebrated the Mass. 2136 Council Fathers were present, one more than yesterday.

Before opening the Assembly Archbishop Felici announced that a message of congratulations was being sent to the Holy Father on the occasion of his 81st birthday.

Five Cardinals and nineteen other Council Fathers of the total of 26 who had asked for the floor actually spoke. Cardinal Wyscynski asked that the countries in which the work of preaching the Gospel is impeded should not be forgotten in the discussion of the question of communications. Cardinal Godfrey questioned the wisdom of including this schema in the agenda of the Council. Such subjects can be handled separately by special directives such as have already been taken care of through the different encyclicals. As for the schema itself, it is much too long. Conciliar documents should not be written as if they were theological tracts. In this Cardinal Godfrey probably was taking a crack at the type of dogmatic constitution that is being proposed to replace the one prepared by the Commission(?). Cardinal Godfrey also made another statement which would not be accepted by many, viz, that diocesan newspapers are a mistake. He intimated that where a diocese has its own publication it naturally will push the circulation, with the effect that the national Catholic publications which are of much higher quality and serve a much better purpose do not enjoy the circulation they should. It will be interesting to see whether anyone will answer Cardinal Godfrey next Monday.

Cardinal Leger stressed the importance of the subject covered by this schema and asked that it be carefully considered. But he questions the wisdom of including the question of the right of the Church to teach in this schema. That should be dealt with adequately in its proper place in the schema de Ecclesia and not repeated here. He proposed that the schema be returned to the proper commission for shortening and revision.

Cardinal Suenens called attention to the fact that this schema is strictly pastoral and not dogmatic; therefore the approach to the subject should be different. This could be in reply to Cardinal Godfrey. He said "schema nimis longum; quid faciendum? How can you shorten it? He gave part of the answer himself when he suggested that the question of the right of the Church to teach be eliminated from this schema. Cardinal Suenens brought up a subject of vital importance not touched upon by any speaker, viz., the right of the individual to privacy. The public may have a right to know things pertaining to government and the public interest generally; but they have no right to unrestricted information concerning the private lives of individual citizens. He also touched on such matters as wiretapping, etc. He also called for more unified action on the part of clergy and especially the laity in protesting abuses in the public means of communication; as well as positive support for everything in this field which discharges its duties to promote the public interest in a commendable manner.

Bea brought up some points which directly or indirectly touch upon the matter of his Secretariat for Unity. He suggested that the Church not press the matter of its rights in this field so much; but that we try to demonstrate in as much as we can that by discharging their duty in respect of the public interest they will serve their self interest. We have so much to offer which will help improve the quality and increase the appeal of public communications.

As the other bishops spoke it became apparent that two lines of interest, in conflict with each other, are developing more and more. On the one hand many speakers stressed the fact that schemata are too long and are verbose; while other speakers made a number of suggestions that more be added to the schema. On the one hand they complain about so much belaboring of the obvious; on the other there were proposals to be even more specific and go into even greater detail. Bishop Mario Castellano of Sienna proposed that a completely new Congregation, or at least a major section of some existing congregation, be set up to handle this whole field.

On the whole, the meeting was very dull today. That was reflected by the number of Fathers who left their places. At 11:30 less than half of the seats in the aula were occupied! I am sure it was the boredom of the meeting as much as the espresso at the coffee bar which caused this mass movement. Two of the speakers were interrupted by Alfrink, one of them twice, for introducing matters that were not ad rem.

As I sat there today my mind went back to Father Alphonse's Fourth Latin Class and the opening line of Cicero against Cataline; and a paraphrase seemed appropriate: "Quousque tandem abuteretis, Patres Conciliares, patientia rostra." Maybe there was mental telepathy, but a few minutes later a speaker started, not with the customary, Patres Conciliares, but Patres Patientissimi!

No announcement was made at the Assembly but the L'Osservatore this evening stated that, in addition to members of Unity Secretariat, Cardinals Lienart, Frings, Ruffini, Meyer, Lefebvre and Browne would make up the special commission on dogma, with Ottaviani & Bea co-chairmen.

NOVEMBER 25:

The weather was fine, with a clear sky and crisp atmosphere. This was the second day of such weather; a welcome relief from the bad weather we have been having.

I had planned on doing much work today, but Father Lessard suggested that we go to the "Mostra della Chiesa" (Church Exhibition) at the regular exhibition grounds south of Rome. Bishop O'Connor, and Msgr. Wirtz went along. It was a most worthwhile experience. We spent better than three hours there and were on the go all the time, but managed to cover only about one third of all exhibits. The exhibit sponsored by the Propaganda de Fide, the Chiesa Oggi, and the exhibit entitled "Congregation of Rites", but actually sponsored by liturgical publishers, were the most interesting. The technical perfection with which the exhibits were set up was really outstanding. Whoever designed the layout in the Propaganda exhibit and in the Chiesa Oggi had real imagination and displayed great artistic skill. The whole thing was really an inspiring experience, even though we were chilled to the bone. There is no heat in any of the buildings and we had to step outside periodically to get warm in the sun. A cup of hot cocoa with melted marshmallow helped a great deal!

At supper Cardinal Koenig brought Canon Feiner from Chur in Switzerland as a guest. Feiner is one of the dogmatic periti. He is very young, speaks English quite well, and proved a most interesting conversationalist. Cardinal Koenig told us that the new dogmatic commission had its organization meeting this afternoon at 5:00 P.M.

Bea and Ottaviani will serve as co-chairmen, presumably alternating in presiding at meetings. These meetings will be on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday evenings. Ottaviani wanted a meeting also on Monday evenings but for the moment they settled on only three meetings weekly. Four subcommissions were designated. Ottaviani and Bea each designated an equal number of members to each subcommission. There are twelve cardinals, twenty-five bishops and archbishops and seven periti on the commission; and the subcommissions may enlist the aid of additional periti. I asked the Cardinal whether Karl Rahner is one of the periti. He said: "Yes. He is my expert" Aside from organizing, the commission made one major decision at this meeting: they changed the name of the schema from "De Fontibus Revelationis" to "DE REVELATIONE." That is a very definite concession to the viewpoint of the Unity Secretariat and the "liberal" group generally.

The jokes about Ottaviani keep coming. Feiner told the following, which seemed quite harsh to me and an indication of how deep the feeling against Ottaviani. A new prayer for Ottaviani is now supposed to have become popular. It runs like this: "O Lord open his eyes so that he may see. If in Your infinite Providence this is impossible, close them gently!" Another joke brings up the old theme of Trent which has made the rounds in several different versions. The other day Ottaviani called his chauffeur and gave instructions to be driven to the Council. He entered the car and pulled his curtains. The chauffeur started at a good speed and keep driving for quite some time, much longer than the minute or two it would take to get to St. Peter's. Ottaviani pulled the curtain aside and to his amazement saw that they were on the autostrada heading north. He asked his chauffeur sharply: "Where are you going?" "To Trent!"

NOVEMBER 26:

Cardinal Koenig was with me at breakfast this morning as usual. He spoke of the audience the Austrian bishops had with the Holy Father yesterday. It seems that John XXIII is inclined to go along with the suggestion made by Frings that the second session of the Council begin only in September of '63. I don't like that. He also said, "I had a few minutes privately with the Holy Father. He said some things about Ottaviani which I do not want to repeat. They were not complimentary.

Cardinal Tisserant presided at the 27th General Assembly today. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Julio Rosales of Cebu.

The Secretary General read a message from the Holy Father in reply to the good wishes which the Council had extended on the occasion of his 81st birthday. Felici also announced that during the month of December, up to the end of the first session of the Council, General Assemblies will be held every day except Sunday. On December 8 there will be a Solemn Assembly to mark the closing of the first session of Vatican Council II.

Felici also announced that after the conclusion of the discussion of the subject of Communications now in progress, the schema on De Unitate Ecclesiae "Ut Unum Sint" prepared by the Commission for the Oriental Church would be taken up, followed by the schema "De Ecclesia and then by the schema "De Sancta Maria." There are two other schemata on the project of Unity of the Church which will be considered at a later date also, one prepared by the Theological Commission and the other prepared by the Secretariat for Unity. Felici stated that reservations for time to speak on "De Ecclesia" are now being made already; therefore applications should be filed now.

This was the Third General Assembly devoted to Communications. 2133 Council Fathers were present today. Bishop Adam Kozlowiecki, Archbishop of Lusaka in Rhodesia, added a new tone to the regular line followed by the speakers when he devoted himself very vigorously to the subject of the right of individuals to privacy in the matter of information concerning their private life. He restated what Cardinal Suenens had stated on the subject, but wanted the Council to go much further in stating exactly the limitations of the right of the public to be informed on such matters. If his suggestion is followed there is no doubt that the press generally will scream about freedom of the press.

Thirteen Council Fathers spoke on the subject of communications. At 11:05 Felici announced that an important matter was to come up on the floor of the aula and requested that all Council Fathers return to their places. There was a regular rush and the aula, which had been only half full, soon saw most seats occupied again. At 11:30, Felici announced that the Presidency,

feeling that the schema on communications had been adequately debated, proposed that the discussion of the subject be terminated. A rising vote was practically unanimous on the question.

Cardinal Cicognani, president of the preparatory commission for the Oriental Church prefaced the treatment of the schema "Ut UNUM SINT" by telling of the solicitude of the Catholic Church for the separated Oriental Churches. He indicated that this project concerns itself only with the Orthodox Churches and not with Protestant Christianity, and their concern in this project was only to consider the possibility of preparing a document on the basis of which reunion with the Orthodox Churches might be possible. On the request of Cardinal Cicognani, Father Athanasius Welykyi, Secretary of the Commission for the Oriental Churches, made a lengthy report on the project. He stated again that they had been concerned in the preparation of this project only with the best manner in which reconciliation of the Orthodox Church could be achieved. Other problems, such as rites, participation in sacred functions, etc., had been referred to other commissions directly concerned.

The first part of the project explains theological unity of the Church, and indicates that permanent unity can be accomplished only on the basis of theological truth. An attempt was made to avoid scholastic terminology of a Latin flavor in order to arrive as closely as possible at the Orientals' mode of thought and expression.

The second part of the project seeks to work out a practical plan for reunion, based on theological, liturgical, juridical, psychological and practical factors. The third section considers the possibilities of reconciliation and the conditions under which it can be achieved.

This presentation was followed by discussions of the project by Cardinal Lienart, Ruffini, Bacci and Browne. Lienart was very critical of the project. He did not consider it practical since the Orthodox Church are not at all a unity and there is much dissension among them. The latter point was implied rather than stated, because obviously statements offensive to the Orthodox must be avoided.

Ruffini and Browne were pretty much of one mind. It is true that doctrinally the Orthodox are close to us, aside from relatively but tremendously important differences of belief. But they wanted to know why there was this special project by the Oriental Commission? Why was this not considered under the project "De Ecclesia" where it belongs?

From the stories I have heard, Ruffini and possibly also Browne may have been taking a side swipe at Cardinal Bea. It seemed quite logical to everyone that the question of reunion should come under the study of the nature of the Church. But Cardinal Bea and the Secretariat for Unity did not under any circumstances want to accept the very harsh manner in which Ottaviani and others of his school in the Central Commission wanted to and did state that phase of the treatment of the Church. The story is that an absolute impasse was reached on this subject and separate treatments of the subject were finally admitted coming from the Dogmatic Commission, the Oriental Commission and the Secretariat for Unity. There will be many repercussions on this subject. The usual weekly meeting of US bishops was held at 4:30 PM. Msgr. Tucek spoke. Nothing of importance came up.

NOVEMBER 27:

Cardinal Lienart presided at this session. There were 2160 Council Fathers present.

Felici announced that in response to the request of many bishops the Holy Father had changed the opening date of the second session of the Council. The solemn opening will take place on Sunday, September 8, 14th Sunday after Pentecost and the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This change was desired by many of the bishops from distant places and also by many other groups. But the Americans as a whole were not too happy, because many had made commitments for dates on the basis of the May 12 opening. I will have to call off plans for early ordinations. I also have an idea that many will be sorry for an early September opening of the second session because of the great heat Rome often experiences through September.

Another announcement from the Commission for the Oriental Church was read by Felici. Apparently they are beginning to sense the widespread opposition to the idea of a separate consideration of the question of unity. The announcement stressed three points:

- 1) This project applies only to the Oriental Church;
- 2) Any dogmatic conclusions contained in the schema are not intended as absolute definitions, but merely illustrate the points pertinent to this project. There is no thought here of defining principles of dogma;
- 3) The object of this schema is to size up the situation in so far as the Orientals is concerned.

At this time the General Secretary asked for action on the proposal from the Commission responsible for the project on communications, which was given to us in printed form yesterday as the session closed without any explanation. Felici explained that since there was little opposition to schema on communications in general, the final disposition of the matter could be greatly facilitated if the Council Fathers would vote on the proposal which would constitute a mandate to the Commission to rework the schema so that it would be shortened a great deal and would direct them to provide for an extension of the competency of the present Papal Commission for movies, radio and television to take in the press and to authorize the said Commission to issue pastoral directives after consultation with experts in the field from various countries. The vote was taken early in the session and announced later. The votes were as follows: 2160 votes cast; 2/3 majority 1,460; placet 2138; non placet, 15; invalid votes 7.

The discussion of the project "Ut Unum Sint" continued throughout this morning's session. I did not keep an exact tally of the opinions expressed, but it seems to me it was about 75% critical. There was a monotonous repetition of the idea that this matter really belongs under the project "De Ecclesia" and should never have been submitted by a special commission. With some truth, they said there is no sense in considering this identical point in the schemata: 1) "De Ecclesia" 2) "Ut Unum Sint" from the Oriental Commission and 3) by the Secretariat on Unity. Many of them pointed out to the poor logic in a procedure which takes up in such a piece-meal manner. Why wasn't there consultation between the two Commissions and the Secretariat involved. This trend in the debate is an indication of what is coming up in a serious manner when the project "De Ecclesia" is taken up and the question of unity considered there. A number of speakers pointed out the loss of time that is involved in discussing this controversial question three different times. But they went right ahead then and considered it in detail!

Cardinal Camara of Rio de Janeiro and 14 other Council Fathers spoke. Patriarch Maximos IV was the first to speak after the Cardinal and then Bishop Hakim read a translation of the Patriarch's speech in Latin. It had been given in French. While this was a trenchant criticism of the schema, it was given in a moderate tone, much more moderate than we had expected. Archbishop Edelby, who is the auxiliary to the Patriarch gave a masterful presentation covering

the defects in the schema on doctrinal and historical grounds. He stated very emphatically that the Oriental churches are Apostolic churches and owe nothing in their liturgy or theology to the Latin church. (When he made this statement and some others, I could hear grumbling among the different Italian and South American bishops sitting close to me.) In my opinion, Archbishop Edelby gave the best speech of the day. (He is still very young for his responsible position - in his early forties. He speaks Latin and French fluently, has just published the first complete missal in Arabic, and in his conversation indicates that he has a keen mind. His great advantage is that he is not as hot-headed and sensitive as the Patriarch.)

Bishop Arceo Sergia Mendez of Cuernavaca, Mexico, tore the whole schema to pieces, dwelling particularly on the waste of time involved in having the same controversial point in three different schemata. (It seems everybody can foresee the struggle with Ottaviani over language, which in today's debate was described as offensive, inaccurate and harmful to the spirit of ecumenism which John XXIII stressed so much.) Bishop Mendez used this as a jumping off place for a proposal he made for revamping the whole mode of procedure in the conduct of the discussion in the Council.

He outlined a plan whereby the hierarchies in the different countries would meet in advance of the next session. This would mean, of course, that the General Secretariat would get the various schemata to the bishops sufficiently in advance of the session to permit such discussion in each country or area. Then the votum or vota representing the feelings of the different groups could be sent to the General Secretary who in turn would forward them to the pertinent Commissions. These Vota would be a major consideration in the deliberations of the different Commissions. Whether these suggestions will help in the matter remains to be seen. It is quite obvious that there has been no disposition on the part of the Roman Curia to take into consideration the fact that more than three times as many bishops are participating in this Council than there were at any previous council. But aside from the use of a good PA system and electronic equipment for the processing of the ballots, this council is being conducted exactly the same as the one in Trent! (Only I hope it will not take as long!)

Father Lessard, Father Cormac and I will have dinner with the Finns in the Florentine restaurant tonight. No chance of picking up much information concerning the Council there. Phil Finn is director of the local USO. His wife, Jackie is a cousin of Father Lessard's. Actually the name of the place is Taverns Guelfa. This second contact with the Finns was as delightful as the first. They are a truly Catholic couple with a most wholesome interest in life. This restaurant with its fine food and "intimate" atmosphere (so far as I could see they have room to serve no more than twenty-five persons) seems to have attracted the clergy in a special manner. Aside from the Finns and about four others, the entire patronage last night came from clergy. Bishop Fletcher was the only other bishop present last night, but the guest book which was gotten up specially for the Council had a long list of autographs by American bishops. I was amused to see that Bishop Batholome's signature was the first in the book! Hans Kung was there with a group among whom was Father Yzermans, Msgr. George Higgins and several others whose names I do not recall. At another table there was a group among whom was Msgr. Sennot from the Boston chancery. He stopped to chat for a minute.

Father Yzermans chatted with us for a while. He said that Father Godfrey collapsed while giving a talk some time ago. He was flown home to the hospital in St. Cloud. It seems that a double hernia was the root of the trouble and that the surgery took care of the situation. But he is supposed to avoid strenuous activity for some time. I hope that this second warning to

Father Godfrey will persuade him to restrict his activities within the limits of physical endurance and that he will not overwork himself to the point that Father Virgil did.

Father Yzermans was taking Father Kung to the Pisers after the dinner. He asked us to join the group there. Senator McCarthy of Minnesota, his wife and his secretary were to be there also. It was 11:00 PM by the time we got back to Salvator Mundi from the restaurant. Father Kung, driving his own car, stopped here since neither he nor Father Yzermans knew the way to the Pisers. Father Lessard and Father Cormac went with them and I stayed here and went to bed. I might just as well have gone along since I didn't get to sleep till after midnight anyhow. When I heard that there was not the big crowd at the Pisers I had expected, I was sorry that I didn't go.

During the minute that I chatted with Father Kung, I invited him to come to Fargo after appearing in St. Cloud and St. John's. He made no promise since someone else is making up his schedule. If he has a regular Lecture Bureau to schedule his appearances, he certainly will be crowded.

NOVEMBER 28: The 29th General Assembly was presided over by Cardinal Tappouni. He did a much better job with the names today than the last time. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Asrate Marian Yemmeru of Addis Ababa in the Ethiopian rite. The Ethiopian rite dates back to the fourth century. It is characterized by a participation of the laity in a constant dialogue with the celebrant. The language used is classical Ethiopian called "Gheez". Some parts of this liturgy are among the most ancient used in any liturgy.

For anyone who is a stranger to this liturgy, the assistance at the Mass was something of a weird experience. The whole ceremony seemed a bit bizarre, even though the participants seemed to be greatly inspired (begeistert). Their music has much in common with tribal music in Africa which sounds very strange to our ears. The essence of the music is rhythm; and has a scale all its own, which strikes our ear as being without melody and without harmony. This was demonstrated in a specially striking manner when the book of Gospels was enthroned: the singing was then accompanied by drums, bells and the clapping of hands. By comparison the Missa Luba which has been recorded is quite conventional according to our standards of music.

The first announcement made by the Secretary General was before the beginning of business. During the course of the Assembly a pamphlet containing the text of the emendations of the first nine paragraphs of Chapter I of the Liturgical schema as edited by the Liturgical will be distributed. The pamphlet has two parts. The first part gives a list of the emendations made on the floor and accepted by the Commission; the second part contains two versions of the complete text of the first nine paragraphs arranged in parallel columns. The column on the left contains the text as proposed by the Preparatory Commission on the Liturgy; the column on the right contains the revised text now being proposed to the Council Fathers. The Council Fathers will be asked to cast one ballot for the essential changes made in each paragraph, i.e. nine ballots. The second part containing the texts was prepared merely for the convenience of the Fathers in studying the matter before voting. Felici announced that the ballots on these nine paragraphs would be cast at Friday's Assembly.

Three Cardinals and 14 others spoke this morning. Cardinal Tappouni spoke briefly before announcing the other speakers. He stated this schema "Ut Unum Sint" was not intended as a dogmatic treatise on the Question of the Church and its unity. It was drafted solely for the purpose of exploring the problems of unity between the Latin and the Orthodox Churches; and

to suggest some practical steps that might be taken in order to make an approach to the Orthodox. The Protestant Christians of the West were left out of consideration entirely because their problem is so different. There isn't the doctrinal unity between Catholics and Protestants which we have between Roman and Orthodox. Hence it was not practical to attempt discussion of this matter at the same time. I suspect that this explanation was offered in order to weaken the opposition to the schema on the grounds that it was too repetitious since the same matter is to come up in the dogmatic schema and the schema on the Unity of the Church.

Cardinal Spellman: The one Catholic Church was founded by Christ on Peter. Hence union with Peter is essential to any church. While union is essential, uniformity is not. Hence the many different rites. Yet, just because of this permissible diversity a central authority is required. Fragmentation of Christianity is source of much tragic loss. He suggested that Commission and the periti go over the whole matter and come up with a Constitution that is acceptable but does not labor from false irenecism.

Ottaviani spoke briefly on the schema "Ut Unum Sint." On the whole he was satisfied with the schema, even though it needed some minor emendations. Ottaviani devoted most of his time to a discussion of the proper time to begin discussion on the dogmatic schema "De Ecclesia." Since we are drawing near the end of the first session he said it did not make sense to begin discussion of these schema since it is out of the question that the whole schema could be debated to the extent to which such debate would be required. He suggested that on Friday, when the debate on "Ut Unum Sint" is completed, we begin discussion on the schema "De Beata Maria Virgine Mater Dei et Mater Hominum." This schema could easily be completed; it would be absurd to begin such an important schema as that on the Church and then go into it for only a bit before the long interval between the first and second session.

Paul III Cheikho, Patriarch of Babylonia of the Chaldeans made a very conciliatory speech. It was very well received and made a splendid impression because of his earnestness in delivery. Joseph Tawil, Archbishop and Vicar-patriarch for the Melchites in Damascus spoke rather pointedly about the present treatment of the Orientals in communion with Rome. That pattern of treatment is for the Orthodox a mirror reflecting the type of treatment to which they would have to look forward if there ever were significant steps towards reunion. At this time, what the Orthodox see is not very reassuring to them. He cited one example illustrating the matter of precedence which is a very sore spot with the Orientals. Historically, the rank of patriarch antedates that of archbishops and Cardinals by many centuries; hence they feel that they should take precedence over Cardinals. Yet that is not the practice, and there seems to be no disposition ever even to consider it. He cited the example of a function recently in which a Patriarch was present; he not only did not take precedence over the Cardinals present, but was placed below the Archbishop and the bishop in whose diocese the function took place. He said the comment of the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria was: "Kyrie eleison = Domine misere nobis"

Bishop George Dwyer of Leeds was the last speaker for today. He didn't suffer in the least from this disadvantageous spot on the program. The reason was that his speech, as his previous appearance had been, was marked by very sharp and critical remarks about this schema in particular and the lack of progress of the Council in general. He pointed out that the present treatment of the Uniate churches was unjust and a scandal which constituted a grave obstacle to reunion. He repeated that Archbishop Edelby had said on Tuesday viz., that the Latin Church had contributed nothing to the liturgy, the theology and the history of ancient oriental churches. If we want to effect reunion of the Roman and Orthodox churches, we must

recognize the position and the history of all Oriental churches and not treat them as step children. There was none of the commotion usual during the last speech of a session. Bishop Dwyer's remarks that came "straight from the shoulder" really struck home.

I asked Archbishop Edelby this noon whether it would be possible to get a copy of his speech of yesterday. He said he was having it mimeographed and would supply me with some copies.

This question of the relationship between the Oriental church (Uniates) and Rome is getting more and more attention; much more and of a different type than Rome had expected. The point regarding the much more ancient history of these liturgies is being recognized more than ever before. As one bishop put it: These liturgies were flourishing for a long time when our forebears in Germany were still crawling around in the trees eating acorns!

The rumor is current that Ottaviani will retire after this first session of the Council. Cardinal Koenig said he heard this rumor also, but called it absurd.

NOVEMBER 29: Aside from next Sunday, this is the last "free-day" we will have during the remainder of this session. I had planned on going downtown to do the rest of my shopping. But the weather was positively foul all day. As a consequence I did not set foot outside of the building all day. I did get a great many letters written and some reading done.

I had received an invitation to attend a performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony directed by Dr. Eugene Jochum and sponsored by Italian Radio-Television (RAT) in honor of the Council Fathers. The concert was held in St. Paul's Outside of the Walls. It was also carried on television and radio. Because of the bad weather we decided to see and hear it at home over TV. It came over very well; first movement was a bit weak, but thereafter they found themselves and gave a magnificent performance. The chorus was particularly impressive.

The L'Osservatore had an announcement concerning the Holy Father's health. It was not too specific and about all that one could gather from it was that there is no crisis and that the Holy Father will be back on the job as soon as possible. Since I didn't get out today, I heard no rumors.

NOVEMBER 30: Cardinal Spellman presided at the 30th General Assembly and Archbishop Andre Charue, of Namur in Belgium celebrated the Mass. Because of the feast of St. Andrew, the skull which is reputed to be that of this Apostle was exposed for veneration before the Confessio.

This was the first day that Msgr. George Wirtz and Father Lessard attended an Assembly as official periti. They got their tessera yesterday and will be permitted to attend every session in the future. This involved a change in the arrangement for driving to the meeting. Ray parked the car near the entrance used by the Cardinals, which made it most convenient. Believe it or not, this was the first close-up view I had of the arrangement of the altar, the seats used by the Presidency and the Observers. Using the Cardinal's entrance makes it convenient to approach our seats from that end of the aula.

The meeting opened with an announcement from the General Secretary concerning the ballots to be cast in the nine emendations proposed to Council Fathers by the Liturgical Commission covering the first section of Chapter I of the Schema. He read the emendations and then indicated that we could vote either "placet" or "non placet."

Bishop Joseph Martin of Nicolet in Canada, Secretary of the Liturgical Commission spoke briefly on the various emendations that are proposed for a vote. He indicated that some changes in the text were purely for the sake of gaining greater clarity of language and would not be voted on. He also explained the major changes, giving us some idea of the criteria that were used in determining which emendations that were suggested were actually adopted by the Commission and which were rejected. He said in this matter they followed almost exactly the method of procedure used in the First Vatican Council. He indicated that 59 changes actually were made in this text under consideration, of which 9 will be voted on, 10 were of minor importance, and forty were merely changes in the wording as mentioned above.

The voting started as soon as the announcements had been made. Nine ballots were cast between 10:15 and 11:50 A.M. At the close of the session the results of the first five ballots, each covering one emendation were announced as follows: (The other four ballots will be reported tomorrow.)

Ballot	Total Votes	Required Majority	Placet	Non Placet	Invalid
I	2145	1430	2096	41	8
II	2143	1430	2103	34	6
III	2139	1426	1984	150	5
IV	2135	1423	2113	13	9
V	2125	1418	2049	66	10

All during the time that the balloting was taking place the discussion of the schema "Ut Unum Sint" was in progress. It was amazing how efficiently and quietly the ushers worked in distributing and collecting the ballots. It did not interfere appreciably with the discussions that were going on. It is also interesting to note that the number of ballots dropped only 20, from a total attendance of 2145 to 2125 cast the fifth time around. It meant a great deal less "business" at the coffee bar and a much shorter stay for those who did go for their espresso or cappuccino!

Two Cardinals and 13 other Council Fathers spoke at this morning's session. Cardinal Bea mentioned that this schema really was not intended for separate discussion since it contains much material in common with that in the schema prepared by the Secretariat for Unity. He also suggested that in formulating our dogmas we should keep in mind the mode of expression used by other religious groups in order to make ourselves more clear and present our truths in the most favorable light.

This same thought was contained in the speech of Bishop Eftimious Youakim, of Zahleh and Furzol of the Melchites in Lebanon. He got down to specific terms: do not use the term "discidium" but "dualismus vel paralellismus." Archbishop Dionysius Hayel of Aleppo in Syria spoke strongly in favor of retaining this schema separate from that dealing with Protestant Christianity. The differences between the Orthodox and the Protestants is much too great to make it feasible treating the problems of unity with both in the same schema. He also insisted that we should not say "ecclesia orientalis" but "ecclesiae orientales." There are so many independent groups that they can not be treated as a single unity. This point apparently is true because when Father Stransky told us of their activity in trying to invite the Oriental Churches they found that it was simply impossible to do as they first planned: viz, send an invitation to the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople and have him pass it on to the other Orthodox groups.

Archbishop Heenan spoke at length. He referred to the fact that the Anglicans had not so much as been mentioned so far in the discussion. Yet they were the ones who made the first move. Archbishop Fisher was the first of the prominent non-Catholic churchmen to call on the Holy Father.

Bishop Dunne leaned over to me and whispered: "What Archbishop Heenan is saying could well go into a letter to the (London) TIMES." This led to a conversation about Heenan. The Archbishop is not, as I had surmised, a real leader among the English bishops. He is not accepted as such by the others; and he himself is of the lone wolf type and goes along entirely on his own. He is not a team man. This is true in spite of the fact that he is considered a "real brain" by his fellow bishops.

Bishop Elko of Pittsburgh spoke at length, to a point where Spellman interrupted him. His speech was quite a show, eliciting laughter at him and applause for him in turn.

At the conclusion of the session Felici announced that the Presidency had decided to terminate the discussion on "Ut Unum Sint" and asked for a vote, which was unanimous. Tomorrow we are to receive more material from the Liturgical Commission to be voted on Monday. The schema on "De Ecclesia" will be introduced for discussion tomorrow by the Chairman of the Dogmatic commission.

DECEMBER 1: Cardinal Koenig told me this morning that he had a conversation with Father Jungmann who is a consultor to the Liturgical Commission. Jungmann indicated that it would be easily possible to get not only the first, but also the second chapter of the Liturgical schema to the Council Father for final action; but that this will probably not be done because Cardinal Larraona seems to have no interest in securing a quick disposition of this matter. There are rumors that this is the case because Larraona has received orders to that effect from above. In any case Father Jungmann expects that we will finish the first chapter this week. I have my doubts.

Cardinal Frings presided at the 31st General Assembly this morning. Several announcements were made before we got down to business. First, the Holy Father is reported to be much better. He feels so well that he would like to be at the window regularly to give his blessing at noon. -- The Cardinals were reminded that during the coming week they are to wear their purple and not red robes, because of the penitential season beginning tomorrow. --

We were handed a PROPOSITIO at the beginning of the Assembly which runs something like this: Since the discussion of the decree "de Ecclesiae Unitate" has been finished, it appears that the Council Father have approved of the same as a statement concerning the points on which the Roman Church and the Orthodox agree and also as an expression of good will towards our separated brethren of the Orthodox Churches. In view of the emendations proposed to the original schema, it is proposed that this schema be coordinated with and made a part of the schema "De Oecumenismo" which is Chapter IX of the general schema "De Ecclesia." This matter was put to a vote with the following results; Felici also announced the result of the vote taken yesterday on the last four ballots pertaining the liturgy. I will list all of these:

Ballot	Total Votes	Required Majority	Placet	Non Placet	Invalid
Yesterday's ballots					
VI	2122		2101	15	10
VII	2120		2114	101	5
VIII	2116		2092	19	5
IX	2117		2097	13	7
Today's ballot: On Unity					
	2112	1408	2068	36	8

Ottaviani presented the schema on "De Ecclesia." It was a rather strange performance. It was obvious that he was not anxious to have this schema come up now. He no doubt was greatly disappointed that the Presidency had ignored his request to discuss the schema on the Blessed Mother and defer the one on "De Ecclesia" until the next session since it can not be completed this session. He went through the usual routine of explaining how the schema had been drafted, first by the Dogmatic Commission; then by the Central Commission and finally approved by the Holy Father. Then he made some cynical remarks about what very probably will be said by the Council Fathers of this schema: too scholastic in language; not pastoral, etc. etc. He drew several laughs when he said that this schema would probably go the way of others as cries of: "Tolle! Tolle! Substitue illud!" would rise from the Council Fathers. He ended by saying that this schema has very probably been prejudged already. He no doubt knows what has been going on. Actually there is a move to set this schema aside, just as the one of scriptures was set aside. Just what will happen cannot be predicted with certainty but one can at least be sure that efforts will be made to reject the schema.

Five Cardinals and 16 other Council Fathers were announced as speakers. They did not all get a chance. There will be no question about enough speakers to fill the time for some days.

Cardinal Lienart started the debate. He left no doubt in anybody's mind about the fact that this schema will be hotly debated. He discussed the nature of the Church. It is the real Mystical Body of Christ. He defined those who belong to the Mystical Body. In this he did not adhere too strictly to the opinion expressed by Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis*. He intimated that the Mystical Body is more extensive than the formal membership of the Roman Catholic Church. In his opinion we can not identify the members of the Mystical Body exactly with the members of the church. I am sure this point will be debated a great deal.

Cardinal Ruffini made it equally clear that there would be at least some who would defend the line of thought in the schema most vigorously. It was difficult to follow his exposition because he proposed a complete rearrangement of the schema in order to eliminate entirely all traces of "new thought" or positive approach which was introduced into the schema by the more "liberal" elements in the preparatory commission. If he could redraft the schema one could be sure that it could be exactly the same as the classic dogmatic text books in use in seminaries for years.

Cardinal Koenig gave an excellent talk: calm, well reasoned and orderly. He reminded us of changes on the international scene which demand a less rigorous and narrow approach to the question of the nature, authority and mission of the Church. He asked that the Council be particularly careful to define the nature of the Church.

Cardinal Alfrink raised some questions which makes it clear why the Holy Office had forbidden reproduction of the Dutch joint pastoral on the Ecumenical Council! Never allowed in Italy, Alfrink wanted the matter coordinated better. He asked some pointed questions. Why a

section of "De Episcopis Residentialibus" instead of one on the episcopal office as such? What about corporate powers of bishops outside of the Council? They do not lose their divine character between councils. What about the question of religious liberty? Why no exact definition of that? Why so much insistence on the powers and the rights of the Church in Chapter IX and not more insistence on teaching responsibility? He ended by suggesting that the whole thing be restudied by a new joint commission.

Cardinal Ritter spoke with even greater bluntness than Alfrink. Unfortunately his delivery and his Latin was not as good as on previous appearances; but he certainly left no doubt about where he stood. The schema fails to define the nature of the Church and delineate the life of the Church. It is not merely a question of having left out some points which can be added to correct the defect; the whole method of presentation of the matter is wrong. These matters are considered only from the stand-point of the Church's Magisterium. Important points must be considered more directly and completely: Church and State relations must be defined; a decree on the freedom of conscience and religious liberty must be drafted to meet that issue squarely and in terms suited to our pluralistic society. He ended by saying that we simply can not revert to the terminology of Trent and Vatican II!

(There was a very definite undertone of grumbling among the Italian and Brazilian bishops around me while Ritter talked.)

Bishop de Smedt made a really slashing attack on the schema - the boldest statements yet made on the floor of the Council. He said there is too much clericalism and too much juridicism and not enough charity and humility. "Pappa est unus ex fidelibus; episcopi sunt fideles. Pompa transit; remanet ministerium hierarchiae."

There were others who attacked the schema fiercely. Only Bishop Carli of Segni spoke up in defense; he was as bold and vigorous in defense as others had been in attack.

DECEMBER 2: George Wertin received the second two Minor Orders this morning. He, Father Potter and Father William Mehok, S.J. came to Salvator Mundi for dinner. We sat around and visited the whole afternoon. It was a bit like old home week. Aside from two letters written this morning I did no work all day.

Father Lessard told me of a conversation with Msgr. Bendas. The latter had received a visit from Msgr. Piolanti, the Rector of the Lateran University. Piolanti told Bendas of the speech given by Cardinal Antoniutti at the solemn opening of the academic year at the Lateran, in the presence of 30 Cardinals and about 150 Bishops. Apparently it was something of a wild talk against communism, modern trends in biblical interpretation, etc. The copy of the speech was not accepted for publication by the L'Osservatore Romano, apparently on orders from above, which means Msgr. Capovilla, the Holy Father's private secretary. The conservative crowd has no time whatsoever for Capovilla because of instances of this kind

DECEMBER 3: Cardinal Ruffini presided at the 32nd General Assembly. The Mass was in the Malabar Rite and celebrated by Archbishop Joseph Parecatil of Ernakulam, India. This is the rite described a few weeks ago at the time of one of our liturgical committee meetings. The parts of the Mass which the celebrant recites secretly and the words of consecration are in Aramaic, the language of Our Lord. The remainder is in the malabar vernacular. The rite essentially is the same as that of Siro-oriental Rite of the Chaldeans. There was a great deal of dialogue between the celebrant and choir. The music is quite interesting with a completely

different type of harmony from what we are accustomed to hear. 2116 Council Fathers were present.

The General Secretary first asked for action on the third section of the liturgical schema (Chapter one). Two ballots were required. Archbishop Grimshaw of Birmingham, England acted as relator and explained the emendations. The result of the voting was announced at the end of the meeting and were as follows:

Ballot	Total votes	Majority	Placet	Non Placet	Invalid
I	2113	1408	2096	10	7
II	2109	1406	2051	52	6

The L'Osservatore reported that the majority of the speakers today spoke in favor of the schema. This is not true. Most of the speakers did begin by saying that there were many points in the schema that were good: but... (and some of the buts were pretty rough!)

Spellman was the first speaker. As usual, he was quite brief. He endorsed the schema on the whole. At the end he said: "Dixi." A good Italian behind me added: "Sed non intellexi!" (which was quite true.)

Cardinal McIntyre raised the question of the infants dying without baptism, a point which is not treated in the schema.

Cardinal Gracias was very critical; said there are so many defects that it can not be corrected with emendations. He wants the schema to be given over to another special commission. He was particularly critical of Chapter Ten. It is offensive to those whom we seek to bring into the Church. If this is adopted the bishops from mission countries, when they return home will (this he quoted in English) "will have to face the music".

Leger made some concrete suggestion about what can and should be done between the first and second session. He was very critical of the slow progress being made. He ended by asking pointedly: "Why haven't we had more of the liturgical schema on the floor for a vote?"

Doepfner: Whole structure of the schema is unsatisfactory - too long, too much extraneous matter, etc. Chapter V on seeking perfection placed between IV and VI as if it represented three classes in the Church instead of clergy and laity. Nature of Church not adequately treated - treatment superficial. Concept of Church too juridical. He also warned that we not obscure the primacy of the Pope in trying to clarify the nature and function of episcopal office. The schema can not be patched up - must be redone completely. He suggested that while the debate on the schema continue, the Presidency should arrange to have a vote taken to see whether the Fathers as a whole find the same acceptable at all. He also suggested that a few chapters should be taken out of this schema and turned over to pertinent commissions.

The Bishop of Monaco talked too long and at times a bit wildly. He was very critical, but served no useful purpose. He did draw a laugh when he said that we debated on the liturgy almost five weeks and today we got a chance to vote on two words! What is the use of talking in the Assemblies? "Sum sicut vox sonans aut cymbalum tiniens".

Had the regular weekly meeting of American Bishops. Msgr. Fenton talked. He was more subdued than expected. He developed four theses, rather in a seminary lecture fashion. He presented as best he could the ultra conservative view, without meeting the real issue that he

was expected to take up - a critique of modern biblical criticism. The question period did not produce much fire * (See below: Dr. Vischer)

DECEMBER 4: Cardinal Caggiano of Buenos Aires presided at the 33rd General Assembly this morning. 2109 were present.

*Dr. Lukas Vischer, one of the Observers was here for lunch, Monday noon, December 2. He is a representative of the Swiss Reformed Church. He is Research Secretary in the Division of Faith and Morals at the Headquarters of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. He is a young man, somewhat ascetic looking (though he did not hesitate to have an aperitif before lunch!) He was with me at table and then I spent over an hour with him and the group in Father Lessard's room after lunch. He did not say anything particularly startling, but we did speak very freely about problems of ecumenism. One of the matters which came up was the question of mixed marriages, which in Europe, where they have well organized religious groups on national levels, is a more acute problem from their viewpoint than in the States. Vischer is very well informed on this subject both as regards Catholic legislation relative to marriage and also as regards the practical situation resulting for them. The matter was discussed openly and very frankly. Father Stransky of the Secretariat for Unity was here also.

*

Before beginning the regular meeting the Archbishop of Zagreb made a brief address expressing greetings and best wishes to the Holy Father on behalf of the Council Fathers, and also gave assurance of our prayers.

The General Secretary announced that six Cardinals and twenty others had sought permission to speak at this Assembly. Cardinal Frings paid a tribute to the great amount of research work which went into the preparation of the schema "de Ecclesia." But he was very critical of the method used in selecting the references, which are numerous. He stated quite bluntly that many were taken out of context in a manner as to give a slanted interpretation to the point under consideration. He also complained of the use of "accommodated" references to the Scriptures, which may be all right in sermons and exhortations, but have no place in a scientific and scholarly work, such as a schema should be.

Frings also complained of the fact that the section on de Episcopatu was separated from that on the Magisterium of the Church, as if they were in no way related. "Ex his omnibus mihi apparet hoc schema profundius emendandum, recognoscendum, etc."

Cardinal Godfrey spoke of the situation in England in relationship to ecumenism. He complained of people who came to England for a few weeks to observe the scene and then go home and write articles about how close the Church of England is to Rome in its organization, practice and theology. He stressed that this was a misconception. The English people as a whole are not united in their beliefs or practice. He also cautioned against giving rise to any misconceptions concerning possible concessions in the field of dogma and morals relating to essential truths. There can be no adjustment of basic principles, which all are agreed upon in the Council; for that reason in charity and in the interests of mutual understanding we must state clearly where we stand and not give rise to any false hopes in this matter. Godfrey spoke firmly in defense of the schema; his speech was most effective. He did not approach the subject in an emotional manner, which is being done so often these days. He met the issues clearly and directly and made a good statement which is respected even by those who would not agree in all details about the wisdom of doing everything he said in the manner he advocates.

Cardinal Suenens: Before the end of this first session, which will come in a few days, we should ask ourselves and clearly answer this question: "What is the objective of this Council?" This point is not clear because the various schemata are not coordinated, overlap, and sometimes even contradict each other. As of now it is certain that we are not achieving the objectives the Holy Father had in mind in summoning the Council. He gave a beautiful homily on the text: "Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti" in illustration of the nature and the mission of the Church. "What answers do we have for the pressing problems confronting the Church?" He listed some of these problems and drew his conclusions. He ended by saying, as if to challenge the ultra-conservatives by saying: "I have not said one word which the Holy Father himself has not already said explicitly or implicitly."

Cardinal Bea: "his schema is the heart of the Second Council of the Vatican." He also praised the research work that went into the schema, but he complained that some essentials are missing. For one thing we speak only of the Church militant. The question of membership in the Church in all its phases has not been discussed and developed to a point of sufficient maturity to make possible a safe definition at this time. He summed it up by saying that the essential defect of this schema arises from the fact that it does not tend to realize the objective that the Holy Father had in mind. (It would seem that Suenens and Bea had collaborated with each other in preparing their statements, they were so perfectly coordinated.)

The discussion as a whole continued very much along the lines of previous days, with probably a larger percentage than yesterday defending the schema. There were some excellent speeches on both sides; though as usual there was much sermonizing.

During the meeting the fourth batch emendations on the Liturgical schema covering Chapter I, nn 16-31 were distributed. No announcement of any kind was made regarding these emendations; but I presume that we will vote on them tomorrow, or at least as many of the 111 propositions submitted to us, as we can handle during tomorrow's session. I am surprised at the amount of change in the liturgy the Commission is recommending. It will be interesting to see whether the Council will vote down any of these emendations.

The latest bit of gossip is that when a deadlock was reached in the Liturgical Commission various devices were used by different members of the commission, principally by Archbishop Hallinan, to get some action. The problem was not to get work done on the emendations, but to get Cardinal Larraona to permit things to go back to the Council floor. It seemed as though Larraona or somebody higher up simply did not want to permit final action on anything, during this first session of the Council. The story is that as a last resort different members of the Commission saw various Cardinals, especially Frings and Suenens et al. who took up the matter secretly with the Holy Father who personally gave orders for more action. Too bad this was not done earlier. Even though we are balloting on some items, I doubt whether there will be anything ready to be promulgated next Saturday.

DECEMBER 5: The 34th General Assembly was really a busy one. If this much had been accomplished every day, we would easily be half through with the agenda! Cardinal Alfrink presided. The Archbishop of Brazil was the celebrant of the Mass.

The General Secretary announced that the balloting on the eleven emendations of articles 16-31 Chapter I of the Liturgical schema would take place today. At the same time he announced that the proposed emendations for the remaining articles of this first chapter would be

distributed today for action tomorrow. They also distributed a summary of the schemata which are to come up in the second session of Council in 1963.

Bishop Justin Calewaert of Ghent in Holland was the relator for the emendations on which we started balloting today. The balloting continued during the entire assembly; eight ballots were cast, leaving three to be taken care of tomorrow. At the end of the Assembly Felici announced the results of the first four ballots cast today. It will be more convenient to record the results here under date of December 6, when I will have the results of all ballots cast today and tomorrow.

Ruffini spoke first. He suggested two separate schemata on the church, one dogmatic and the other pastoral. It is quite obvious that he just can not give up the idea of stating the dogmatic truths about the nature and function of the Church in the stark and harsh language in use in former Councils which were held under more polemical circumstances. He is also determined that all details in this connection should be formally defined by this Council, a matter which is regarded with less than enthusiasm by the more "liberal" group in the Council.

Montini spoke today, after Ruffini. That was the first time he spoke since the very first session in which discussion of the Liturgy began. My feeling is that this speech will be regarded as most important - probably the most important of the First Session. He began by saying that we should consider very carefully what Cardinal Suenens had said yesterday. It would almost seem as though Cardinals Frings, Suenens, Lienart, Doepfner and Montini had coordinated their efforts in preparing their respected speeches - they dovetailed perfectly in covering the field of the nature, mission and organization of the Church. Montini again said that this is the most important schema in the agenda of the whole Council. We must ask ourselves: "Quid est ecclesia? and Quid agit ecclesia?" The answers to these questions are the facts on which the whole Council hinges. He spoke eloquently of the manner in which the Church is presented to the world; if he were an American one would say he was concerned about the "image" of the Church. His second point was the episcopate. This he pictured as the toil used by Our Lord to carry on the work of the redemption. The episcopate reaches its "culmen" in the Primacy of the Pope.

In this way he clearly painted out the nature and powers of the episcopate without in any way detracting from the preeminence of the papacy- in fact the papacy is the culmination of the episcopate.

The remaining speakers were fairly evenly divided between those who supported the present schema and those who attacked it. Maximos IV spoke. I could not follow his French too well, but Msgr. Giovannetti, who visited here today for a short time, said that the Patriarch was very harsh in his criticism - in fact at times he skirted very close to heresy!

Archbishop Florit of Florence spoke at length. He went right down the line in support of the Position taken by Ottaviani and Ruffini. He talked as though the "liberal" group wanted to destroy the juridical structure on which the Church rests and which is essential to its nature. He could not or did not want to understand that those who attacked the juridicism in the Church were criticizing the manner in which her nature would be defined in this schema.

The Assembly was dismissed at 11:45 AM today in order to permit all Council Fathers to be in St. Peter's square to recite the Angelus with the Holy Father and receive his blessing. This was quite an experience. The weather perfect under a clear blue sky, even though the temperature was a bit on the "nippy" side. The Holy Father's voice came clear and strong over the PA

system. In spite of his favorable appearance today, the rumors are still strong regarding the nature of his illness. The persistent references to his "stomach ailment complicated by anemia" nurses the rumor that he has either a bleeding ulcer or a stomach cancer which causes a serious loss of blood. Obviously, no such rumors are confirmed in any official manner. Unless there is a turn for the worse, the Holy Father is to officiate at the Solemn Session on Saturday closing the first session of the Council.

Msgr. Giovannetti had some interesting comments on Montini's speech. In the first place he himself was quite thrilled by the speech. Furthermore; he had spoken to several Italian bishops after the morning's assembly. They unanimously expressed great satisfaction with the speech Giovannetti said that the average Italian bishop would not dare to speak out in the way Montini did; but it gave them a great boost in morale to have someone like Montini who now already is spoken of openly as a successor to John XXIII, take such a strong stand against the accepted views of a large number of Italian Cardinals. Giovannetti made the comment that the Italian bishops live in a very narrow world. Few of them having gone farther from home than to Lourdes. As a consequence their views are dominated pretty much by a few strong characters in the hierarchy - Siri, Ruffini, etc. Siri is chairman of the Italian Conference of Bishops.

DECEMBER 6: The 35th General Assembly was presided over by Cardinal Tisserant. The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Bernandin Gantin of Cotonou, Dahomey, West Africa. During the Mass, Gregorian Chant was sung by the students of The Pontifical Atheneum, Rome, with the Council Father joining in. The chant went well except that they took a pitch which was much too high for the average Council Father.

The meeting was opened by Archbishop Felici, Secretary General, with a review of the activities of the first session of the II Council of the Vatican. Since the opening of the Council on October 11 with solemn ceremony presided over by the Pope, 34 General Assemblies had been held up to and including yesterday, beginning with that of October 13. Five projects were discussed, viz., The Sacred Liturgy, the Fonts of Revelation, Communications Media, Unity of the Church, and the general aspects of the project on the Church. Thirty-three ballots were taken, the first to elect the 160 members of the various Council Commission, another four on the general acceptance of the projects on the Liturgy, the Fonts of Revelation the Communications Media and on the Unity of the Church. The other 28 ballots were taken on the amendments submitted on the Preface and Chapter I of the Liturgy. Up to and including December 5 there were 587 speeches by Council Fathers made on the floor and 523 intervention in writing, a total 1110. This is a rather impressive record of work done, considering the magnitude of the process involved in conducting the Council.

Felici also announced that the Holy Father had granted the following privileges: to impart the Apostolic Blessing when we return home; and also to celebrate Mass at any convenient hour of the day or night whether on the day of departure from Rome or on the day of arrival at home. This latter privilege may be exercised also by the secretary or others on the staff of Council Fathers.

The results of the voting yesterday and today were announced by the General Secretary: I am giving herewith the results announced yesterday and today. Some of the ballots were taken yesterday and the others today.

Announced 12/5

BALLOT	TOTAL VOTE	REQUIRED MAJORITY	PLACET	NON PLACET	INVALID
I 2110		1406	2085	14	11
II 2114		1408	2083	21	10
III 2109		1406	2044	50	15
IV 2073		1382	2033	36	4

Announced 12/6

V 2072		1382	2011	54	7
VI 2082		1388	2016	56	10
VII 2079		1386	2041	30	8
VIII 2086		1384	1903	38	145
IX 2082		1388	2054	22	6
X 2058		1372	2023	31	4
XI 2078		1380	2037	37	4

The General Secretary called attention to the fact that in the eighth ballot, the last cast yesterday, many of the Council Fathers apparently did not have time to mark their ballot because of their hurry to get to St. Peter's Square to get the blessing of the Holy Father. That will explain the fact that 145 ballots were invalid. The Presidency, however, ruled that it was not necessary to repeat the ballot since far more than the 2/3 majority required was cast for the measure as it was; they therefore declared the measure carried.

The following are the results of the two ballots in connection with the final section of Chapter I of the Liturgy; the proposed emendations were distributed yesterday.

I 2037	1358	1916	115	6
II 2014	1343	1981	22	11

One Cardinal and ten Council Fathers spoke on the schema, "De Ecclesia" today. Cardinal Lercaro endorsed what Suenens and Montini said yesterday. Lercaro spoke of the spirit of poverty as the spirit of the Church. It was not too easy to follow, because it was quite abstract and mystical.

The Bishop Agnani went on and on, completely aside the point; Tisserant finally interrupted by saying: "We are now discussing the schema de Ecclesia; so far we have heard nothing on this point. But we do thank you for the examination of the consciences of the Council Fathers"

Today I had received four invitations to attend various social functions and the reception for the Observers. I couldn't make the dinner at the Maryknoll House but I did get to the others, as follows.

The reception honoring the Observers was a most pleasant affair. Father Stransky presided at an informal meeting. Archbishop Shehan of Baltimore spoke on behalf of the Bishops and Dr. Horton spoke briefly on behalf of the Observers and presided over the question and answer period. About seven or eight of the Observers spoke in reply to the questions. They were very interesting and quite frank in their replies. I was glad to hear Father Cunningham, who sponsored this reception, say that this would be done at frequent intervals in the next Session. It

After the reception for the Observers at the Grand Hotel, we went to the Taverna Guelfa on Via Fiorentina where we were guests at a dinner put on by Bishop Soenneker to honor Bishop Bartholome on the 21st anniversary of his appointment as Bishop. 23 guests were present, mostly bishops and priests from the Province of St. Paul and especially the Diocese of Winona. It was a very delightful dinner. After Bishop Bartholome's dinner we went to the Pisers for a cocktail which they arranged for a group of about forty people, mostly connected with the Council. Among the crowd I saw Father Fred McManus, Father Gustave Weigel, Dr. Lindbeck and wife (Lutheran Observer), Bishop de Souza and a number of those who had been at the dinner for Bishop Bartholome.

At the reception for the Observers Archbishop O'Boyle, Chairman of the Administrative Board for the NCWC pulled me aside to chat about the Council generally and my contacts with the German group through Cardinal Koenig in particular. I took the occasion to discuss the matter of a proper presentation of the question of Church and State when it comes early in the second session. I suggested that they arrange to have one or a few people do a thorough thesis on this question from our viewpoint and then have it put into good Latin and divide it among about five of the "name" bishops to be presented very early in the discussion of the chapter on Church and State in the schema de Ecclesia. No one can do a complete job on this in ten minutes, therefore the subject matter must be perfectly developed and presented in a coordinated manner by five men. If this is not organized there will be a haphazard presentation or no presentation at all, thus allow this to go by default. The subject is of greater concern to us than to any of the European groups and therefore we will have to take the lead. O 'Boyle was very much interested and said he would discuss it with Archbishop Alter tomorrow.

When I ran into Weigel at the Piser's I mentioned the same thing to him. I believe he and John Courtney Murray can probably do the best job for us. Weigel is enthusiastic over the idea; but unless something is done officially through the Administrative Board it will be neglected. In the conversation with O 'Boyle I used the example of the German and French speaking groups to illustrate what can be done. Everybody recognized that the best leadership in a coordinated way was shown by those groups in this first session. Without them we never would have gotten what we did in the Liturgy, nor would we have prevented the very unsatisfactory handling of the dogmatic issues as proposed in the official schema.

In connection with the Church and State issue, I suggested to Father Weigel that the approach to problems of authority used by Father Buckley of the Lariat Fathers today in the Council could very well be used as a philosophical and theological foundation for the treatment of the problem of Church and State. Buckley started, not with the Church or the State who exercise authority, but with the autonomy of the individual, and from that concept develop the relationship of the individual to the authority of the Church and the State. Church and State receive authority from God only for the purpose of protecting the rights and liberties and promoting the welfare of the individual. God created the individual before the State or before establishing the Church. It is in that sense that we can logically develop the idea that all authority comes from God and is conferred upon the State or Church through the individual. (The position of the Church in this line of argument may not be acceptable as outlined above!!)

NOTE: I re-read the last paragraph after the end of the Council. I am sure that this view is not completely orthodox. It is an Oversimplification.

Also the above plan discussed with Archbishop O'Boyle and Gus Weigel was quite naive in

DECEMBER 7: This was the 36th and last General Assembly of the first session. Lienart presided. The Mass was celebrated in the Chaldean Rite. Announcements were made for tomorrow.

It was also announced that the Holy Father would address us over the radio. He was witnessing the session over television (that explains why all lights were on during the meeting)

Felici then announced that we would ballot on the Proemium and First Chapter of the Liturgical Schema. The vote would be either Placet, non-Placet, or Placet iuxta Modum. Those who voted the latter would have to deliver their reservation to the General Secretariat before the end of December. Since the placet iuxta modum is essentially an approval it will be treated simply as a placet vote if the Secretariat is not given the emendation or change desired by the end of December. The ballot was taken early in the meeting and the results announced around 11:00 A.M. They were as follows:

Total	Placet	Non Placet	iuxta Modem	Invalid
2118	1922	11	118	5

Felici stated that since there was far more than the required 2/3 majority voting "placet" the Proemium and the Chapter I are finally approved since the votes iuxta modum could have no effect on the final outcome. Hence those who voted iuxta modum need not report their reservation to the General Secretariat.

I voted placet iuxta modum. My intention was to propose that in Article 7 of the final draft (page 7, line 4 there be inserted after the words "... tum maxime" the words "ET QUIDEM SUBSTANTIALITER" in order to emphasize the difference between the manner in which Christ is present through the minister and manner in which he is present under the two species.

The discussion on "de Ecclesia" was rather half-hearted; it seemed quite obvious that they were merely marking time. Cardinal Koenig answered the argument used by some bishops: "We have labored all night but have taken nothing." He pointed out the various ways in which a great deal has been accomplished and emphasized that the groundwork has been laid for great and rapid progress in the second session next September.

Cardinal Lefebvre spoke beautifully on the matter of charity. He complained that the schema doesn't even mention the word. The charity of Christ which pervades the teachings and the life of Christ; it should play an equally important role in the mission and the life of the Church.

There was a flurry of excitement when it was announced that the Holy Father would come to the Council Chamber in person to pray the Angelus and give his final message of the session. This he did. He looked quite pale, but spoke with vigor. He gave the blessing and also blessed all religious objects which we had on our person and at home for that purpose.

Giovannetti was here for supper tonight. He said that The Holy Father was not supposed to come to St. Peter's, but at 11:30 he decided to do so - and did!

Archbishop Gawlina was here for dinner this noon. He was most interesting in his conversation as usual. He said that he has his personal memoirs completed and would have little difficulty putting together the things in his experience which are related to the work of Cardinal Muench in Germany. He promised that in the next year or two.

Visited with Mother Olympia and Mother Monica to give them \$5000 as a

DECEMBER 8: Cardinal Koenig came to the breakfast table this morning very much depressed. Beyond the conventional greeting he said nothing when he came, but immediately went into a description of the meeting of the special sub-committee of the joint commission working on "De Fontibus Revelationis", which is dealing with the subject of revelation and tradition. He started by saying that the meeting of this sub-committee which lasted from 5:00 to 8:00 P.M. last night was a "horrible experience." He said that all other phases of the work of this special commission has made excellent progress, but there is a deadlock on the question of Scripture and Tradition. (This is pretty much of a continuation of the deadlock which existed on the Council Floor and which lead up to the events which prompted the Holy Father to interfere and appoint this special Commission.

It seems that a special letter was presented to the Holy Father in which a dire picture was painted of what would happen to the interpretation of Sacred Scriptures in the event that a schema as proposed by the "liberal" group went onto the floor and was adopted. The letter was signed by nine Cardinals of whom Koenig named Browne, McIntyre, Masella and Siri besides Ottaviani and Ruffini. He did mention that Spellman did not sign, nor did any other Americans aside from McIntyre. The letter was based largely on some book and articles by a Belgian priest from Bruegges and some articles by a German priest. Cardinal Koenig did not mention the names of the priests. But he did mention that the Belgian priest was a subject of Bishop de Smedt and the books in question carried the Imprimatur of Bishop de Smedt. This made Bishop de Smedt very angry because the fact of his giving the Imprimatur was used in the argument over the matter in the meeting. Such an argument is so very obviously unfair that de Smedt's anger is readily understandable. The tone of the meeting reached its lowest ebb when Ottaviani and Ruffini both attacked Cardinal Bea in a very bitter manner, leading to a harsh exchange of comments. It seems that copies of this letter were circulated among the members of the special commission, ostensibly by Ottaviani since he made the statement that the Holy Father himself had asked that this be done.

This leaves a very sour taste in the mouth of the special commission members, especially since the meeting was held on the eve of the closing of the first session of the Council. Apparently this special subcommittee will not meet again until a week before the opening of the second session. It is quite clear that there will be some sharp debate before the schemata on dogma and also on the Church are finally disposed of. As matters now stand it seems most likely that a liberal view can be adopted if the matter ever comes to a vote on the floor. Ottaviani and Ruffini and their group very probably will do anything they can to prevent a liberal schema from coming to a vote. They can never secure a favorable vote on their own ultraconservative viewpoint.

At this morning's solemn session the atmosphere was quite different. In talking to or hearing the Council Fathers in conversation one felt that it was "the last day of school" before a vacation! Everybody was in a hurry to get home.

Cardinal Marella Capella offered the Mass. The music at the Mass was congregational and consisted solely of Gregorian chant. It was a far more impressive performance than the Sistine Choir dreams of putting on.

The Holy Father did not appear till after the Mass. He made a brief address in which he spoke of the Council in its beginnings, its achievements and its future. He definitely set a deadline -

THE COUNCIL MUST BE COMPLETED BY DECEMBER 25, 1963! He feels that if the instructions he gave about interim work, the whole thing can be completed by his deadline.

The Holy Father spoke with a firm voice, but he did look pale and worn.

COUNCIL DIARY - SECOND SESSION - 1963

September 26 - As was the case in previous trips to Rome, the first day after arrival found me interested in little besides getting some sleep. I slept only about two hours on the trip between New York and Amsterdam and it seems that it will take several days to get sleeping habits readjusted to the change in hours and also to the difference in climate.

Aside from sleeping, I spent the day in getting things in order for the routine of the Council. Here at Salvator Mundi some changes have been made since the first session. Bishop Biskup will be here for the duration of the second session; Bishop Hastrich and his mother will remain here for about ten days; Father Henry McMurrugh will be here to drive the car and serve as Bishop O'Connor's secretary instead of Msgr. Wirz; Bishop of Bolsano, Bishop Treacy of LaCrosse with Msgr. James Finucan, Bishop Bona of Green Bay will all live here during the second session. The biggest change for me is that Father Lessard is now at the Casa Santa Maria and will not be available as a chauffeur and general aide. His schedule at the Casa is quite heavy.

I went over to the Casa to see Father Potter and Father Lessard; did some shopping and then had dinner with the two of them at 7:00. We were all alone in the restaurant, a very interesting place near the Casa, until about 8:00 when another party of priests came in! An indication of the different hours kept here in Rome from what we were used to at home. Got home at 9:00 and slept the night through.

September 29: We left here shortly after 8:00A.M and were in our places in St. Peter's by 8:30. By 9:00 A.M. just about everybody was in their places; but then we sat for a whole hour waiting. It was exactly 10:00 A.M. when the Holy Father arrived. It would almost seem that this was planned; but nobody seemed to know the reason why. There was a huge crowd, with the all the seats and tribunes used regularly in the Council filled and all temporary seats and tribunes as well as standing room within sight of the main altar filled. Cardinal Tisserant celebrated the Mass. The Sistine Choir was very much in evidence; but they at least permitted the huge congregation to sing the common parts of the Mass. The weather seemed pleasant, but before we were in St. Peter's very long it became quite oppressive.

The Holy Father began his address at approximately 11:45 and continued speaking in Latin till 12:50 PM; then he added a five minute summary in Greek. Dante handed him another sheet, apparently with a summary in another language, but the Holy Father pushed it aside and proceeded to give the blessing immediately and then left immediately, walking the full length of St. Peter's. He was very obviously quite exhausted by the tremendous effort he took to deliver his speech. He does not have a very good speaking voice and even with the fine PA system, he had to work very hard. He also was quite emotional in phases of the speech, e.g. when referring to the reunion of Christendom and when paying a tribute to John XXIII.

It was impossible to follow the speech in great detail. For one thing, after being there from 8:30 to 11:45 in the very uncomfortable atmosphere everyone was pretty tired before the Holy Father began speaking. It was very obvious that the speech was delivered more for the record than for the people who were actually present.

Father Lessard and I went to the Bob Kaisers for a buffet supper. Their son John was baptized this afternoon in St. John Lateran by Archbishop Roberts. There was an interesting group present. Aside from a few couples with whom they are in contact socially there was quite a collection of Jesuits: Gus Weigel, John Courtenay Murray,

McCool of the Biblicum, Lynch of Vatican Radio, Malachi Martin of the Secretariat for Unity, McKenzie - the new head of the Biblicum, another Jesuit by the name of McKenzie, and a few other Jesuits whose names escape me. At the same time I saw Gregory Baum, Father Placid Jordan, OSB, Archbishop Hurley of Durban, Archbishop Roberts, two Indian bishops whose names I do not recall, Sanche de Gramont of the New York Herald Tribune. These were the people I had a chance to visit with; there were many others whom I saw only casually and whose names escape me. There was practically no conversation about Bob's book. That, incidentally is practically impossible to borrow and absolutely impossible to buy here in Rome!

SEPTEMBER 30: 37th Assembly - 2258 present

The reaction to the Holy Father's speech was excellent. Gramont's story appeared on the front page of the Herald Tribune and was well done. The secular press naturally stressed the Holy Father's reference to reunion of Christendom. But some other phases of his speech were even more significant because they constituted proof that Paul VI will pick up where John XXIII left off. He carried many of John's ideas far beyond what John said in his opening address of the Council last year.

The first General Assembly was held today. They assigned us our pew numbers indicating seniority and our place in the Council Hall. I was moved up from 432 to 386 in the line of seniority. We were surprised to find that Cardinal Lercaro presided at this session. It has been understood that the members of the presidency still would preside even though the program at each general assembly would be determined by the four moderators. Someone asked "What are the members of the presidency to do?" Someone answered: "They will take turns at saying the Angelus at the end of each general assembly!" This crack was made because Tisserant closed the first general assembly with prayer.

The NCWC Rome office is furnishing us with an excellent summary of each general assembly. A good job is being done in this, so I need not attempt to make a summary here since I plan to keep all copies of these daily bulletins. As I type this, the news is coming in over the AFN network from Germany. They are giving a good, though brief, summary of the discussion at the general assembly. This is an indication that there has been a great improvement in the functioning of the Vatican Press Bureau. The English section also has a new director, leaving Msgr. Tucek to take care of his job as the Rome Director for the NCWC News service. *Insert from below.

OCTOBER 1: 38th Assembly 2301 present

Cardinal Agagianian presided at today's General Assembly. Felici announced that all privileges granted to council fathers last year are renewed for the duration of the second session - faculties to hear confessions, which may be delegated also to secretaries of council fathers; afternoon Mass; use of antemensium. Felici also announced the order of the five schemata that will be taken up in order at this session. Since only five were announced, one wonders how far they expect to get in this session???

The discussions today were very technical and therefore the assembly was quite dull. Cardinal Ruffini, as was expected, attacked the schema on "de ecclesia" with his usual vigor. Even though we are only working on the schema in general, he went into numberless details. *The only stir was created when Archbishop NGO-DIN-Thuc of Vietnam was called to order by Cardinal Lercaro because he did not confine his remarks to the schema. Gramont in his story in the Herald Tribune tried to sensationalize this bit by giving it the headline on the front page,

conveying the impression that this action reflected an earlier rebuke given the Archbishop while he was in Rome because of his political statements. (This belongs above because it occurred in the session on September 30).

The debate on the schema "de Ecclesia" in general was concluded by 11:00 and a ballot was taken immediately on whether this schema should be admitted for discussion in detail and as a basis of the final decree or constitution on the church. We sat there making conversation for about twenty minutes until the ballots could be processed. The results were announced as soon as they were received from the IBM office. They were as follows: Total ballots: 2301; placet 2231, non placet 43; invalid ballots 27. (It seems to be taking some of the council fathers a long time to catch on that the ballot does not register unless the special pencil with magnetic crayon is used.)

We then took up the discussion of the Introduction and Chapter of the schema. Ruffini spoke first as indicated above.

OCTOBER 2: 39th General Assembly - 2288 present - Doepfner presided.

The General Secretary again announced the rules concerning those who wished to speak. Those who want to speak on the second chapter should make their applications now. He also announced on behalf of the Council Presidency (it seems that they want to let it be known that they are still there) that the Fathers are urged to remain in their places during the process of the debates. This is a bit ironical; today was the first day in the first and second sessions that I ever left my place to get a cup of coffee. And they had to make this type of an announcement the first time. The coffee bar was so horribly crowded on the south side that I didn't attempt to enter it, but walked over to the north side. That was almost as bad, and the coffee was worse! The number that left their places to go to the coffee bars or just to walk up and down in the side naves is very large. I am sure that at one time more than half the Fathers were not in their seats. One can hardly blame the Fathers because the air was very hot and sultry, with the special type of sultriness peculiar to Rome, and the debate, while quite serious, was very dull. The only lighter moment came when Bishop Primeau was announced as the Bishop of Manchester in England. Then Primeau rose to speak he prefaced his remarks by saying that he wished to correct the Most Eminent Presiding officer that he was the Bishop of Manchester in the United States and that there was a Bishop of Manchester in England but that he was one of the separated brethren. Following Bishop Primeau as the last on the program was Abbot Butler, OSB of England who speaks a flawless Latin without manuscript with a very strong Oxford accent. Everybody listens when he talks, simply because of the accent.

Listened to the first World Series game tonight as the Dodgers beat the Yanks 5 to 3
Reception was not good.

OCTOBER 3: 40th General Assembly: Cardinal Suenens presided; 2262 were present.
Nineteen council fathers spoke.

Bishop Holmes- Siedle, my neighbor, showed me a note written by Msgr. A G. Martinmort, a French liturgist, concerning the vote to be taken soon on liturgical schema. He suggests that when the vote on Article 47 (in the original numbering which becomes Article 43 (a in the revised numbering) we should vote "placet" on emendation No 2 and "placet iuxta modum" on emendation No 3, de Sacramentis, submitting the following "modus" Art (a sic mutetur): "In administratione sacramentalorm et sacramentalium lingua vernacula adhiberi potest ad normam Articuli 36."

Deleatur omnia alia verba huius paragraphi.

This note is worth following when the time for voting comes.

During the speeches it became evident that very little progress has been made in speeding up the procedure of the Council. The Cardinals spoke first, and said practically everything that can be said. As a consequence the speeches generally are a tiresome repetition or concern themselves with a multitude of trivialities like suggesting a change of a word or two in many parts of the schema. I hope that the debate will be terminated tomorrow on Chapter I and that Chapter II will be taken up. The subject matter of number II will certainly create more interest - and controversy.

The Secretary General announced that tomorrow (Friday) we will receive copies of the revised liturgical schema. It was not quite clear from his announcement whether we would receive all or only some of the chapters that remain. The voting on the emendations of this schema will begin next week.

At table tonight Bishop Cleven, who had just returned from the meeting of the German Bishops at the Anima, spoke with great concern about certain developments taking place among some groups concerning this schema on "de Ecclesia". He started telling me that the Italian bishops want to put the section De Revelation into the schema on de Ecclesia! This would upset the whole program. Bishop Cleven did not finish telling me of this development when Karl Rahner came in as the guest of Cardinal Koenig. I did not get a chance to follow this up later. Will try to do so tomorrow if I have a chance to talk to Bishop Cleven. I am sorry that I did not have a chance to visit with Rahner. Father Placid Jordan, OSB was here for dinner this noon. He told of the splendid press conference conducted the other day by Karl Rahner. Father Jordan was asked by Cardinal Koenig to come to his room; that left no opportunity for me to visit with him. He promised to return later.

The "Cause celebre" today is the action of the Roman Vicarist in banning the display and sale of books by Teilhard de Chardin or books of authors who exalt his works. A ban has also been placed on the books on the Council by Xavier Rhyne, Bob Kaiser, Hans Kueng.

OCTOBER 4: 41st General Assembly; Archbishop Kroll enthroned the Gospel; Cardinal Agagianian presided: 2256 Council Fathers were present.

Cleven spoke on the first chapter of "de Ecclesia" after which Cardinal Browne, relator for this project, assured us that the emendations recommended will be "duly considered" and then made a few suggestions on his own. (Agagianian pronounced his name properly when introducing him, something which Lercaro did not do the other day; he called him "Brownie!")

It is also interesting to note that this is the very first time in either the first or the second session that discussion of a given chapter was concluded because the list of speakers who had sought the floor was exhausted; in every previous instance the discussion had to be terminated by the vote of the assembly after the Presidency had asked for such a vote. That is some progress!

Discussion of the second chapter of "de Ecclesia" was begun immediately. Ten spoke on this chapter, which with the seven plus Cardinal Browne who spoke of the first chapter, made a total of eighteen speakers for today.

Spellman was the first to speak on the second chapter; he endorsed the chapter as a whole, but vigorously opposed the idea of a permanent diaconate, whether the deacons were married or not. He had the very practical arguments that: 1) it would greatly increase the cost of seminary training since a separate program if not completely separate institutions would have

to be provided, which would be too costly and 2) it would reduce the number of priests. In this connection it is interesting to note the conversation I had with Bishop Cleven on the subject of teachers of religion. The Archbishop of Cologne has a corps of lay people who teach religion on a full time basis. There are over 200 in this group which is made up of men and women, married and single who are specially trained for this purpose. They carry a schedule as heavy as any teacher in the schools and are paid an adequate wage to enable them to make a life time job of this work. We were interrupted in our conversation; hence I could not pursue this subject to find out how the program is developed - in which schools or other institutions they have their classes, in public schools, catechetical centers, etc.? I will go back to that topic with him some other time.

Archbishop Vuccino of Apro in the name of seven bishops proposed that the schema "de Revelatione" be incorporated into the Schema "de Ecclesia." The German bishops had already expressed concern about this move. I hope that the suggestion will receive little attention.

The Secretary General announced that the rule promulgated yesterday prohibiting the distribution of books, pamphlets, letters, etc. without the express permission of the Secretariat applied only to the Council Chamber.

He also announced that a new roster of the Council Fathers would be made available in order to have a complete list of all Council Fathers including the changes since the beginning of the first session. A new assignment of numbers would also be made because some of the fathers did not turn in their names last Sunday and as a consequence received places out of line insofar as seniority is concerned. We are to receive notice of our new number on Saturday. Word will be sent to all those whose addresses the Secretariat has. The new numbers and consequent place assignments are to become effective on Tuesday, October 9.

A pamphlet giving the emendations accepted by the Liturgical Commission was distributed. This pamphlet covers only the Second Chapter of the Liturgical Schema. The vote on this chapter will take place next week, beginning with Tuesday. Since there are 19 propositions to be voted on in this chapter alone, it may take a few days.

OCTOBER 5: Took advantage of the first "free day" to get some paper work done. There were several letters requiring an answer. I did not leave the house, but filled the day with writing letters, getting a nap and trying to get caught up on some of the reading. In the evening, beginning at 9:00 P.M. we listened to the third world series game - and then to bed.

OCTOBER 6: The day broke clear and beautiful. But by five in the afternoon it was raining again. It seems that we are destined to have a repetition of last year's weather during the Council. Aside from the first three or four days since I came here we have had some rain every day.

Father Godfrey called me. He is staying at the Hotel Alicorni, not too far from the Vatican. He was quite elated over the fact that Archbishop of Rouen (Martin) used the exact text of a memorandum which had been prepared by Fathers Gregory Baum, Fred McManus and himself, in an intervention at the Council on October 3. The memorandum dealt with a discrepancy between the present schema under consideration (de Ecclesia) and the schema on the liturgy, Chapter I which has already been voted. It seems there is some contradiction between the concept of the nature of the Church in the two schemata. Father Godfrey did not

say whether they also wrote the introduction, to Archbishop Martin's speech. He said: "My speech will be short for the sake of both brevity and charity."

At noon I had a dinner in the private dining room at which the following were present: Father Placid Jordan, OSB, Father Potter, George Wertin, Kenny Gallagher and Bishop Hoch. This was much more pleasant and we had better food than if we had gone down town to eat. Sister gave us some fettucini that was far superior to any I ever got at Alfredo's. Kenny Gallagher certainly seems to enjoy being in Rome. I am sure he will adjust to the routine very quickly. With his knowledge of Spanish, and I believe, some French he should become proficient in Italian rather quickly. George Wertin looks very well. He was supposed to have taken his examinations in the subjects he missed while back in the States from April to August during the past weeks, but one or the other professor had not yet returned to the Greg, so the exams were postponed to this week. Since the retreat at the North American College begins tonight, he will have to make that up at some later date.

Father Placid Jordan was really at his best in the conversation during the dinner and after. He certainly is very enthusiastic about the progress being made in the Council in the matter of carrying through with the program of reform that John XXIII had initiated and which is being vigorously promoted by Paul VI. He is openly and very vocally a supporter of the progressive viewpoint. At the same time he is very critical, in a reserved and charitable way, of the Curia. He told of the efforts which were made and still are being made by some of the underlings in the Curia (very probably on prompting from above) to soften the impact of the program of reform promoted by the former and the present pope. He spoke of the omissions in the official text of John's opening speech at the opening of the Council, especially the paragraph concerning the reform needed within the Church and the restatement of the unchangeable truths in terms that can be understood and are relevant today. It seems that a rather strong paragraph contained in the Italian text which John drafted himself was omitted in the official Latin text prepared by underlings who are the experts in Latin. Father Jordan cited other instances in John's speech at the close of the first session and Paul's speech at the opening of the present session. For instance, the English translation of that speech in the section on reunion reads as follows: "The second is that this mystic and visible union cannot be attained save in identity of faith and by participation in the same sacraments and in the organic harmony of a single ecclesiastical CONTROL,..... The word in the original is "regimen", which Father Placid pointed out is something quite different from control. He stated that some of the observers who received the English text were very much put out by that expression. Father Jordan used this as another illustration of the manner in which the Curia is trying to slow down the reform proposed by the Holy Father or to deflect it into a different channel. He referred to the incident cited by Bob Kaiser in his book, namely the fact that the English translation omitted entirely the directive given by the Holy Father (John) that during the interim between the two sessions Episcopal Conferences should meet not only to discuss the new schemata but also to prepare and send in their collective thinking regarding emendations.

Watched the fourth game of the series. Much as I hated to see the Yanks lose, I am glad the series did not go beyond four games. Nine PM is too late for a game to start!

OCTOBER 7: Forty-second Assembly; Lercaro presided; number present 2275. Felici announced thirty-one who had been given a chance to talk; sixteen spoke today; leaving fifteen for tomorrow and perhaps the day after. The lineup of speakers today represented a real rolling of the big artillery! Eight Cardinals and Maximos IV, were the first nine speakers.

Cardinal Siri admitted the doctrine of the collegiality of the bishops. It contributes to the solidarity of the episcopate and promotes charity among them. Concept of collegiality is juridical. It must be carefully kept in harmony with the doctrine of the primacy of the pope as defined in Vatican I. Siri's speech was very surprising; he went right down the line with the progressive group in this matter; something which he seldom does in other matters.

Cardinal Leger asked for a careful definition of the manner in which the bishop becomes a part of the collegiality; is it by consecration? Leger also reiterated the plea to stress the mission to the poor. In this connection it would be good to discard much of the splendor of the ceremonies of the Church.

Cardinal Koenig made his best presentation today of anytime that he spoke in the first session. He made a concise, direct and very clear statement of the fact that the supreme authority in the Church is vested in the collegiality of the bishops acting in union with and under the direction of the Holy Father as the Supreme head. This doctrine is traditional in the Church. He stated that the substance of this doctrine was already stated in Vatican I.

Cardinal Doepfner spoke of the permanent diaconate in the Church and endorsed it very strongly. Theologically it has a solid basis. The possibility of its being adopted in the Church in some areas or everywhere should be kept open. Doepfner discounted the seriousness of the practical problems mentioned by others (e.g. Spellman) in the training of deacons or the effect on number of vocations to the priesthood.

Cardinal Meyer made an excellent presentation, his first speech in this session.

We were to go to the first meeting of the US Bishops at 4:30 PM today. At 3:30, however, we received word that the Holy Father would call at Salvator Mundi to visit the sick bishops confined here. We promptly forgot all about the meeting of bishops and got into our formal clothes, ferriola and all to greet his Holiness. At the same time a mild thunderstorm with considerable rain blew up, which did not simplify the matter greeting the Holy Father properly. He was scheduled to arrive between 4:30 and 4:45 PM, but actually it got to be a bit after five before he got here. Cardinal Koenig also skipped a meeting he was scheduled to attend in order to be here to greet the Holy Father. The Cardinal and Maximos IV along with Father Cormac the chaplain and Mother Olympia, the Mother General, met the Holy Father at the entrance and escorted him to the third floor. (All of us breathed a prayer that the elevator would work properly and heaved a sigh of relief then the Holy Father got off on the third floor - the elevators had not been too reliable ever since we got here even though two of them are completely new.) Cardinal Koenig presented each of the Archbishops and bishops present. He then went to the room next to mine to see the Archbishop from India who is critically ill and spent considerable time with him in prayer and questioning the doctors about the Archbishop's condition. It is too bad that the poor man was in no condition to realize the privilege that was his. The Holy Father then went to Bishop Cowley's room just across the corridor and chatted briefly with him. Bishop Cowley came in just about two hours before the Holy Father came! He has a bad cold. We accused him of putting on an act to gain the attention of the Holy Father. His Holiness then went to the chapel, which is on this floor, where the nuns sang "Oremus pro pontifice nostro" after which His Holiness spoke a few words to them and gave his blessing. From here, he went to the first floor to greet Archbishop Jordan, Coadjutor Archbishop of Edmonton, Canada. The good nuns are still walking about on a cloud; they were thrilled only slightly more than the rest of us.

Tomorrow we start voting on the second chapter of the Liturgical Schema. It is hard telling what the outcome will be, though everyone takes it more or less for granted that practically all propositions in amendment of the Schema will be adopted as well as the entire Schema in the end. But there has been some skulduggery in the manner in which some of the emendations were tampered with in the Commission. Some undesirable changes were made.

OCTOBER 8: 43rd General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presided; present were 2298. Cardinal Tappouni officiated at the opening Mass celebrated in the Siro-Antiochian rite. 27 announced as having asked to speak; of these eleven actually spoke, carrying sixteen over to tomorrow. We are getting farther and farther behind in the number waiting to speak. It seems this will be a repetition of the situation which obtained in the discussion of the liturgy last year!

Much time, about 45 minutes, was taken up in making the report on the matters to be voted on in the second chapter of the Liturgical schema. Cardinal Lercaro made an excellent report on the technique followed in processing all the emendations, suggestions, amendments, etc., proposed by the council fathers who made interventions when the liturgical schema was under debate. The only trouble is that there was some skulduggery along the way by which certain restrictions were slipped in by the conservatives in the Commission which were not suggested from the Council floor. e.g., the use of the Latin in the form of the sacraments and sacramentals in chapter III; the use of the vernacular in the breviary in chapter IV, etc.

Cardinal Doepfner made an announcement asking the Council Fathers to remain in their places during this session because the balloting would continue during the whole period of the assembly; this had only a slightly noticeable effect on the trek to the coffee bar.

The Relator then called attention to some of the highlights in the "relatio" covering the 19 propositions which must be voted on in the second chapter. It is good that he didn't read it all; the "relatio" covers 14 printed pages!

Felici read each proposition separately before the vote was taken on a given proposition. We didn't get down to actual voting until 10:35. Five ballots were taken on as many propositions during this assembly and the results of four of these ballots were announced before the end of the session. I will not repeat the results here because they are included in the summary furnished to us by the NCWC office.

The debate on "de Ecclesia" continued while the voting went on. It was quite dull. Cardinal Gracias, as usual interjected some English proverbs, this time the following: "elaborating the obvious; slaying a dead horse." Only this time he did not attempt to translate them into Latin.

Archbishop Staffa spoke. Maybe it is my imagination resulting from my dislike of the manner in which Staffa does things, but he sounded very overbearing in manner and speech. He was quite apodictical in his statements, giving the impression that there simply is no sense to any claims that the Church was founded on the Apostles united with and under the leadership of Peter. The latest story about Staffa's methods is that he, at the suggestion of Ottaviani, promulgated a rule that no Catholic College is to grant any honorary degree without first clearing the candidate with the Congregation of Seminaries and University Studies. This was supposed to have been slipped through the last days of John's life when he didn't know what was going on. The action was brought on when St. Louis University conferred an honorary degree on Hans Kueng. Then, it is said, the real climax came when the Congregation (Staffa) refused to clear Bea for an honorary degree! So far as I know this rule has not been promulgated in the States, at the instance of Spellman.

Giovannetti was here for supper. He arrived here at 6:40 PM, quite upset. At 6:00 PM the Holy Father granted an audience to all nuncios, internuncios and delegates. Just as the Holy Father began to speak, the nuncio to the Philippines, who had remained at the entrance to the audience chamber because he didn't feel well, collapsed and died in a matter of a very few minutes. The Holy Father stopped speaking and gave absolution.

Msgr. Giovannetti remained only until shortly after eight. He had little to say today.

OCTOBER 9: 44th Assembly; Cardinal Suenens presided; present were 2278. 26 names were announced as the list of speakers; fourteen actually spoke! Still no signs of cutting the debate short. Some very good things about the priesthood and the diaconate were said today; but there were also many dull speeches.

Votes were taken on the 6th through the 12th proposition proposed in connection with the II chapter of the Liturgy. The results of these seven ballots were announced just as the assembly ended. That leaves seven propositions on the II chapter which should easily be disposed of tomorrow.

The meeting this morning opened on a tragic note. Not only did the General Secretary announce the death of the nuncio to the Philippines, but also the death of Bishop Leo Smith, Bishop of Ogdensburg. The latter came as a complete shock to everybody, especially the American Bishops. Practically no one knew of Bishop Smith's death before this announcement was made. We learned only later that he was found dead in bed this morning. Bishop Smith had been the Auxiliary Bishop of Buffalo until he was appointed to Ogdensburg earlier this year; and it is only a few days less than a year ago that Bishop Burke of Buffalo died only fifteen minutes after having been brought to Salvator Mundi suffering from a heart attack!

This noon we had dinner in the special dining room for Father Lessard, Father Potter, Father Godfrey Diekmann, OSB and Mr. Wilmer (Bill) Thorkelson, religion editor for the Minneapolis Star. He is also the chairman of Religious News Service (RNS). The visit with this group was very interesting. Thorkelson is very favorably inclined to the Church and always handles religious news in the Cowels papers in Minneapolis very well, insofar as items concern his department. He came to Rome for the opening of the second session of the Council and will remain here about another week or ten days.

As might be expected, the conversation covered the subject of Bob Kaiser and Xavier Rhyne and their respective books. Those who had read Bob's book (everybody seemed to have read Xavier Rhyne) seemed to be agreed that he did not do nearly as good a job as Xavier Rhyne. Father Godfrey said he had dinner at Bob Kaiser's along with Malachi Martin, Gus Weigel, and of course, Archbishop Roberts who lives there. Bob openly asked for a criticism of his book; apparently some of them told him in rather frank terms what the shortcomings were. Father Godfrey also said he had met Father Murphy, C.Ss.R. who is widely believed to be Xavier Rhyne, and to be one of a "team" that produced the book. Many think that the book was produced by having one or two priests from Rome supplying material to rewrite men in the office of the New Yorker. Godfrey said that Murphy solemnly denied that he collaborated with anybody in New York; the question whether he collaborated with anybody here and/or had anything to do with the writing of the book was not asked or answered directly.

There is a strong suspicion that Father Malachi Martin S.J. of the Biblicum and the Secretariat for unity supplied much of the material which Bob Kaiser used in his book. That may be true, in a measure. He may have supplied some of the material, but I am sure that Archbishop Roberts supplied many of the ideas, and that Bob dug up many of the facts himself. I had observed during the first session that Bob was very successful in getting information, some of it which could have come only from very "high sources".

OCTOBER 10: 45th General Assembly; Cardinal Agagianian presided, number present 2265

The voting on the seven remaining emendations to the second chapter of the Liturgical schema was started as soon as Felici had completed the preliminary announcements. The seven ballots were completed by 11:45 AM and the results were announced after the last speaker was finished shortly after twelve noon.

Twenty-five names were announced as having requested permission to speak; sixteen actually, spoke, leaving nine on the list for tomorrow. Some good speeches were made but everything that is being said is in repetition of what has been said several times already. It is difficult to understand that the Moderators do not ask for a vote on the question of terminating the discussion on the second chapter of "de Ecclesia".

Archbishop Yu Pin made a passionate plea for a permanent diaconate. He said that the population explosion makes it simply impossible to keep up with the number of priests required to care for those who are Catholic and especially those who still need to be evangelized. Other speakers had mentioned that the percentage of Catholics among the world population is steadily growing smaller because the increase in population is highest in pagan countries. Archbishop Yu Pin's theory is that deacons could be trained more easily because they need not be educated in the Latin language; the vernacular only is used in the work of the deacons.

Archbishop Van den Hurk of Indonesia did introduce a new thought which I had not heard expressed in the Council; but it is a point on which I have had strong feelings for a long time. He objected to the practice in the schema (and in general conversation) of referring to "his Diocese" when speaking of a bishop in relationship to the Diocese over which he has jurisdiction. The terminology should be "the Diocese entrusted to a bishop." The schema should also use the term "munus ministerii" instead of "potestas." "Ecclesia non est episcopi; episcopus ecclesiae!" This is a reflection of my feeling of intense dislike for the expression "my diocese" "my priests" "my parish".

At lunch this noon Eunice Ryan called up to say that she was in town; has been here since Tuesday, but didn't call until today. Made arrangements for her to come here for dinner tomorrow, Friday. Have asked Bishops O'Connor, Hoch, Hacker and Treinen to join us. Typical of Rome: I tried to call her back at the Hotel de la Ville (next door to the Hassler) this evening to confirm the arrangements but was told that she is not registered there; this in spite of the fact that she called from there!

At five thirty this evening we went to the church of Nostra Signora della Mercede for a funeral Mass for Bishop Leo Smith. Yesterday I said that he was found dead in bed yesterday morning; this was not quite accurate. He had been living at the Clinica di Nostra Signora della Mercede. He suffered a heart attack and died very quickly at 6:30 AM yesterday. Eight Cardinals and a church full of prelates and priests were present for the requiem low Mass celebrated by Bishop Navagh. Cardinal Spellman gave the absolution after the Mass. Three

of Bishop Smith's predecessors are still living: Bishop McEntegart of Brooklyn, Bishop Kellenberg of Rockville Centre and Bishop Navagh of Patterson.

OCTOBER 11: 46th General Assembly; Cardinal Lercaro presided; number present at the beginning of the General Assembly Felici called attention to the disaster at Belluno in which a huge landslide above a dam displaced the reservoir of the hydroelectric plant and caused many thousands of tons of water suddenly to spill over the dam and turn the Piave Valley into one huge grave. The town of Longarone with 4500 inhabitants was wiped out. Estimates of those who died ran over 3000.

Felici asked for prayers during Mass for the victims and survivors. He also asked that the first anniversary of the opening of the Council, observed today, be kept in our prayers also.

After the Mass Felici announced that the Mexican hierarchy had already made a cash contribution for the relief of the victims of this disaster. He indicated that if others wished to follow this example, the contribution could be sent directly to the Holy Father.

During the course of the General Assembly this morning the following items were distributed: Emendations of Chapter III of the Liturgical Schema which are to be voted on at the General Assembly on Monday; a new roster of the hierarchy of the world brought up to date to cover changes during the past year; a copy of the letter which Paul VI addressed to the Council Fathers convoking the second session of the Council; and a beautifully printed and bound copy of the allocution of Paul VI at the opening of the second session on September 29.

In glancing quickly through this copy I noted with interest what the person who edited this pamphlet tried to soften the remarks which the Holy Father made on the subject of Christian unity. In the margin brief titles were given to cover the subject under consideration; but the titles did not always indicate the subject exactly, but tried to cover it over or tone it down. E.G. in the passage which attracted so much attention and in which the Holy Father said "Si quae cuspa ob huiusmodi separationem in nos admittenda sit, veniam humili rogatu a Deo petimus, ab ipsisque petimus, si injuriam a nobis se accepisse putent...." The title accompanying this section is "Seiuncti Fratres ad reconciliationem invitantur." There were many among the conservatives who did not like the tone of Paul VI's speech and they are anxious to counteract it as much as possible. This is a continuation of the spirit shown a year ago when John XXIII spoke so bluntly at the opening of the first session. E.G., the passage in which John referred to the "prophets of gloom" around him, was omitted in the text of the speech printed in the L'Osservatore Romano!

At the beginning of the debate Cardinal Lercaro begged the Fathers not to repeat anything that had already been said, but merely to read those sections of their manuscripts that contained new ideas and turn the entire manuscript in to the Secretariat. That had absolutely no effect on most of the speakers, though some of them did cut their speeches short. Lercaro's announcement drew a good round of applause from the younger council fathers at the far end of the chamber. Then Lercaro made another announcement reminding us that applause is forbidden. Slipyi was the second speaker, and promptly drew another round of applause!

Sixteen fathers spoke today; twelve of the list announced at the beginning did not get a chance to speak. There just seems to be no inclination to hurry the debate along. In most cases the speeches are just as long and the repetitions just as frequent. At the beginning Lercaro had indicated that because of the importance of the subjects contained in Chapter II the Moderators felt a vote of cloture at this time would be premature. In the end I feel sure they

will have to impose cloture because they will keep on going indefinitely. Some of the speeches were good and would have been effective if they had been made at the beginning of the debate; as it is, they were not too well resolved because they contained nothing new. It is very obvious from the attitude of the fathers that they are becoming bored with the long drawn out debate.

The General Secretary referred to the final vote to be taken next Monday on Chapter II. There will be an opportunity to vote placet, non placet, and placet iuxta modum. They who vote placet iuxta modum must deliver the "modus" to the teller along with the ballot. That means that the "modus" must be typed out in advance. If any vote is cast placet iuxta modum and the modus is not delivered with the ballot, it will be counted as a simple placet.

Eunice Ryan called yesterday to say she would be in town until Saturday. I invited her to Salvator Mundi to have dinner with Bishop O'Connor, Bishop Hoch, Bishop Hacker and myself. Bishop Treinen could not join us because of a previous commitment for lunch. Eunice looks well and apparently is enjoying her tour of Europe. She is with a large group from the Columbus area, mostly Irish. She and Bishop O'Connor had much to say about the days when Bishop O'Connor and Bishop Ryan were youngsters together.

At 5:00 this afternoon we went to St. Mary Major for a commemorative service marking the first anniversary of the opening of the first session of the Council. The Holy Father was present and also spoke for fifteen minutes. His talk was given in Italian and was a "ferverino" on our Blessed Mother, the feast of whose maternity was celebrated today. Many were disappointed that he spoke in Italian which limited the number who could understand. This was very probably done because the Latin does not lend itself to that type of speech.

Going and coming we had a good demonstration of Roman traffic at its worst. There was a very large crowd of council fathers and other clergy present, almost filling the church. There were many thousands of people crushed into the square in front of the church. No doubt some of the main thoroughfares were blocked off because of the coming of the Holy Fathers. We were royally entertained by the antics of drivers of the various types of vehicles which jammed the streets for a part of the way home.

OCTOBER 12: This was a real free day. Went shopping this morning and bought a few Christmas gifts. Stopped at the Casa Santa Maria to see Father Lessard and Potter. The work load in the audience office is very heavy. Everybody wants to get into audiences or special functions in St. Peter's. Coming back from a walk this afternoon, I ran into Cardinal McGuigan who was calling to see Archbishop Jordan who is still a patient here. The Cardinal looks about the same as a year ago. The only noticeable difference is that he walks with more of a shuffle in his step.

Received some clippings from the States; one was the latest letter from Vatican City which appeared in the September 20th issue of THE NEW YORKER. The letter does not have the punch which the first one had a year ago; but it is still in very much the tone and follows the same line. The other clipping is from the October 3 issue of THE SEATTLE TIMES - a signed article by George Weller of the Chicago Daily News Service. It deals with the matter of the banning of several books by the Rome Vicariate. It ends with this sentence quoting Bob Kaiser: "The error that shocks me most is that the Vicariate should raise Kueng, Rynne and myself to the level of de Chardin." The writings of DeLubac on Teilhard de Jardin were included with the three current books that merited the displeasure of the Vicariate - and Holy Office. Actually the Vicariate did not prohibit the sale of these books - they still are available in

Catholic books stores - but the monitum said they should not be displayed - that is, their sale should not be "Pushed".

OCTOBER 13: Spent the morning working on the mail. At noon today five members of the Hungarian hierarchy were guests of Cardinal Koenig at dinner. Among the guests was the auxiliary bishop of Bucharest, of Cardinal Mindzenty. Archbishop Byrne sat next to him; he said that the bishop never mentioned the name of Mindzenty. He apparently takes no chances in talking about that subject on occasions like this. It was also interesting to note that one of the men here was appointed to one of the dioceses in Hungary and now functions as administrator, but he has never been consecrated even though his appointment was made seven years ago. The government does not approve of him and therefore will not permit his consecration.

The man who sat next to me spoke some German. But there was only desultory conversation because he spoke Italian fluently and spent most of the meal talking to Bishop Bona who also knows Italian quite well.

A little sidelight was furnished to this scene by Father Nedbal; he said that the Monsignor spoken of above is angling for appointment to Budapest! Even under persecution, human nature remains the same. The senior among the Hungarian bishops present proposed a toast to Cardinal Koenig who responded. At the end of the meal, Maximos IV sang "Ad multos annos" in Arabic.

This afternoon we went to St. Peter's for the second part of the ceremony of beatification of Bishop Neumann. The ceremony proper was in the apse of St. Peter's. This meant that little could be seen from our seats in the main nave. As a consequence there were few bishops in the tiers regularly occupied during the General Assemblies. Much to our surprise, the Holy Father was brought into St. Peter's on the Sedia Gestatoria through the mail name even though there was scarcely a soul in the tiers until he arrived at the fifth section from the front. I was in my regular place in the seventh section along with Bishop O'Connor and Bishop Fulton Sheen. When the Holy Father passed our section the three of us were alone and therefore we got a special nod and smile in recognition of our applause.

The ceremony was very brief, consisting of a prayer in honor of the new "beatus", benediction with the Blessed Sacrament, and then a speech by the Holy Father, fifteen minutes in Latin, and about three minutes in German closing with about the same length in English. There was a roar of applause when the Holy Father started speaking in English and again as he referred to the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. In his Italian speech the Holy Father referred to the Book which Cardinal Cicognani wrote on "Sanctity in America". This was in connection with a tribute His Holiness paid to the growth of the Church in the US not only materially but also spiritually.

Bishop Sheen as usual was interesting in conversation. With a sober face he said to me, "Do you know which miracles are attributed to Bishop Neumann?" I said, "One was a cure of a man who is present today." He said "the first one was when Bishop Neumann asked that his diocese be divided and also asked the poorer section be given to him!" Sheen said that he is preaching the third evening of the triduum which will be held at Mary Major on Monday through Wednesday next week. His theme will be centered around the fact that Bishop Neumann did nothing extraordinary - he became a saint by doing his work with patience and devotion.

Bishop Hoch, Father Kereme and I went to the Kaiser's for their usual Sunday evening open house and buffet supper. That is a good place to see a good cross section of the

"progressives" outside of the council fathers' circle. The crowd, not nearly so large as two weeks ago when they had a special occasion because of the baptism of their son, contained many Jesuits, as well as men like Father Godfrey, Father McManus, Father Baum, Msgr. Higgins, Father Yzermans, etc. Hans Kueng was there and I had a rather long discussion with him on the subject of freedom of conscience and church and state relations. Contrary to the thinking of Archbishop Alter, Archbishop O'Boyle and others from the US Hans Kueng feels that this is the time to have a discussion in the Council leading up to a formulation of the basic principles concerning the nature of man as a free being, supremacy of conscience, freedom of religion, separation of church and state. I explained to him how much we have at stake in this question as it applies to separation of church and state in the US and freedom of religion in the Latin American countries. Kueng feels that even if we did not get a statement that clearly defined all basic principles, as US citizens we would be in a much better position back home if we at least tried.

Kueng seems a very intense individual, bubbling over with enthusiasm and actually quite humble, though quite unafraid to meet an issue or express himself. He realizes that he is still young and relatively inexperienced. In fact, he refers to himself as a "teen-age theologian." It will be very interesting to see how he develops during the next ten years or more. If the Council had not come at this time and if he had not written so boldly (should one say prematurely) about it, Kueng very probably would have developed gradually into a truly great theologian like Karl Adam before him. But the fact that he wrote a book about the Council when it was in its preparatory stage which caught on and made a hero of him practically overnight is a severe test of Kueng's humility, judgment and stability of character. He startled the world by saying things in interpretation of Pope John's objectives expressed in various speeches before the Council, which were a radical departure from the usual pattern. Things which he said in his first book on the Council and which turned the Curia into a rage and shocked many of us in other parts of the world actually are not as advanced or progressive as some of the things which Pope Paul said in his opening address on Sept. 29. The reference to an apology offered to our separated brethren for the things in connection with the Reformation in which we were guilty is a good case in point. Kueng did not go as far in his book on the Council and reform as Paul did in his opening address. Yet he was vilified for saying much less. The manner in which he will pass through this period when he is in a glaring light of publicity will be an acid test of his character. All in all, the conversation with him was interesting.

The word was around generally among the group at Kaiser's about the system of translating the speeches at the Council. Cardinal Koenig had told us about it a few days earlier. He heard it directly from the Holy Father in private audience at the time when he presented Father Hesburgh and Mr. Folsom to give their report as permanent observers at the Atomic Energy organization. Cardinal Cushing has had a private audience also and he reported that the system will be installed for this session already! I hope he is correct.

I gave Bob Kaiser the clipping from the Seattle Times which Bethe had sent me containing the story by George Weller of the Chicago Daily News. He got a real chuckle out of the quote noted above attributed to him. I asked him just what the story is concerning the so-called banning of the different books by himself and others. He said he went to the Vicariate and was told by the Archbishop who runs the vicariate for Cardinal Vicars that he knew nothing about it and had done nothing! Bob says he just doesn't know what the score is on this matter.

Father Godfrey told me that he was responsible for the fact that the lay observers and consultants at the Council received Holy Communion at the Mass on Friday. Mr. Norris and

others had complained that they were given no opportunity to receive at the Council Mass each morning. Father Godfrey, Fred McManus et alii advised him and the others simply to notify the masters of ceremonies that they would come forward to receive Communion at the proper time on Friday morning. The arrangements were made and will be continued daily in the future. Godfrey said one layman commented during the discussion, "sacrifice without a banquet does not make sense!"

Saw Father Lynch of Vatican Radio and told him that I had written home about a regular radio broadcast in Fargo by means of a taped interview arranged by Vatican Radio. This probably will go through. I also saw Father Stransky of the Secretariat for Christian Unity. He said he could come over for dinner anytime. I hope to have him take part in one of the broadcasts; I will interview him on the work of the Secretariate.

OCTOBER 14: 47th General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; number present 2242.

The Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Mikayo, Abp of Tabora in Tanganyika. He is a Negro. Bishop Holmes-Siedel said to me: "Archbishop Mikayo is my Metropolitan and one of the finest men I have ever met. It is hard to realize that forty years ago he was a kid without pants running around the village and in the woods."

Twenty council fathers spoke today, among them Cardinal Ritter. Last night at the Kaiser's Father Godfrey, Father McManus and others were around the kitchen table. They told me "we are preparing Cardinal's Ritter's speech for tomorrow." Don't know whether it was true or not, but Ritter did not say anything of tremendous importance. His speech was very brief. Parente followed the Cardinals (Frings was the first speaker, then Ritter.) He tried to marshal some arguments against the idea of collegiality of the bishops. Of the 31 speakers who had been announced, almost all of them were Spanish or Italian.

This morning the vote was taken on the second chapter of the Liturgy as a whole. The total favorable (placet and placet iuxta modum) gave a strong vote in favor of this chapter; but there were so many votes placet iuxta modum that there was not a two-thirds majority in the form of a simple placet. That is fortunate because it means that among the very large number of votes iuxta modum there are many which will call for a modification of one or the other objectionable details.

It is not exactly clear just how the matter will finally be resolved. Felici tried to make a clarifying announcement, but did not throw too much light on the subject. He referred to Art 37 and 38 of the rules of conducting the Council, but these were not exactly to the point I suspect that they will proceed as follows. The reservations submitted by those who voted iuxta modum will be referred to the Liturgical Commission for processing. The Commission will then refer back to the General Assembly the amendments contained in the "modus" submitted by the Fathers. If they are accepted they will be inserted into the text as voted. Then I presume that there will be another general vote on the chapter. However they do it, I hope that we get the matter of having the "priestly prayers" which are outside of the Canon permitted in the vernacular. As it stands now, the collects, the pater noster and the prayer "Libera" following the pater noster would be in Latin.

Found out the hard way today that Roman barber shops are not open on Mondays – they are open on Sundays! I walked down to the shops in the area twice before a youngster told me they are closed on Mondays.

The Vote on the Second Chapter

Present	Required Majority	Placet	Non Placet	Placet iuxta Modum	Void
2242	1495	1417	36	781	8

The Orientals were happy today; for the first time during Vatican II they have a tribune of their own directly opposite the tribune occupied by the Cardinals. It is directly below the statue of St. Peter. The patriarchs present are Stefano Sidarous, of the Coptic patriarchate; Maximos IV Saigh, Melchite Patriarchate of Antioch; Pietro Paolo Meuchi Maronite Patriarchate of Antioch; Albert Gori, Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem; Paul II. Cheikho, Chaldean Patriarchate of Babylonia; Ignatius Peter XVI Batanian, The Armenian Patriarch. Cardinal Ignatius Tappouni is seated with the Cardinals who form the Presidency. The L'Osservatore Romano carried a good story of this matter in its report on the 47th General Assembly along with an excellent picture. This is an important step forward in the struggle of the Oriental Church to establish its historical position in the universal Church as against the Latin Church.

OCTOBER 15: 48th. General Assembly; Cardinal Suenens presiding; number present 2239. The Mass this morning was in the Mozarabic Rite. The Mass lasted a bit over an hour. The language used is Latin. The singing by the celebrant left much to be desired; but the chant by the schola was beautifully done. There is much more dialogue between celebrant and choir than in the Latin rite.

Before the beginning of the working session Felici announced that several confessors are present from 8:00 to 9:00 AM each morning when General Assemblies are held in the temporary chapel of the Blessed Sacrament. I had discovered this very convenient arrangement last year already towards the end of the first session. It is a real convenience.

Archbishop Paul Hallinan acted as relator for the Liturgical Commission in presenting Chapter III for vote on the emendations. He did an excellent job. We voted on four of the 10 emendations proposed for this chapter. Will list the results of all ten after we have completed the balloting tomorrow.

Thirty names were announced as wanting a place to speak. Nine actually spoke at today's General Assembly. Cardinal Siri is talking for the second time on Chapter II. He went to great length to explain that he was speaking on a different phase of the subject than he treated the first time. He still seems to go right down the line with the progressives on the question of the collegiality of the episcopate.

In the middle of the meeting Suenens announced that there still was a very large number of fathers seeking permission to speak on Chapter II of "de Ecclesia" and that it seems the list will continue to grow. Hence he proposed a motion that debate be terminated with the close of the General Assembly this morning. He asked for a standing vote, and every person in the place literally jumped to his feet! I never saw such enthusiastic unanimity of vote on anything!

The debate then continued till 12:00 noon, when Suenens called on Cardinal Browne to sum up the discussion of Chapter II. Like at least thirty other speakers had done before him, Cardinal Browne again belabored the point that the collegiality of the Apostles and their successors in no way detracts from the position of the Pope as Supreme Pontiff. On the way home this noon, Bishop Hoch remarked that most of the time taken by a large percentage of the speakers in dealing with Chapter II "de Ecclesia" was spent in defending Vatican I instead of considering the problems in this respect facing Vatican II! There is much truth in that remark.

Cardinal Suenens announced that tomorrow the Dogmatic Commission will present four general propositions covering the major points which were debated in Chapter of "de Ecclesia." On Thursday there will be a simple vote (placet or non placet) on these four propositions. The object of this vote is to provide some kind of a guideline to the Dogmatic Commission indicating how the body of the council fathers feels on the basic issues involved in this debate. In this way the Commission will save a great deal of time in revising the schema in the manner that will give promise of securing a favorable vote. This is the first time this procedure was followed. It sounds very sensible to me. It will prevent presentation of emendations which are clearly contrary to the general wishes of the council fathers and will also insure presentation of emendations of points in the schema which are not regarded with favor by the great majority. What will be accomplished on points, if any, on which opinion is fairly equally divided (less than two thirds majority in either direction) remains to be seen.

This morning we got a bit of a scare. Bishop O'Connor did not get up for Mass. He complained of fibrillation's and a greatly accelerated pulse. The doctors took an electrocardiogram. But when we got back from the morning meeting the Sisters on the floor said he was feeling much better. After dinner Cardinal Koenig, Maximos IV and practically everybody else from the dining room went (in solemn procession, as Cardinal Koenig put it) to Bishop O'Connor's room for just a minute to say hello. He has been kept in bed all day, but probably will be able to return to his usual routine tomorrow.

OCTOBER 16: 49th Assembly;' Agagianian presiding; number present 2259. The Mass this morning was celebrated according to the Alexandrian Coptic rite. It lasted fifty minutes. The music is very strange to our ears. It seems to be based on a different scale from what we are accustomed to hear; therefore it seems to have no harmony and little melody. Unlike the African Coptic rite, even the rhythm is irregular. There was an almost constant dialogue, at times the celebrant and the ministers singing at the same time without apparently paying any attention to each other.

At the beginning of business Felici announced that the termination of discussion voted yesterday did not make the matter final. According to Art. 57 #6, after a vote any Council Father who represents 5 or more other members may insist on an opportunity to speak. Hence the announcement that we would proceed today to a discussion of chapter III and that four major propositions would be distributed to be voted on tomorrow covering chapter II, was premature. He said that the propositions would be distributed at a later date; and then he announced eleven speakers, nine of whom spoke. Cardinal Koenig intimated that there is a bit of a feud between the Moderators and the General Secretary, and that Felici's announcement was a gentle tap on the wrist for Cardinal Suenens who presided yesterday and made the announcements concerning the discussion today and the distribution of the four propositions. It will be interesting to see now how long it will take before the propositions are distributed and voted on.

The discussion of Chapter III started at 11:25. Ruffini was the first speaker. While I did not time him exactly, I am sure he spoke more than 15 minutes. The manner in which some of these people can disregard rules and get away with it is disgusting at times. But Ruffini can be really clear at times, and in the process reveal his overbearing personality. In trying to knock out one statement in the schema, he said: "... aut non sunt Vera, aut non intelligo." (If I don't understand it, it's wrong - Wenn ich es nicht weiez, dann ist's nich war!)

Cardinal Bacci, the great Latin expert put in a parenthetical phrase which called our attention to the fact that he is a Latinist " ...si linguam Latinam intelligo..."

During the process of the debate, the voting on the emendations of the third chapter of the Liturgy continued. Only four ballots were taken today, leaving two more to complete the chapter tomorrow.

After the entry for yesterday was completed yesterday afternoon, we attended the reception given by Archbishop Krol at the Grand Hotel in connection with the program of beatification of Blessed John Neumann. Even though the rooms provided for were very spacious, the place was packed from 7:15 till after 8:30. When we left at 8:45 there still was a great crowd there

I enjoyed this reception more than any other of that type that I ever attended. There was a good representation of the Observers present; Skydsgaard, Dr. and Mrs. Lindbeck, Dr. and Mrs. Horton, Bishop and Mrs. Corson, etc. I had a long chat with the Lindbeck's. I told him of my plan to tape some interviews for broadcast over one of the stations at home, and asked him whether he would be interested in giving me a fifteen minute interview at some convenient time. He was very much in favor of the idea, but suggested that I get Dr. Skydsgaard. He said he would be very happy to talk to the Dr. and arrange the matter for me. We ended by making an appointment to meet him and if possible Dr. Skyzgaard at 8:45 AM Thursday at the St. Martha entrance to St. Peter's. I was a bit amused when he asked me what coffee bar I patronized. When I told him that I don't like coffee he looked at me a bit surprised, but he seemed to take it for granted that every council father went for a stretch and a cup of coffee every morning.

I was a bit apologetic to Dr. Lindbeck for asking him to give an interview for broadcast. I asked him whether their policy permitted such public statements. He said: "This is not in conflict with our policy and the Vatican policy at this time. A year ago when we first were sent here, our people instructed us not to make any public statements during the Council. He didn't know just what to expect when we got here, and therefore our people wanted to be sure that nothing indiscreet would be said. That was Vatican policy also. But our experience was so pleasant in every respect in the first session that there is no longer any restriction on our own good judgment in deciding for ourselves."

OCTOBER 17: 50th. General Assembly; Cardinal Lercaro presiding, number present 2259 Felici repeated the prohibition against distributing pamphlets, letters, etc. in the Council chamber ("in hac aula"). Since I haven't seen anything that was distributed except purely official matter, I don't quite understand why this matter is repeated so often; there must be somebody getting propaganda material to somebody against the wishes of the General Secretariat.

Felici also announced that the vote on Chapter III of the Liturgy as a unit will be taken tomorrow. I saw Archbishop Hallinan just before the meeting. He said that Cardinal Larraona hasn't done a thing about the vote on the second Chapter of the Liturgy. They haven't even had a meeting on this matter and therefore have taken no action on the processing of the large number of reservations represented by the votes cast "iuxta modum" in the ballot on the Second Chapter. Hallinan asked Cardinal Meyer to try to exert some pressure on Larraona.

I asked Archbishop Hallinan if he could do something about having the NCWC office distribute to each Bishop from the US a mimeographed copy of the "modus" which is recommended when voting on Chapter III, in reference to Art 63 #a. This eliminates the provision that the

sacramental form must always be pronounced in Latin. Hallinan was a little reluctant to take the initiative in this matter because of his position on the Liturgical Commission. In the end, however, he did follow the suggestion; we received such a form along with the digest of today's meeting.

In the speeches today one man devoted two or three minutes to the matter of eliminating a coma from the text of the schema!

Bishop Hengsbach of Essen in Germany spoke eloquently; even though he made no reference to Ruffini by name, it is evident that he was directly answering some of the points made by Ruffini in the first speech on this chapter. Ruffini had stressed the danger of extending any authority to the laypeople; they would lose the sense of obedience to ecclesiastical authority. Hengsbach stressed the point that we have a real threat to the spirit of obedience to authority if we deny the laypeople their rightful position in the Church and do not make them understand the responsibilities deriving from that position.

Bishop Wright and Bishop Hannan (Auxiliary of Washington) each made a good presentation in connection with the question of Catholic Action. Their speeches were made the principal subject of the news releases devoted to today's meeting by the US news agencies. Wright referred to the theological basis of Catholic Action and Hannan to the practical application of that theology in organizing Catholic Action. The Church is a "sacerdotal society" and not a "clerical society." We must explain what "layman" really means in that society.

Bishop Holmes-Siedel came back from his regular to the coffee bar with a big smile on his face. He said: "I have been in Canada twice to make appeals for funds to support my missions; the last time in 1953. One of the bishop English speaking bishops in the midwestern section of Canada gave me a bad time of it. He spoke rather harshly about my appeal; the one and only time I ever received such a reception. I just met this bishop at the coffee bar. He told me that he has regretted the manner in which he received me very much ever since I was there. He handed me a check of \$500 and told me that he would arrange to have at least two parishes in his diocese give special aid to my mission. This is most extraordinary. The Council has done wonders for some people; and I have a check for \$500 in my pocket to prove it!

The regular meeting of the US bishops this week was postponed until today because the triduum in connection with the beatification of Blessed John Neumann was observed the first three days of the week and conflicted with our regular meeting date. It was decided that the weekly meeting would be scheduled regularly for 4:00 - 5:30 PM on Mondays.

Bishop Ahr moderated a panel discussion of the schema on "de Ecclesia", Chapter 3. The panel consisted of Fr. Weigel, SJ; Fr. Sullivan SJ of the Gregorianum; and Msgr. O'Shea of the major seminary in Darlington, NJ. The presentation by the panel was excellent, especially by Weigel and Sullivan. It was announced that there would be an informal meeting tomorrow (Friday) night for further discussion of this subject.

Vote on Chapter III, Liturgy.

Present: 2217 Placet: 1130 Non Placet: 30 Placet iuxta Modum: 1054; Void: 3

OCTOBER 18: 51st General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding, 2217 Fathers present
Felt terrible this morning; I did not get any sleep last night - just an occasional doze of five minutes occasionally. An almost constant cough prevented any thought of real sleep. I tried to see Dr. Nick before going to the Council, but missed him. I made the mistake of going to the

General Assembly even though I felt miserable. I wanted to keep my record clear of missing any General Assembly! I was glad to get home at noon. Dr. Nick came to see me as soon as I got back. I had a temperature just under 101 and bad case of bronchitis. Dr. Nick ordered me to bed immediately and prescribed so much medicine that I felt like a walking apothecary shop by the time I could get up on Sunday!

The general Assembly today was taken up with the vote on the third Chapter of the Liturgy and 16 speeches on the third Chapter of "de Ecclesia." Bishop Klepacz of Poland, in the name of all Polish bishops, made an eloquent plea for separation of Church and State along with freedom of religion under all governments. His statement was very much along the lines of what we in the US are pleading for. Yet, his plea was tied directly to the situation in Poland today. For that reason it gives a basis for the charge made by Blanchard et alii that freedom of religion is not a matter of principle with the Catholic Church but a matter machiavellian policy; we cry for freedom when we are in the minority or are persecuted; we deny the same freedom to other when we are in control!

It does, however, seem quite likely that the question will come to the Council floor in the third session if not in this one. The Secretariat for Christian Unity has prepared such a draft-schema which will be presented in due time. Archbishop Alter is in charge of the regular meeting of the American bishops next Monday afternoon which will be devoted entirely to this subject. We have also received a memorandum from the NCWC (authorship not indicated) which adds to the draft prepared by Bea. More on this subject later when the subject comes under discussion.

Two of the speakers were cut off today, because they ran over the time limit; one of them was Cardinal Gracias. Doepfner should have been presiding on October 16 when Ruffini went over fifteen minutes.

OCTOBER 19 & 20: Stayed in bed all day Saturday; Sunday I said Mass but canceled a dinner date with Msgr. Giovannetti, Father Lessard and Father Potter at noon. I was still very much too weak to move around much. Spent the day reading, catching up with the entries here, writing some letters and sleeping. I expect to be in excellent shape tomorrow for the regular schedule.

There were two interesting items in the papers today. The one referred to the fact the Archbishop Grimshaw has organized a group of bishops from English speaking countries to begin working on the vernacular missal that will be approved without question by the Council. The initiative in this matter taken by Grimshaw, which is an interesting fact. He has the reputation of being the most conservative of all English prelates on the matter of the vernacular. Why should he be taking this initiative? Could he be trying to head off any extensive use of the vernacular in all English speaking countries? This is a development which will bear watching. Hallinan and Griffiths are on his committee to represent the US. O'Neill of Regina represents the English speaking Church in Canada. A name that I was happy to see on the list was that of Archbishop Young from Tasmania. I know he will not be satisfied with a mere minimum use of vernacular.

The second news items refers to the third session of the Council. The AP reported a rumor that the third session might be convened as early as January, thus providing little more than a month's intermission. I am wondering whether this is a planted rumor. Last year it was announced that the second session would convene on May 12, 1963. There was so much protest to this that the date was quickly changed to September 8, later to September 29 by

Paul VI. Are they trying to find out what the reaction would be to hurrying the work of the Council to conclusion by having a session early in the year and another at the same time as this session is being held? It will be interesting to see what reaction, if any, there is to this "rumor." Personally, I wouldn't mind spending half of 1964 here, if there were some assurance that this would mean the end of the Council before 1965.

OCTOBER 21: 52nd General Assembly; Cardinal Suenens presiding; number present 2204. The Mass this morning was according to the Byzantine-Roumenian (Romenum) Rite. It lasted an hour. The music, like most of the Byzantine rites, was very florid - Bishop Holmes-Siedle said the music sounds like the Don Cossak Chorus, which is a very apt description. Some passages sung by the choir gave the impression of being a dance tune. There was a great deal of dialogue between celebrant and choir.

Bishop Martin of Nicolet in Canada was the "relator" for the fourth Chapter of the Liturgy. The printed copy of the "relatio" amounted to thirty pages: Bishop Martin read about half of them and it took him from 10:30 to 11:03 AM. to make his presentation. It is good that he didn't read all of the copy. He received a great hand when he finished, but it was not apparent whether the hand was for the manner in which he made his presentation (which was excellent) or because of the simple fact that he quit! Many of the Council Fathers got up and left for the coffee bars long before Bishop Martin finished. There is a mounting criticism of the fact that so much of the material in connection with the voting which is printed in beautiful form is read at length by the "relator" and also because of the fact that Felici reads each single emendation before each ballot is cast. Felici apparently noticed that so many left the aula before the vote on the first emendation was taken because he announced that 2204 council fathers marked their attendance card but only 2163 voted on the first emendation and even fewer on the next two. Probably they will begin to understand soon that there will be less and less interest manifested in the proceedings until they speed them in some way and make them less boring.

Ottaviani was the second speaker this morning, following Cardinal Meyer who opened today's discussion. Before going into his subject Ottaviani in a very peevisish tone called attention to the fact that some of the periti were passing out material to bishops in the aula in an effort to secure more favorable votes for the married deacons. He called attention to the fact that this was going entirely beyond the proper function of the periti. Actually it is not within Ottaviani's competence to discuss this matter; it was just another instance of his domineering manner. The ironical thing is that he then proceeded to talk about a matter that does not pertain to the chapter under discussion; he suggested permanent minor orders instead of a permanent diaconate.

I saw Ottaviani at close range in the Blessed Sacrament chapel before the assembly this morning. I was shocked. His complexion, which always had been somewhat pasty, badly discolored, his steps were very short and decidedly unsteady. He has aged terribly and looks much older than he really is.

Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban spoke again this morning, and spoke well as usual. But if everybody spoke as often as he did, it would take three generations to complete the Council! His subject - the relationship between church and state. He stressed the point that our people should be better instructed in the question of duty to civil society and duty to church founded by Christ.

The only other speaker who attracted real attention Archbishop Kozlowiecki, of Lusaka in Rhodesia. He is the man who created a sensation last year when he said in the course of one

of his speeches against the Curia: "Non timeo Petrum; sed valde timeo Petri secretarium" Today he started his speech with the following salutations: "Venerabiles Patres et Carissimi Periti!" The man apparently has no hesitation openly to take a very obvious slap at Ottaviani. I don't know how many noticed this matter, but there fortunately was no very noticeable reaction from the fathers generally. During his speech he referred to a passage as "verba tautologica et illogica." He certainly is not slow to speak out in harsh terms about anything with which he does not agree. He is a Jesuit who spent five years in Dachau. The story is that a whole group of students were taken right from the seminary as they completed their studies and consigned to the Concentration camp at Dachau by the Nazis. That may provide some explanation of the blunt and hard traits of his character. One thing can be said for him: he is absolutely fearless.

Bishop Holmes-Siedle came up today with an interesting bit of gossip. Retired Bishop Joachim Ammann, who had been a bishop in Africa for many years, made a rather sensational speech the other day in which he advocated abolition of the entire diplomatic corps of the Church. The story is that he did not deliver the last sentence of his speech which he had written, namely, that all nuncios, internuncios and apostolic delegates along with all relics should be given an honorable burial! Like the speech of the Bishop of Little Rock in the First Vatican Council, one might refer to that sentence as "Verba facienda sed non facta."

OCTOBER 22: 53rd General Assembly; Cardinal Agagianian presided, number present 2238. Felici announced that the fifth Chapter of the Liturgical schema will be distributed during this session and voting on it will begin on Thursday. Whether this will be so remains to be seen. The rate at which the voting is conducted, it is more than likely that it will take all day today and tomorrow to complete the remaining nine emendations of the fourth Chapter, with the vote on the fourth Chapter as a whole on Thursday. Maybe they can get started on the fifth Chapter that same day, but the way things are going that doesn't seem too likely.

The delaying tactics with regard to getting something concrete completed and promulgated are giving rise to more and more rumors. The prize rumor making the rounds today (it was the hottest topic of conversation in Bar Jonah) is that Paul VI will have no more General Assemblies after the conclusion of the second session. Thereafter the whole work of the Council will be completed expeditiously by the Commissions! It is not clear, (rumors never are clear) what the composition of these Commissions will be. It is the chairmen and Curia members of the Commissions that now are constituting the road block. It would be the height of folly to have these same commissions with the same leadership (or the same mill stones around their necks) expedite the matters which they now are obstructing. No bureaucracy in history ever functioned more efficiently to bog down in its own inefficiency while it works on the process of reform which is resigned to destroy it or reform it beyond recognition. One can not help but feel that there are those in the Curia who are determined to preserve the status quo no matter how much that will destroy the Church's power for good in this generation. The technique is being used so effectively by the Liturgical Commission at the present time that many of the most farseeing supporters of liturgical reform are willing to call it quits and salvage what we already have. This copy of a document being widely circulated now can be interpreted in no other manner.

Happened to look back to AMERICA of October 19, 1963, page 453 to John Cogley's Poems on Postcards. This week's poem is entitled "Literary Intelligence." It is an illustration of one phase of the atmosphere surrounding this second session.

Venerabiles Patres,

Episcopi et periti subsignati humillime et instanter orant et obsecrant ut caput quartum et ceteros "De Sacra Liturgia" per "placet simpliciter" suffragio vestro confirmetis, omissis, si fieri potest, omnibus modis nisi iis qui gravissima de cause necessarii visi sunt.

Etsi enim electio modorum de se perfectionem pulchritudinemque testui conciliari afferre valeat ex Vestra Sapientia et doctrinam, totum schema tamen in magnum periculum injicit, tum quia Commissio de Sacra Liturgia, labore obruta, difficillime eveniet ad eum finem a SS. Dmo Papa Paulo VI et a vobis intentum, ut Constitutio "nunc ad felicissimam perduccatur exitus", tum praecipue quia res in Capite IV, "De Officio divino" ita arcte coagmentantur, ut sublata alia aliae simul in ruinam cadent.

Speramus et confidimus ut vestris suffragiis approbetis nostra conamina ad viam mediam, omnibus acceptabilem, inveniendam, et magnum gaudium erit, ni fallimus, si ad optatam promulgationem perveneretis.

Romae, 19a Octobris 1963

- + Albertus MARTIN, ep. Nicoletan (praeses subcommissionis et relator "De Officio Divino")
- + Franciscus Salesius ZAUNER, ep. Linciensis (praeses subcommissionis et relator "De anno liturgia")
- + Cesarius D'AMATO, o.s.b., ep.tit. Sebastensis, Abbas S. Pauli, (praeses subcommissionis et relator "De musica sacra")
- + Carolus ROSSI, ep. Bugellen (praeses subcommissionis et relator "De arte sacra")
- + Otto SPUELBECK, ep. Misniae (Meissen)
- + Bernard FEY, ep. coadj. Potosi (Bolivia)
- + Guillelmus BEKKERS, ep. Buscoducensis (Niirbendiae)
- M. Ros. GAGNEBET, o.p. (praeses subcom. theolog. in Comm. liturg.)
- Emmanuel BONET (praeses subcom. juridicae in Comm. liturg.)
- Johannes WAGNER, -
- Amatus Georgius MARTIMORT
- Cyprianus VAGAGGINI, o.s.b.
- Anscharius DIRKS, o.p.

All of these rumors, politics, etc. seems to indicate that things are building up to some kind of climax. The whole note of frustration (similar to what is happening in Congress in Washington where they are in session ten months already and will almost certainly remain in session right up to Christmas) as assembly after assembly goes by with little to show but talk is making bishops who have much to do at home become very impatient. Cardinal Koenig mentioned at table this noon that the Moderators and the presidency are meeting to do something about bringing the discussion on Chapter III of the schema "De Ecclesia" to an end; also to take some steps that will speed up the whole procedure. It is about time somebody takes action.

Felici asked that the Ushers be not asked to be messenger boys, etc., especially during the period when we are voting on any project. He pleaded that the ushers were already overburdened and should not be disturbed while they are trying to take care of the distribution and picking up of the ballots. This may be a valid request during the actual balloting; but it would be easy to make a few suggestions to Felici for hurrying the proceedings along a bit. A little better coordination of the process of voting on emendations could easily save half the time it now takes.

Sixteen council Fathers spoke today - the first two were Cardinals Caggiano & Suenens. Caggiano asked that the Council distinguish carefully between the "universal Priesthood" and the "hierarchical priesthood" in the Church. Suenens stressed the fact that St. Paul did not regard the Church as an administrative organization, but as a living body endowed with many charismatic gifts, most of which were in aid of the carrying out the ordinary mission of the Church and were not miraculous in nature. Even the present Council enjoys charismatic gifts to succeed in its task.

Father Yzermans was here tonight for supper and then we visited for a while in Bishop Hoch's room. As usual he had some news and some gossip to relate, being aware of my interest in such matters pertaining to the background against which the Council is functioning. He and Msgr. Ligutti were leaving the assembly together the other day when they encountered Cardinal Suenens. Ligutti is well acquainted with Suenens and presented Yzermans to him. Suenens spoke with much enthusiasm of the workings of the charism in the Church. Later Father Yzermans met Hans Kueng and mentioned this meeting with Suenens to him (this meeting with Kueng took place after Suenens had made his speech on the charism this morning) telling him about Suenens' enthusiasm over the subject of the working of the charisms in the Church. Kueng answered: "Yes, I know; I wrote his speech for him!"

Yzermans had a similar story concerning the speech that Cardinal Meyer gave last Monday on the point that the schema "De Ecclesia" neglects mentioning the fact that we are not only the people of God but that we are also sinners, members of a fallen race. On Sunday evening he and Hans Kueng were going to Kaiser's and dropped by the Biblicum to pick up Father Malachi Martin at 7:00 PM. They were told to wait because Father Martin was busy seeing Father Barnabas Ahern. They waited till nearly 8:00 P.M. when Father Martin appeared with Father Ahern offering their apologies for being late: they were delayed because of their work on putting the finishing touches to the speech which Cardinal Meyer was making the next day. It is true that Cardinal Meyer has a great deal of confidence in Father Ahern and depends on him a great deal for help.

OCTOBER 23: 54th General Assembly; Card. Agagianian presiding; number present 2234. The newest gag making the rounds is that we vote "ADSUM IUXTA MODUM." With the dull meetings we are having and the consequent increase in the number of those who leave the Council chamber to spend most of the time having coffee or just visiting, such a vote would be quite appropriate!

Twenty-eight names were read on the list of speakers awaiting their turn. Of these twenty-eight, six were Italian and three were Spanish. That means one third of those on the list today were from the Latin countries - much out of proportion to the total number of members in their hierarchies. This is contrary to what they did last year. Could it be that the Latins are trying to "talk the Council to death?" It will be killed if this endless debate on every schema, paragraph and line continues."

One interesting item to be noted is that some seem consistently to be voting "non placet" on every item put up for a vote. This became apparent in the vote on the seventh Emendation of the Chapter on the Liturgy. This emendation consisted of inserting a paragraph exhorting all who are bound to recite the breviary to do so with greater devotion and intelligence. There were twelve voting "non placet" on that proposition! It seems there are some among the Council Fathers who would vote "non placet" to a simple proposition stating the doctrine of the Trinity!

Today we finished voting on the thirteen emendations on the chapter of the Liturgy pertaining to the breviary. Tomorrow morning we are to vote on the Chapter as a whole and receive the "relatio" on Chapter V pertaining to the liturgical year. It will be interesting to see just how many will heed the request in the letter received yesterday that we take the remaining chapters of the Liturgy as they are and not cast any votes iuxta modum. Actually there is a group including Father Jungmann that would like to introduce another modus, besides the one we are promoting, to the effect that any one with the obligation of the office would have the option to substitute twenty minutes of scripture reading for Matins on all days except first and second class feasts. Cardinal Koenig brought us a copy of that "modus" yesterday.

Cardinal Koenig told us at dinner that the Presidency and the Moderators are to have a meeting this afternoon to study ways and means of speeding up the proceedings. He spoke of such possibilities as designating the number of general assemblies to be allotted to each project; preliminary work done in national meetings, etc.

Story of the day: Bishop Holmes-Siedle was at the coffee bar. "I was standing at the bar. The man handed me my cup of coffee when a hand shot over my shoulder reaching for my cup. I got the cup, turned to the bishop and with both hands handed him the cup and bowed."

Bishop Cleven came late for supper tonight. He is the official contact-man between German and Belgian hierarchies and had attended a meeting of the latter this afternoon. Hans Kueng addressed the meeting. Cardinal Suenens was not present for the meeting. The Bishop of Tournai presided at the meeting. In the course of his remarks introducing Kueng he said: "You are a young and a handsome theologian, and we are very anxious to hear you talk." Following Kueng's talk the bishop thanked him and said "You are a very interesting lecturer in theology." Kueng spoke on the charismatic gifts in the Church. Judging from Cleven's report, he was not taken too seriously. He said, "Hans Kueng is no Karl Adam as yet, nor is he a Romano Guardini".

OCTOBER 24: 55th General Assembly; Card Doepfner presiding; number present 2236. Before the beginning of the Assembly, I stopped to chat with Cardinal Meyer for a minute. He told me that the meeting of the Moderators with the Presidency yesterday afternoon produced exactly nothing by way of results. The meeting last 2 hours 40 min. of which a full two hours were taken up with the matter of the propositions that are to be voted on to give the Theological Commission a guide line in formulating the emendations to be voted on in connection with the schema "De Ecclesia." Cardinal Meyer said they simply could not agree on a formulation of the propositions concerning the collegiality of the Episcopate. Many of those present who had spoken on the chapters of "De Ecclesia" practically repeated their whole speeches before this group! During the last ten minutes of the meeting they discussed the matter of terminating debate on Chapter III today! It is difficult to find any other explanation of the snails pace at which we are proceeding than a calculated program sabotage so as to prevent the Council from accomplishing anything constructive along the lines recommended by John XXIII and Paul VI. The reactionary group consider any change tantamount to denial of the faith. The question of speeding up the procedure at the Council was not discussed; it wasn't even on the agenda for that meeting of the Moderators with the Presidency.

Before the beginning of business Felici made several announcements: Chapter V emendations would be started today with the usual vote of "placet" or "non placet." They would be completed tomorrow with a vote on the entire chapter next Monday. This morning the vote

on Chapter IV as a whole will be taken. He pleaded for fewer votes *iuxta modum*, adding "*modi sunt crux Commissionis!*"

The vote on Chapter was taken immediately. Apparently the campaign started by Canon Martimort was effective because the Chapter was adopted by just a little over 2/3's majority, thus going into effect as it is without giving consideration to the votes *iuxta modum*. That probably is just as well. We can well settle for Chapter IV as it stands after adoption of the original emendations, if only we get the modification of the second and third chapters which we had voted.

Seven Council Fathers, including Cardinal Siri, spoke on the third chapter. Bishop Hakim was the last speaker. He made a typical Oriental speech, blunt, critical of the Latin Church for its disregard of the history, traditions and rights of the eastern Churches. His interpretation of the expression "*Populus Dei*" would practically obliterate all meaning of the membership in the Church of Christ since he would include everybody in good faith, Catholic, Protestant and pagan in the Mystical Body and with the *Populus Dei*. He also made the crack that the schema on the laity treats the women "*tamquam non sint*".

After Hakim's speech Doepfner called for a standing vote on the question of terminating debate on the third chapter. He explained that those who wanted to exercise their right to speak according to the regulations would have to register with the Secretariat today and would be given the opportunity tomorrow. The standing vote to terminate debate was unanimous.

OCTOBER 25: 56th Gen. Assembly; Card Suenens presiding; number present 2192. Felici announced that on Monday, October 28, there would be an observance of the anniversary of the election of John XXIII. The Holy Father will offer the Mass on that occasion and Cardinal Suenens will preach the commemorative sermon. The Mass will be offered at the altar used regularly for the Mass opening the General Assemblies. The Council Fathers are to be vested as for the regular General Assemblies. But there will be no regular meeting following the Mass! This announcement was received with less than enthusiasm. It isn't that there is any objection to the observance of the anniversary of Pope John's election; on the contrary his memory is held in the highest esteem and the occasion will be commemorated with great enthusiasm and affection. But there is strenuous objection to having that observance displace one of the regular General Assemblies. The pace of the Council is getting to be slow enough as it is, without dropping so many of the General Assemblies. As matters now stand we will be missing Assemblies on October 28, November 1 and November 4. Four weeks have already passed and only five remain of this session; and we have accomplished very little: the action on the Liturgy which was debated a year ago has not yet been completed and could well remain incomplete at the end of the session, and we have just begun debating the fourth Chapter of "*De Ecclesia*."

On Tuesday, October 29 we are to vote on Chapter V of the Liturgy since the voting on the emendation is to be completed today. Immediately after that the relatio on Chapter VII, "*De Musica Sacra*" is to be made and the voting on the emendations is to begin. It is hardly likely that all six of these emendations will be voted on, though that could easily be accomplished with a little planning.

Today we also received the memorandum containing the speeches made yesterday by Cardinal Santos and Cardinal Koenig providing the arguments pro and con for the question of whether the schema concerning the Blessed Mother is to be made a part (Chapter V) of the schema "*De Ecclesia*" or whether it is to be retained as a separate schema. The vote on this

question will be also be taken on October 29. The question will be decided by an absolute majority vote, and not by the usual 2/3's majority required for approval of any proposition.

Nine of the Council Fathers were given the floor this morning. They insisted on the opportunity to speak even though the fathers almost unanimously voted to terminate discussion of Chapter III of the schema "De Ecclesia" yesterday. Why they insisted on speaking is not clear because they presented nothing new in their speeches. The one speaker did suggest that the schema speaks too much of the rights of the laity while saying practically nothing of the duties of the laity in the Church. Where there are duties, there also are rights; it is just as harmful to the People of God to overemphasize the duty of obedience to the neglect of rights, as it is to overemphasize rights to the neglect of duty.

The final speaker objected to the use of the term "Populus Dei" at all. He was a missionary in India. He said that the pagans strongly resent using this term to denote the Christian people. They consider it to mean that we regard them as "Populus Diaboli!" These pagan people are well aware of the fact and stress the same that in so-called Christian countries there is much sin and crime and injustice to the extent that it is quite incongruous to speak of them in the scriptural terms of "populus Dei, regale sacerdotium, etc."

At 10:55 A.M. we finally got started on the debate of the fourth Chapter of "De Ecclesia." Indications are that this debate will be dragged out as long as the others.

As I left the Council chamber I met Archbishop Krol, one of the sub-secretaries, and chatted with him for a minute. I asked whether there is any prospect of speeding up the action of the Council. He says the powers that be, including the Holy Father himself, consider this schema the heart of the second session if not of the whole Council and therefore it should be debated so long as anyone is anxious to express his opinion. The Observers also share this opinion. Archbishop Krol says that a number, including himself, have failed to convince the others that there is no longer any value to a debate which consists essentially of mere repetition.

While downtown this afternoon I ran into Father Godfrey. He said that a meeting of the Liturgical Commission is to take place this afternoon. Let us hope that some action was taken on the "modi" submitted by the Council Fathers on Chapter II & III of the Liturgy so that we can get another step closer to finishing this whole schema and get the new constitution promulgated.

OCTOBER 26: Thoroughly enjoyed this "free day". Spent most of the day reading and also took a long walk down to the Trastevere district where I visited "STANDA". This is something like our supermarkets. You can get just about anything there.

Bishop Baumgartner dropped in for a brief visit. He looks well - quite a change from a year ago when we thought he was dying. He is leaving for the States on November 3.

OCTOBER 27: In their regular column on the Council in THE TABLET for October 19 the question of Collegiality and the Diaconate comes under discussion. The criticism on the concept of collegiality centers around the vagueness with which it is expressed in the revised schema. The sharpest critics refer to it as "Tromp seasoned with ecumenical sauce." Tromp was secretary of the dogmatic commission which prepared the first schema on "De Ecclesia" which was rejected by the council. The schema as it now stands represents a compromise as is clear from the speech of Staffa who is still way out on the extreme right. The propositions in the old schema were taken right out of the book of the extremists on the question of infallibility

in the first Vatican Council. It was well worth a little vagueness to get rid of those elements, even though as a price we have to permit a little vagueness to be cleared up in the future.

THE TABLET points out that an analysis of the debate on this question "plays ducks and drakes with the old national alignments, especially on the right." The Italians are still the most talkative and are closely followed by Spaniards. (Between them they account for forty-five speeches - during the first two weeks - more than one third.) But the Italians are presenting a different picture from last year. Only thirteen of the forty-five speeches can be called conservative - five Spanish and eight Italian and four of the latter are from the curia, Staffa, Parente etc. Not a single Italian speaker has heeded the plea of the Moderators that Council Fathers should not all ask to speak, but should have one speaker represent all those of like opinions within a national group. The Latin Americans on the other hand have done this with real spirit, thanks to their rather tight organization known as CELAM. Only sixteen out all speeches during the first two weeks were "group-speeches" of which nearly half were South American. e.g., Cardinal Camara of Rio de Janeiro spoke for 155 Brazilian bishops.

Even though Parente and Staffa present the set out to reassert the primacy of Peter and the Roman See in the old traditional ultramontane language, Cardinal Lercaro's auxiliary, just a few days after his consecration, spoke as an Italian to disclaim the idea that the doctrine of collegiality had been brought down from beyond the Alps as a resurgence of the old Gallican spirit.

The Italians are individualists, as is evidenced by the fact that they met as a hierarchy for the first time in history during the first week of the second-session of the Council early this month! It is said that they love oratory for itself and as a prime instrument of attracting the attention of the curia. THE TABLET concluded this subject by sayings: "But it is no new reflection that freedom of speech is worth the price of a little tedium."

At the same time it is becoming more and more evident that the Council Fathers as a whole want to do something to remove the tedium from the proceedings. The matter is coming into the open; THE DAILY AMERICAN today is carrying a front page story about the effort different groups are making to speed things up. Cardinal Koenig mentioned the other day that several national groups have made representations on this subject directly to the Holy Father.

OCTOBER 28: Attended the Mass in St. Peter's this morning commemorating the anniversary of the election of John XXIII. Pope Paul VI was the celebrant and Cardinal Suenens preached the eulogy. Surprisingly enough, the attendance of the Council Fathers was the same practically as for a regular General Assembly. The sermon by Cardinal Suenens was a masterpiece. It was a beautiful tribute to the late Pope and yet was in good taste all the way through, without any exaggerations. Suenens spoke in French. They passed out copies in various languages before the function. Bishop Holmes-Siedle had a French copy which he let me have since he speaks French fluently. In that way I could follow the text as Suenens spoke and understand every word. Suenens was interrupted by applause several times.

Suenens quoted a passage from Pope John's opening address to the Council a year ago in which he referred to the prophets of doom. I am told that L'Osservatore Romano omitted that passage from their printed report of the text; it will be interesting to see whether they omit that passage again in Suenens' speech. I am going to check it when the paper comes tomorrow.

SPECIAL: Results of voting on Liturgical Schema

	Present	Required Placet	Non Placet	luxta Modum	Void
Chap II					
1)	2298	2278	12		8
2)	2290	2264	14		12
3)	2284	2249	31		4
4)	2285	2263	15		7
5)	2284	2261	18		5
6)	2275	2215	52		8
7)	2278	2212	47		19
8)	2251	2193	44		14
9)	2219	2139	67		13
10)	2218	2159	46		13
11)	2226	2131	96		9
12)	2254	2232	14		8
13)	2263	2166	92		5
14)	2265	2088	168		9
15)	2261	2111	142		8
16)	2166	2006	142		18
17)	2163	1839	315		9
18)	2224	1975	245		4
19)	2231	2159	66		6
Chap II	2242	1495 1417	36	781	8
Chap III					
1)	2239	2224	12		3
2)	2159	2103	49		7
3)	2100	2058	42		-
4)	2168	2143	35		-
5)	2259	2219	37		5
6)	2216	1964	247		5
7)	2175	2124	50		1
8)	2220	2194	24		2
9)	2250	1637	607		6
10)	2248	2207	39		2
Chap III	2217	1130	30	1054	3
Chap IV					
1)	2163	2151	8		4
2)	2022	2009	12		1
3)	2141	2130	9		2
4)	2234	2113	118		3
5)	2231	1722	509		-
6)	2216	1840	371		5
7)	2123	2111	12		-
8)	2110	2088	20		2
9)	2230	2111	118		1
10)	2225	2200	24		1
11)	2160	2125	34		1

12)	2040	1904	131		5
13)	2181	1960	218		2
Chap IV	2236	1491 1638	43	552	3
<hr/>					
Chap V					
1)	2232	2217	15		
2)	2158	2148	9		1
3)	2085	2071	11		3
4)	2060	2049	10		1
5)	2151	2146	4		1
6)	2192	2181	10		1
7)	2180	2171	8		1
8)	2071	2057	13		1
9)	2062	2057	4		1
10)	2068	2058	9		1
Chap V	2193	2154	21	16	2

Went to the Taverna Guelpha on Via Fierenze last night for dinner with the Muellerleile's, Father Gus Weigel, Bishop Hoch, Father Yzermans, Father Godfrey, Father Lessard, Father Potter, Father Dick Mahowald, Mr. Roach of the SIGN and myself. The food was delicious and the company was good, though a bit noisy. It was a delightful evening. At table this noon Cardinal Koenig indicated that the Presidency and the Moderators had decided definitely to limit the time to be taken in discussing the various projects but assigning a definite number of General Assemblies to each project. This sounds very promising and I'm sure it will be welcomed by the vast majority of the Council Fathers. This of necessity means fewer speeches on the floor; the \$64 question is how are they going to allocate the time? Cardinal Koenig did not know just how that would be done. They probably will attempt to ask the various groups to agree upon a policy regarding the various projects or schemas and then have a few representative speakers. This change in procedure connected with the use of simultaneous translations will really present some difficult practical problems. But with a little good will, I am sure they will be able to devise a workable arrangement.

The meeting of the US bishops this afternoon was the best we have had either this session or the last session. The subject of discussion was the schema DE BEATA MARIA VIRGINE.

They had the following panel:

Fr. Barnabas Ahern, C.P., The background of the schema.

Fr. Eugene Maly, The Scriptural Basis.

Fr. Godfrey Diekmann, OSB:, the Patristic Background

Fr. Wm. Coyle, C.Ss.R., Mary in the textbooks.

Each member of the panel did a masterful job in presenting his phase of the subject. I may be a bit prejudiced, but I feel that Father Godfrey did the best job. I hope that copies of the papers can be obtained.

After the bishops' meeting Bishop Hoch and I went over to RADIO VATICANA and each of us made a 30 minute tape to be sent back home for radio broadcast and/or playback at organizational meetings. It was an interview type of program with Father Lessard acting as my interviewer and Fr. Dick Mahowald asking the questions of Bishop Hoch. In my case the program was entirely unprepared and unrehearsed. I am not too sure whether or not it will be suitable for broadcast. On Wednesday afternoon Bishop Hoch and I will interview Father

Sheering of the Catholic World and Father Stransky of the Unity Secretariat respectively. We are also working the possibility of interviewing Dr. Lindbeck and Dr. Skyzgaard.

OCTOBER 29: 57th. Gen. Assembly; Card Agagianian presiding: number present 2193
The Mass was according to the Byzantine-Ukranian rite. Archbishop Slipyi was the celebrant and there were two bishops concelebrating and a deacon assisting. The ceremony was beautiful. The dramatic action was impressive and the music superb. Archbishop Slipyi's voice was not so good, probably because of the years he spent in confinement.

The General Assembly was opened in an atmosphere charged with expectancy. Felici paused an unusually long time after the enthronement of the Gospel before making the announcements.

The first item was the vote on Chapter V of the Liturgy as a unit. This was carried almost unanimously, the only surprising feature being that there were only sixteen votes cast "placet iuxta modum."

Then came the ballot which had been awaited for several days with high pitched emotion; the vote on the question whether the schema "De Beata Maria Virgine, Matre Ecclesiae" should be treated as a separate schema or as a special chapter in the schema "De Ecclesia." The wording of the proposition was objected to by many Council Fathers. The way the question was formulated, it proposed that the schema on the Blessed Mother be made the "last chapter" of the schema "De Ecclesia." Actually, those who objected to having a special and independent schema on the Blessed Mother had no intention of insisting on its being the last chapter of the larger schema - that was considered a point to be threshed out in the course of the debate and not to be decided by this preliminary vote. It did not pass without notice in making the announcement of this ballot Felici places special emphasis, repeated several times on the word *ULTIMUM* caput, giving the impression that those who supported this idea wanted the schema on Our Blessed Mother to be a sort of after-thought tacked onto the end of the schema "De Ecclesia." The thought had been made very clear in Cardinal Koenig's statement on behalf of this project that the integration of the schema on the Blessed Mother into that of "De Ecclesia" was not intended as a device to downgrade devotion to Our Lady in the life of the Church, on the contrary, this step would serve to place this devotion into its proper perspective and would insure a much more sound devotionism because it would be based on a much sounder basis of biblical and patristic theology. In the long run it would strengthen and not weaken devotion to Mary.

The vote was taken in an intensely charged atmosphere and all through the debate on the fourth Chapter of "De Ecclesia" everybody seemed to be thinking only of the outcome of the vote, which was as follows:

Present: 2193; placet: 1114; non placet: 1047; Void: 5.

This was an exceedingly close vote considering that 2193 ballots, of which 5 were null were cast. The size of the majority was a little over 51%. The actual result of the vote was surprising in one respect at least: the nearest thing to a solid support for a separate schema was in Italy and South America. And there are 1,000 bishops in Italy and the Latin America countries. If you add Spain to this, you will have much more than an absolute majority of the Council Fathers in the category from which you would expect the greatest support for this point of view. One factor which saved the situation was the fact that a goodly number of Latin American bishops have become frightened by the fact that a great many of their people have little religion left except a distorted form of a cult of the Blessed Mother which in many cases is

material if not formal idolatry. They want to get the devotion to Our Lady into its proper perspective; hence they supported our point of view.

Another factor in the successful vote was the excellent job done by the panel at the meeting of the US Bishops yesterday afternoon. I am convinced that a number of US Bishops would have voted with the conservatives if they had not had the benefit of the presentation made by this panel of the subject of Mariology. A switch of only twenty votes would have defeated the project, and I feel quite sure that at least twenty votes of US Bishops were switched as a result of that meeting.

We gave Cardinal Koenig a big hand when he came to the dining room for dinner at 1:15 P.M. He had a great deal of prestige riding on the results of the ballot since he made the intervention before the Council on behalf of changing the schema to the one of "De Ecclesia." Yesterday he was very obviously nervous about this matter; when he appeared this noon he was completely relaxed and greatly pleased by the outcome, close as it was.

I was told by Bishop Cleven, in strict confidence, that Cardinal Cicognani approached Cardinal Koenig asking him actively to support and promote a negative on this question! This is one of the strangest and disappointing developments in the Council. Cardinal Ottaviani personally had asked Cardinal Koenig to make the intervention on behalf the side supporting this proposition; how could he be asked to turn tables and support the opposite side. Cardinal Koenig refused without hesitation; but he did not pass this information around. If he had, there certainly would have been a reaction that would have had many repercussions, not only on this vote, but on future developments in the Council. I am greatly disappointed to hear that Cardinal Cicognani was a party to this matter. I had expected that he would remain aloof from a matter of that kind.

The vote today was significant from another standpoint. If we could muster an absolute majority on a point that had should a very large group in opposition it means that we will be able to muster a 2/3rds majority on many progressive ideas that are to be voted on in the future. I don't think that there would be any other subject supported so solidly by any element among the Council Fathers as this one regarding a separate schema dealing with Mariology. I consider this vote today an important turning point in the Council.

Bishop D'Amato OSB was the relator for the chapter of the Liturgy schema "De Musica Sacra." Three of the six emendations recommended by the Commission were adopted. The other three will, I hope be completed tomorrow so that we can vote on the chapter as a whole on Thursday.

Bishop Cleven told me today that Cardinal Koenig prepared the intervention on the place of the schema on the Blessed Mother himself. He did however have a conference with Bishop Cleven and two German theologians on this subject a week previously as I had mentioned above. But the intervention basically was the work of the Cardinal.

Towards the end of the meeting the ushers distributed a docket which finally brings to the floor of the Council the five propositions on which we are to vote in order to provide the Theological Commission some guidelines on the questions pertaining to the collegiality of the episcopate and the permanent diaconate. There apparently is a feud going on under cover between the Moderators on the one hand, the general secretary and some of the members of the Presidency over the technique of taking such "straw votes." As I mentioned to Cardinal Koenig that a vote of that kind by the Council Fathers would put the Commissions "behind the eight

ball" if the vote was very strong towards the traditionalist or the progressive view. My guess is that we could get a very strong vote in favor of the idea of collegiality, whereas the vote regarding the diaconate very probably will be very close. I may be wrong on this, but that is my feeling. "Crastina die videbimus."

At supper this evening Cardinal Koenig indicated that the Moderators would move for termination of debate on Chapter IV "De Ecclesia", probably tomorrow. After that, the next schema to be discussed is on "De Episcopatu at Regimine Dioecesis." It seems that during the second half of this session we may get a little more action.

OCTOBER 30: 58th. Gen. Assembly; Card. Lercaro presided: number present 2157 Felici announced the death of Bishop Francis Beckman, Bishop of Panama. He had come to attend this morning's session, arriving on the bus in apparent good health. After getting off the bus he started up the ramp towards the entrance of St. Peter's, collapsed and died almost instantly right there.

BIG EVENT OF THE DAY: Bishop O'Connor, Madison, enthroned the Gospel! The Moderators asked for a standing vote on the close of discussion of Chapter IV of "De Ecclesia." As usual this was nearly unanimous. The Council Fathers who wanted to speak for the Council will be permitted to do so in tomorrow's session according to Art 57 of the rules of procedure.

It was announced that the next schema for discussion would be "De Episcopis at Dioecesium Regimine."

Four Cardinals and seven other Council Fathers spoke on "De Ecclesia".

At the end of the Assembly Felici announced the results of the voting on the five propositions concerning Chapter II of "De Ecclesia" and also on the six emendations of Chapter VII of the liturgy as well as the vote on the Chapter as a whole. The results of the voting are given separately in this diary.

OCTOBER 31: 59th Gen. Assembly: Card Doepfner presiding: total present 1941. The number present at this General Assembly is the smallest at any regular General Assembly either in the first or the second session. This was no doubt due to the fact that very many bishops were making trips over the long weekend, some going as far as the Holy Land. Quite a few of them must have remained away from this Assembly because they were making a more extended trip.

It was announced that the Holy Father would celebrate Mass in St. Peter's on Nov. 2 at 5:00 P M. in commemoration of the Poor Souls.

Cardinal Doepfner asked for a standing vote on the question whether there should be only a single ballot on the final Chapter of the Liturgy, without a special vote on each of the emendations. He explained that this course of action was suggested by the Moderators because it was apparent that the emendations would get a near unanimous vote. The standing vote was unanimous and therefore the ballot was taken.

Felici then read thirty names of those who still wished to speak on the final chapter of "De Ecclesia."

Doepfner then advised the Council Fathers that many complaints had been received from individuals and groups about the very slow progress that has been made in this second session. To preserve the rights of those who still wish to speak and at the same time to satisfy those who wanted more rapid progress, Doepfner asked the speakers to observe the following rules: a) confine remarks strictly to pertinent matters, b) stay within eight minutes in making the speech; the warning bell will ring at the end of six minutes, d) and remember that written interventions will be just as effective and receive as much consideration as speeches made on the floor. The result of this announcement, for once, was quite noticeable. The speeches were shorter, and ten of the announced speakers withdrew their request for the floor and simply turned in their manuscripts. Twenty actually spoke; and Doepfner made it quite plain that the Moderators meant business; he interrupted several speakers for wandering from the exact topic under discussion. Doepfner's announcement concerning the rules governing speeches was received with loud applause. One of the speakers was interrupted twice and reminded that his remarks were repetitious and commonplace; the man quit entirely after the second interruption.

We left this General Assembly with a feeling that some real progress had been made.

OCTOBER 31 - NOVEMBER 4: Because of the fact that there is to be no General Assembly until Tuesday, November 5 (November 1, a holy day; Nov. 2 & 3 Saturday and Sunday; Nov. 4, 400 centennial of the decree of Council of Trent concerning seminaries) I, along with many other bishops took off for some sightseeing. Mr. and Mrs. Al Muellerleile of St. Paul are in town for two weeks. Father Yzermans invited them, Father Godfrey and myself to drive North to visit Siena, San Gemignano, Florence and Assisi. We left home at 2:00 PM. on October 31 and reach Siena at about 7:30 PM. where we put up at the Excelsior Hotel. Said Mass at the Cathedral on Feast of All Saints. Returned to the Cathedral later for sightseeing. The beauty of the building and the very interesting library in the Cathedral was somewhat marred by the very poor attendance at Mass. As I said Mass at the Blessed Sacrament altar at 8:00 there was a group of probably 25 at the side altar of the BVM which was almost concealed behind dozens of chandeliers and candles. At 10:30 the newly consecrated auxiliary bishop celebrated his first pontifical high Mass at the main altar. The Archbishop preached and all the canons were present in copes and white miters - but there were only 40 people attending the Mass while there were about 70 at the BVM altar where another Mass was being celebrated. It rained quite hard, so our sight-seeing was limited. Had lunch at noon and then started for San Gemignano. The rain stopped on the way. San Gemignano was most interesting with its many towers, but the real thrill came in the two churches, especially the ancient church of St. Augustine which at one time was a cathedral. I also got a foretaste of the interference we would get in our sightseeing from the desire to do some shopping. Theoretically the shops were not open because of the fact that holy days are also national holidays. Of course, all the bars and tobacco shops were open; but what interested us, especially Florence Muellerleile, was the fact that many of the small shops and outdoor stands were doing business! I bought an old mortar and pestle of solid brass and oil lamp with three burners, also of brass. They are not real antiques, but very interesting and decorative.

We reached Florence at 6:45 PM. the evening of All Saints day. Stayed with the German Grey Nuns of St. Elizabetta. Why they are called "Grauen Schwestern" I cannot for the life of me see; they wear a black habit and are one of the many brands of Franciscan Sisters. I have stayed at this place every time that I have been in Florence (this was my sixth trip there) and as usual found it pleasant, clean, convenient and got good food. Cardinal Frings and Bishop Cleven arrived an hour after we did and came to the dining room as we were at table. I spoke a minute or two with him. He said very complimentary things about Cardinal Muench.

It was still raining on Saturday morning, but quit before we went downtown. We remained in Florence till 1:30 PM on Sunday. The time was terribly crowded, considering that I did almost all of my Christmas shopping (At Papini's leather goods shop), saw Santa Croce, San Lorenzo, the Cathedral and baptistery, San Miniato, San Marco, the small chapel in the Medici Palace, Ponte Vecchio and Pallazzo Vecchio along with a few rooms of the Uffizi Gallery!

We arrived in Assisi at 6:45 PM and put up at the pensione conducted by the American Graymoor nuns. The accommodations were a bit rugged because of a process of remodeling but the food was excellent and the atmosphere superb. In Assisi we said Mass at Santa Chiara, almost next door to the pensione. This was a thrilling experience for me. We also visited the Cathedral and San Francesco. Then for an hour we struggled to get Florence to leave the shops and get going on the way back to Rome! We got back to Salvator Mundi at 4:45 PM., in spite of losing our way after we got to Rome!

NOVEMBER 5: 60th Gen. Assembly: Card. Suenens presided; number present 2107. The Mass was in the Chaldean rite. The music was weird, though the liturgy was very simple for an Oriental rite.

Cardinal Marella made some introductory remarks (four pages of them) on the new schema and Bishop Carli was the relator. He read the first portion of the relatio omitting the last eight pages. In the case of both Marella and Carli it was more of an intervention than a relator's report.

Four Cardinals and six other Council Fathers spoke. Cardinal McIntyre certainly would have been stopped if he hadn't been a Cardinal. He gave a very peculiar speech, not on the schema as a whole, which he was supposed to have done, but talked only about the question of Episcopal conferences. He didn't talk for or against the conferences, but merely pointed out how important this matter was since it represented a departure from past history and law by setting up these conferences as legislative bodies.

Bishop Rupp of Monaco drew many laughs as usual.

This evening there was a meeting of the US bishops at North American College. A panel of expert canonists discussed the schema on De Episcopis at Dioecesium Regimine as a whole. Everything went quietly and peacefully until it was time to close the meeting at 5:30. But then Archbishop Alter, Cardinal Ritter, Cardinal McIntyre, Bishop Hannan, Archbishop Binz, Archbishop Krol entered the lists when the subject of Episcopal Conferences was introduced by Archbishop Alter. This subject will lead to much debating in our meetings and in the Council chamber before a final decision is reached.

The general feeling is we should vote in favor of the schema as a basis of discussion, but that it will require many emendations. The only reason for voting for it at all is the fact that it would take too much time to get another one from the Commission. I don't know myself yet what to think of the idea of episcopal conferences with legislative authority. The schema is too vague to permit one to form an intelligent opinion.

NOVEMBER 6: 61st Gen. Assembly; Card. Suenens presided; number present 2136. The fact that Card Suenens presided a second day in a row gave rise to some speculation about what might be the reason. Nothing happened during the assembly to throw any light on the subject. This is an example of how we are on the lookout for something special!

Felici announced the death of Archbishop Mannix of Australia and Bishop Piontek of Germany. Mannix was only four months short of 100 years.

There is something funny about the fact that at the close of yesterday's assembly Suenens announced that the General Secretary had a special announcement to make. No announcement was made. Today he said that the General Secretary would make the announcement at the beginning of the meeting. Felici replied that the announcement would be made by letter; but the Assembly ended without producing any letter, which he had said would be from him personally. Nobody seems to know what this cat and mouse game between Suenens and Felici is all about.

Suenens called for a standing vote on whether discussion of the schema on bishops and government of dioceses should be terminated at the end of this Assembly. The vote was carried by a large majority, which however was not nearly so close to being unanimous as in other cases. This vote was called for at 11:30, though discussion continued till all had spoken.

Eighteen speakers were announced, and all of them had an opportunity to give their speech. With Ruffini, Koenig, Alfrink and Bea leading off the program, we got some excellent viewpoints expressed with conviction. Ruffini spoke in his usual professorial, apodictical manner. His "dixi" had the connotation of 'causa finita!' But he did express himself precisely and clearly. He seconded what McIntyre had said yesterday. For once Ruffini spoke only about six minutes and did not as usual exceed his time limit.

Alfrink's speech was most interesting. He mentioned that many had already spoken in favor of a central body of bishops who would collaborate with the Holy Father. This group would not be the same as the Coetus Episcoporum or a parliament representing the same; but it would be a sign of collegiality and an instrument for its exercise. In this case the Curia would become the executive instrument of this body and the Holy Father. I am sure that the Curia would not appreciate being put into this position. They would simply have the task of implementing the decisions made by the Holy Father and body of bishops and would no longer be as they now are in practice both legislator and judge in ecclesiastical matters for all practical purposes. Bea gave a brief speech outlining the dogmatic and scriptural basis for the college of bishops and its functioning. I am sure his suggestions will receive much attention from the Commission - at least they should.

The vote on the question of accepting the schema as a basis for discussion was held at 11:30, before all speeches were completed, so that the results could be announced today. It was rather amusing how Felici approached the announcement of the vote. First he called that all fathers, "ubiquunque degunt" return to their places because an important vote would be taken in five minutes. After the next speech he announced the proposition to be voted on with great emphasis. The results of the vote were as follows:
Present, 2100; Placet, 1610; Non Placet 477; Void 13.

For some strange reason, even though it was already 12:00 noon, Suenens called on Maximus IV to open the discussion of the first Chapter of the schema, concerning the relationship between bishops and the curia. As might be expected, it was a scathing criticism of the Curia. He said that the chapter represented only a timid approach to the matter of reforming the Curia.

When we returned to Salvator Mundi we found that Bishop Hoch and others had returned from the trip to the Holy Land but had a terrifying story to tell of a near tragedy this morning as they were leaving Tel Aviv. In a cab on the way to the airport they were rammed by a truck. Bishop Hoch had bad bruises on the face; Bishop Hagerty and Bishop Hackett are hospitalized here; and Bishop Scanlon and Bishop Connare are hospitalized in Tel Aviv. It developed that none was injured seriously; but if the truck had struck straight from the side instead of at an angle there very probably would have been several deaths.

This afternoon at 4:30 Father McMorrough and I attended a meeting of periti at the Casa Santa Maria. A panel consisting of Dr. Lucas Vischer and Prof. Robert McAfee Brown discussed the question of religious liberty. The presentation made by each of the panelists was excellent. Fr. Tom Stransky was the moderator of the panel. He opened the meeting by giving the history of the efforts made by the Secretariat for Unity to get a schema accepted on this subject. It makes a weird tale, how Ottaviani has prevented to this date the printing of the schema. The schema was first presented to the dogmatic commission. It received a good majority in the voting, but Ottaviani as chairman refused to accept it and the commission was at a deadlock. Pope John in May, 1962 appointed a special subcommission to produce a schema on that topic; to this date that subcommission has never met because Ottaviani refused to call a meeting. The Unity Secretariate prepared a schema on its own covering this topic, but it was never printed even though the Central Preparatory Commission approved it; Ottaviani sent word to the printing press that it was not to be printed. Then when John XXIII appointed the coordinating commission they asked that all schemas be printed in one convenient volume (there were 127 schemas). The schemas were all printed except the one on religious liberty. Stransky said that Pope Paul is determined that this will get to the council floor; He will order it to be debated this session even if it means that debate on another schema has to be cut off! We should get the printed schema in ten days, he says.

In his presentation McAfee Brown spoke very bluntly on the question of a statement by the Council on the subject of religious freedom. It is the one thing more than any other which the non-Catholic Christian world is looking for; it will be a tragedy if no statement is forthcoming. He pointed out the many things said and written on this subject which are excellent - that is said by individuals like Bea, John Courtenay Murray, etc. He also pointed out isolated and less direct statements made by Pius XII, John XXII and Paul VI; but he said the world will not be convinced till the Council speaks out on the subject.

He said that the statement must be specific, providing not only for individual freedom of religion against persecution but also the right to communal practice of religion and to evangelize.

Vischer complemented what Brown had said by stating that the right to evangelize is not the right to proselytize. The latter is "a bad word" in our vocabulary. He spoke of the "churches" on the one hand and "sects" on the other. The latter are a source of great trouble to the World Council of Churches because they not only are a nuisance to Catholics but also and even more so to the WCC.

He said an interesting thing when he mentioned that it took them forty years (from 1920 to 1961) to get a statement out on religious freedom. This is encouraging in the face of the opposition to such a statement by Ottaviani and company.

NOVEMBER 7: 62nd General Assembly; Agagianian presiding; number present 2155. Felici said that for once he had a pleasant announcement to make: on Saturday, Nov. 9 Archbishop Carinci will celebrate his 101st birthday. All are invited to the Church of Our Lady

in the Piazza de la Querca at 6:30 PM for a Te Deum of Thanksgiving. The Council Fathers sent a telegram of congratulations.

Cardinal Doepfner made an announcement concerning the 17 speakers who had been listed to speak on the last chapter of "De Ecclesia" but were cut off by the vote to terminate discussion. He gave a summary of their arguments, first for the group who spoke in favor of the project, then for those who spoke against. He emphasized also that their manuscripts would be turned over to the General Secretariat and would receive the same attention as if the addresses had been delivered on the Council floor.

In this connection I want to go back to the announcement to be made by Felici a few days ago, but was not made. Yesterday Felici spoke of a letter that would be sent out in place of that announcement; his reference to the letter was not clear because I gained the impression that everybody would get the letter during yesterday's Assembly. Now it develops that the letter was sent by Felici only to those who had been cut off and to whom Doepfner referred in his announcement (mentioned just above) today.

Cardinal Ritter spoke, and as usual his approach was direct and quite matter of fact. He referred to the matter of the faculties to be given bishops. He said they should have all faculties and powers which are inherent in the performance of his pastoral work by virtue of his consecration except such faculties which "ex nature rei" or because of special circumstances of for the sake of unity should best or must be reserved to the Holy Father.

Eighteen speakers were listed for today and all of them spoke.

The simultaneous translation system is not in use as yet in spite of persistent reports that they were to be introduced on Tuesday already. There seems to be some technical difficulties in their operation, according to a story that appeared in LaCroix of Paris yesterday. The regular PA system in use in St. Peter's is so efficient that it interferes with the ear phones. The earphones on the units are quite small; they do not, like the larger earphones, cover the ear so that all other sounds are excluded. As a consequence when they try to use the earphones in the council hall proper, the sound from the PA system drowns out the earphones! No explanation has been given publicly and at this stage we do not know what to expect and in the meantime must struggle with the Latin.

Contrary to all expectations, the discussion on Chapter I of this schema "De Episcopis etc." is as dull as those that went before. After listening to all of the suggestions that are being made for the reform of the Roman Curia one gains the impression that it will be quite a confused monstrosity if all these suggestions are adopted. Archbishop Ziade of Lebanon gave some examples of present dealings with the Curia in the matter of faculties, rescripts, decrees, etc. and reduced the whole matter to an absurdity. Bishop DelPino of Spain had a long dull speech. He paid no attention to two minute warning bell and less to the bell ringing on the phone next to him when the ten minutes were up; he just couldn't be stopped until he was through.

NOVEMBER 8: 63rd General Assembly; Card. Agagianian presiding: number present ___
The death of Archbishop Tonna of Italy was announced.

Cardinal Agagianian presided again. It now has become clear that they have given up the practice of having the Moderators rotate daily in presiding at the Assemblies. They now are having a given Moderator preside at all Assemblies devoted to a specific Chapter.

Yesterday I complained that the session was as dull as those which had been devoted to the debate on "De Ecclesia". This morning it happened! It was inevitable that during the discussion on the relationship between the Roman Curia and the Episcopate there would be a straightforward and complete statement about the unsatisfactory status of that relationship at this time. Without any fanfare or forewarning Frings rose to speak after a rather dull speech by Cardinal Camera of Brazil, which opened this morning's program. He spoke with dignity, but bluntly and to the point. He said the things which have been on the mind of most council fathers. There was no rancor in his tone or manner; but he didn't miss an item as he went right down the line touching upon many sore points in the curia generally and the Holy Office in particular. Bishop Cleven has promised me a copy of the text of Cardinal Frings' speech so I will not try to summarize it here; it must be read in its entirety to understand its importance. We can understand the impact of this speech when we recall that Cardinal Frings called the policy of the Holy Office of condemning individuals or their works without prior notice, without a statement of reasons for the condemnation, without granting a hearing or an opportunity to revise and correct objectionable passages as a public-scandal. He also said bluntly that the number of archbishops, bishops and priests in the Curia should be reduced and the episcopal office should be conferred only on those who are engaged in work that actually involves exercise of episcopal powers. The episcopate is not a mere decoration. Laymen should be employed to perform many of the routine tasks.

Since Ottaviani was scheduled as the third speaker after Frings, little attention was paid to what Lercaro and Rugumbwa said. Everybody waited to hear what Ottaviani would say. Once on his feet he didn't hesitate a moment but literally tore into Frings, without mentioning names. He said he would preface his prepared speech by making a vigorous protest against what had just been said about the Holy Office. He resorted to the device which the curia has used all along, namely that what they do must be above criticism because they act in the name of the Holy Father. In this case he stressed the fact that the Holy Father is the Prefect of the Holy Office and therefore approves its every act personally. Last year they used this device in an effort to prevent rejection of the dogmatic schema; "The Holy Father has approved it, therefore we have no right even to talk about rejecting it." Ottaviani said he attributes this unjust attack to ignorance of the procedure of the Holy Office and would not use a word that might give offense.

Ottaviani also protested against the practice of the moderators introducing propositions for a consultative vote without having them first cleared by the Dogmatic commission.

Ottaviani spoke with more force and feeling than I had ever heard him. He worked himself to such a pitch that one worried about the possibility of an apoplectic stroke.

Cardinal Browne spoke only briefly. Frings had expressed amazement over Cardinal Browne's statement yesterday which seemed to intimate that the Theological Commission was going to give a new judgment on the matter of collegiality after studying it. Frings had said that the Commission was the agent of the Council acting in General Assemblies and not masters of the Council. They act as though they had access to some secret source of knowledge and therefore could ignore the judgment of the vast majority of the Fathers. Browne obviously was replying to this when he said that the idea of the "College" of bishops "co-ruling" with or even under the Pope evidently diminishes the full authority of the Pope. He worked himself up to a grand climax by warning that this is contrary to the 1st Vatican Council and ended by saying "VENERABILES PATRES CAVEAMUS."

Ottaviani and others kept going back to an attack on collegiality in spite of the huge majority favoring it in the "straw vote." Agagianian did not cut off Ottaviani but he did cut off one bishop with the words "Excellentissimae Pater; redeas ad argumentum!" This was the Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers. When he continued he was called to task again and then quit. (His reference to caput was most amusing.)

Archbishop Eugene D'Souza's (formerly of Nagpur, but named an Archbishop since the first session) speech was calm, polite and not as blunt as Frings' argument, but was just as devastating. Indirectly he answered Ottaviani's argument that Frings had insulted the Pope by implying that it is Ottaviani who insulted the Pope. He quoted from Paul VI's allocution to the Second Session in which he spoke of the reform of the curia; he also quoted from the speech to the Curia. He also attacked the argument that you can not base anything in this schema on the idea of collegiality because that has not yet been defined. He stated that 85% of the Council Fathers had gone on record in favor of this doctrine. It is a mockery of the whole Council to ignore that fact. He challenged Ottaviani (without using any names) to prove that the bishops of the world are less devoted to the Holy See than the curia.

It could well be that this exchange between Frings and Ottaviani, followed by Archbishop D'Souza's masterful speech may prove to be the turning point of this session as the action of John XXIII in November last year when he withdrew the Dogmatic schema. Something had to be said to bring the whole matter of the reform of the curia to a head. Frings said it well and forcefully; D'Souza summed up the whole argument perfectly. The four who spoke after D'Souza really added nothing.

At 11:43 all speakers announced for the first chapter had finished. It is a rare occasion that all who requested an opportunity to speak receive their chance and that debate on a chapter does not have to be terminated by a vote of the Assembly. There were fifteen speakers on the first chapter this morning.

Lercaro took over the chair and will preside at all assemblies devoted to the second chapter on Coadjutors and Auxiliaries. He called on Bishop Carli, Relator of this Schema, to read the section of the Relatio pertaining to this chapter.

As happens quite frequently Ruffini was the first speaker on this chapter and he proceeded with his usual appodictical though clear manner. In the matter of retirement he used examples of Leo XIII and John XXII, as might be expected. He summed up the matter telling the story that Leo XIII once asked a bishop of Bergamo to retire because of his age. The bishop replied: "Beatissime Pater, ambo senes sumus."

Went to the Grand Hotel this evening to attend a reception held by the Paulist Fathers for the Observers, US Bishops and their periti and secretaries. It was a most pleasant occasion.

NOVEMBER 9: Went over to Vatican Radio at 10:00 AM for a taping session with Father Heston to make a tape for broadcast in Fargo describing the program for providing information about the activities of the Council to the news media. Due to mechanical difficulties with the taping equipment at the studios in the Petrianum, headquarters of Radio Vatican, Father Lynch took us to the studios on Vatican Hill. The view from this building is gorgeous, giving a picture of St. Peter's from the East that is rarely seen and also a view of the Vatican gardens. Father Heston is Chief of the English Language section of the Vatican News Bureau. He prepares the English language release every day when a General Assembly is held. He must have a hectic time of it because the General Assemblies usually close about 12:15 at noon. He has to

rush to the news bureau, draft the release on the basis of the notes he has taken during the session, have them mimeographed and ready for release to the correspondents at 1:00 PM. Then he is present for the briefing session at 4:00 PM. He did an excellent job in explaining the workings of the whole plan in the half hour broadcast which we taped.

From the studio I went downtown to do some shopping. Among other things I went to Fini's and ordered a Mass cassock which will come to a little over \$50, compared to \$110 at Lohmann's for a similar cassock made of substantially the same material. I also ordered the uniform for Dr. Fortney, as Knight Commander of St. Gregory. The uniform for John Gross can not be ordered till next week because his measurements have not yet been received.

Probably the most talked about matter in Rome today was the exchange that took place between Frings and Ottaviani yesterday on the subject of the Holy Office. The name of Archbishop Eugene D'Souza, newly appointed Archbishop of Bhopal in India almost invariably came up in the conversation. The subject received big play in all papers. The DAILY AMERICAN gave it the principal headline and used the pictures of Frings and Ottaviani. The HERALD TRIBUNE story was taken from cable dispatches and not from a report by Sanche de Grammont. Apparently he isn't in town at the present time. It was interesting to note that the HERALD TRIBUNE gave the most prominent place to the additional section of the schema on Ecumenism dealing with the Jews and made the story on Frings and Ottaviani secondary to the one on the Jews. The two headlines were more accurate than headlines usually are. They were: VATICAN: NO BIBLICAL BASIS FOR PERSECUTION OF JEWS and HOLY OFFICE 'HARMFUL', CARDINAL CHARGES. By Contrast the Daily American had these headlines: first HOT WORDS FLY AT COUNCIL and JEWS NOT TO BLAME FOR DEATH OF CHRIST. The actual stories in both papers were quite well done.

In the evening Bishop Hoch, Father Lessard and I went to the Finns for dinner. Archbishop Eugene D'Souza was also a guest. Between the delightful children of the Finns and later the conversation of Archbishop D'Souza we were very well entertained during the evening. The Archbishop said little about his part in the debate in the Council yesterday morning; but he did tell us that he added quite a bit to his manuscript during the course of the General Assembly before his turn to speak came because of some of the things that were said by Frings and Ottaviani. That will explain why Father Heston told me this morning that he had based the news release covering the Archbishop's speech on the advance summary which the Archbishop had supplied, only to find himself checked by correspondents during the briefing session because the Archbishop had said some things that he had not included in the release.

In all the excitement over the affair Frings-Ottaviani, we overlooked a drama that was being enacted right here in our own house. It all goes back to the speech of Maximos IV on November 6 which was, as everybody expected, sharply critical of the Curia. He said that the schema gave only a timid suggestion regarding the reform of the Curia and failed to distinguish the difference betwhell came yesterday morning when Ruffini talked. After saying some rough things about coadjutors, especially their right of succession, he said that the beginning of Article 16 seems to make the Oriental Church equal to the Holy See. Later he said that some were very much upset recently by an "oratio aspera at molesta" against the Curia and the Latin Church. The words of His Beatitude Patriarch Ignatius Peter XVI made acceptable reparation.

Yesterday noon as we were completely absorbed in the other matter that had come up we were quite unaware of the feeling that had risen to a boiling point among the Orientals. Father Kerame was particularly vocal. He prepared a letter to be sent by Maximos IV to the members of the Presidency, the Moderators and to Ruffini calling attention to the personal attack on

Maximos IV and asking an apology from Ruffini for having made the attack and from Lercaro, the presiding Moderator for not having interrupted Ruffini and rebuked him then and there for the insult. In the letter it was intimated that on Monday, November 11 the letter would be released to the press!

The Council was quite dull for a few weeks, but during the last two days there has never been a dull moment.

NOVEMBER 10: I didn't leave the building all day, except to go to the chapel for Mass this morning, until after dinner this evening when I went for a walk. Spent all free time getting my desk cleared of all unanswered letters, etc.

Cardinal Koenig was there for breakfast, coming earlier than usual in order to get to St. John Lateran for the big ceremony in which the Holy Father formally took possession of his "Cathedral" and offered a solemn pontifical Mass.

The Cardinal told me that early as it was (before eight o'clock) Cardinal Ruffini had sent a priest to deliver a letter of apology to Maximos IV personally! We heard no more about this matter today; apparently the ruffled feelings have been soothed by Ruffini's quick action in reply to the letter.

Bishop Cleven said that the German press and radio was full of the exchange between Frings and Ottaviani in the Council on Friday morning. I had noticed in my contacts with bishops and priests in Germany that the feeling between Germans and Italians has never been too cordial. The cause for that is partly political. (The Italians deserted the Entente alliance in the first war and joined the Allies, and then collapsed during the second World War leaving the Germans in the position of occupying the country of their supposed allies) and partly because of the unsatisfactory relations with the Curia which were not helped any by the manner in which the Holy Office treated German speaking theologians and scripture scholars right up to the present time. Hence it is easy to understand why the affaire Frings-Ottaviani was played up more in Germany than elsewhere.

At supper this evening Bishop Cleven told us that he had dinner this noon with Frings. The latter stated that he went to the Vatican last night, not to see the Holy Father, but to see some other functionary close to the Holy Father, who told him that the Holy Father was "highly pleased" by the intervention made by Cardinal Frings Friday morning during the course of which he called for such a thoroughgoing reorganization of the Curia and complained about the harmful activities of the Holy Office.

NOVEMBER 11: 64th. Gen. Assembly; Card Lercaro presiding: number present ____
On the way to St. Peter's in the car this morning I told Archbishop Robert: "I am sure that I have a bit of news this morning for you which you have not heard as yet." I told him of the letter of apology which Cardinal Ruffini sent to Maximos IV early yesterday morning. He replied: "As a matter of fact, I happen to have that information already: I saw the letter!" Father Kereme had been at the Kaiser's last night and showed the letter to Archbishop Roberts. I presume he showed the letter indiscriminately because it is the prima facie evidence of one of the few triumphs Maximos IV has enjoyed during this session.

Felici announced the death of two more bishops, neither of whom was in attendance at the Council.

A medal commemorating the second session of the Council was distributed to all Council Fathers, periti and observers. Felici emphasized that these medals were available no place else and would be distributed only during this session to those who were in their proper places!

Felici also announced that during the course of the Assembly distribution would be made of the amended schema covering communications media and also a copy of the relation covering this amended schema. A vote will be taken on this schema during the General Assembly on Thursday, November 14: there will be two ballots, one on the Introduction and the first chapter and the second on chapter II.

Twenty three speakers were announced before debate began; 18 actually spoke. Spellman drew a laugh when he started by saying that he is speaking in his own name only. Everybody recognizes that he is representative of the opinion of the US hierarchy in very few matters. He attacked the idea of collegiality. On the matter of the reorganization of the curia he said that since the Curia is the agency of the Holy Father, he alone has the right to reform or reorganize it; it is none of our business.

Doepfner very obviously was answering Ottaviani's charge that the Moderators were introducing matter into the council for vote by the fathers without proper authority. Both Ottaviani and he referred to the vote on collegiality which is to serve as a guideline for the commission.

The session as a whole was very dull. Someone remarked: "It is good that we got the medal today; at least we derived some benefit from this Assembly."

The hottest piece of gossip today was to the effect that the Holy Father will preside at a solemn assembly on November 29 and on that occasion will solemnly promulgate the constitution on the Liturgy and the one on Communications. At the same time he will grant to all ordinaries the faculties listed in the appendix of the schema on "De Episcopis." Many will not be satisfied with the latter; they are insisting that bishops should have all powers belonging to the order of the episcopate and the Holy Father should merely list those powers or faculties which for the sake of unity or other circumstances are best reserved to the Holy Father. It will be interesting to see what comes of these latest rumors.

I did not go to the meeting of the US bishops today because I am to go to dinner tonight with the Muellerleile's et alii.

NOVEMBER 12: 65th. Gen. Assembly; Lercaro presiding; number present ____

The first matter of business was a vote on the question of whether the Council should omit debate on Chapter V of the schema "De Episcopis" etc., since it is purely a legalistic matter which can best be handled by the commission for the revision of the code. The vote was taken and the results announced later in the Assembly was as follows:

Total: 2166, Placet 2025, Non Placet 141

Twenty names were announced for the speaker's list today. Ten actually had spoken when at 11:05 Lercaro asked for a standing vote on the question whether debate on Chapter II should be terminated. The vote was near unanimous. This action came as a great relief because the debate on Coadjutors and Auxiliaries had become quite boring because very little could be said on the subject, and the Fathers kept saying that little over and over again. Suenens had given a strong speech in favor of providing for compulsory retirement at the age of 75 if in the judgment of the proper authorities the ordinary was no longer capable of giving good pastoral

and administrative service. *Nemo iudex in causa sua*, especially when he was already senile or physically disabled.

Cardinal Doepfner took over the chair to preside over the discussion of Chapter III of this schema. Bishop Carli read the *Relatio* pertaining to this Chapter. Of the Cardinals who spoke today, three were from the US - McIntyre, Meyer and Ritter.

Cardinal McIntyre did a poorer job than usual in reading his Latin script. Much of what he said was simply unintelligible. He absolutely opposed the idea of Episcopal Conferences with juridical authority. He even went so far as to say that such an arrangement would cast doubt on papal infallibility!

Cardinal Meyer and Ritter spoke in favor of this proposition, calling, however, for extensive revision of the third chapter of the schema in order to clear up the vagueness of the same on many points referring to this all-important subject. I might note that Cardinal Meyer's speech represented quite a change of viewpoint on this subject. He had always been opposed to the idea of giving legislative authority to an episcopal conference. But, I am told, that just the other day he had a long discussion with Father Franzen on this subject and changed his opinion in the matter. He did, however, in his speech today insist that the schema was too loosely written and that important questions regarding the election of the chairman and the permanent commission spoken of be clearly and precisely defined in order to prevent infringement on the jurisdiction which the ordinary has in his own territory by divine right in virtues of his consecration. Meyer's speech was excellent; well written and delivered.

The second session of the Annual Meeting of US Bishops was rather dull. We did not finish the agenda and will have to go back on Saturday morning. In his report on the National Commission for the Liturgical Apostolate, Griffiths had little to say except that Archbishop Hallinan would report next Saturday on the status of the liturgical schema. We also voted to have the office of the Liturgical Apostolate make available to all ordinaries a letter calling attention to the fact that no one may jump the gun when the Holy Father promulgates the Constitution on the Liturgy. At the same time, we can not drag our feet during the interim, we must suggest to our priests that they begin to prepare for the radical changes that are coming up. We must suggest and encourage them to intensify their educational program and also urge them to use the forms of participation now permitted according to instruction of 1958.

NOVEMBER 13: 66th Assembly; Doepfner presiding; number present 2164

Archbishop Roberts supplied a bit of gossip on the way to St. Peter's this morning. He said he had it on good authority that Cardinal de Silva of Chile was to furnish a bombshell for the Assembly this morning by speaking on the matter of the Curia and openly attacking the Holy Office and asking the Holy Father to intimate to the Council exactly what reforms he wanted in the Curia since he had talked about that on Sept. 21 to the Curia itself and again to the Council Fathers at the opening of the second session on September 29. I waited all through the session for something to happen, but there were no fireworks! On the way home I told Abp. Roberts that I was disappointed in the fact that he was a false prophet. He said he was equally disappointed and would return to his informant "to demand his money back!"

The Mass this morning was in the Byzantine-Russian rite. The ceremony was somewhat abbreviated. The music was superb and the entire ritual was most impressive.

After the Mass Felici said "Exeant omnes" as usual and we were trying to get organized in the usual manner for the beginning of the business when, suddenly his voice blared over the PA system with another "exeant omnes" which, for all the world, had the intonation one would associate with the expression "Get the hell out of here!"

Three had requested permission to speak on Chapter II to carry after debate was terminated by the vote yesterday.

There was a big laugh when Bishop Fernandez suggested that the problem of caring for retired bishops be solved by having the Episcopal Conference in each country build and maintain a home for retired bishops. He said "those who have worked well for the Church have a right to sleep and rest in peace in it." I suppose that where such a home is built the inscription over the entrance will read "Requiescant in pace."

The third speaker (Melas of Italy) was checked after droning on for some time because his speech was not ad rem.

Cardinal Doepfner took over when we began debate on the Third Chapter which treats of Episcopal conferences.

Cardinal Spellman was the first to speak on the Third Chapter. He simply was "agin" the whole idea. Episcopal conferences are useful as long as they remain on a consultative basis. Any legislation that is binding should be left to Provincial and Plenary Councils which are convoked with the consent of the Holy See and there are papal legates presiding over the Plenary Councils. If the episcopal conference is given legislative authority in its routine meetings it would be superior to Plenary Councils.

Cardinal Frings gave a speech quite different from what I had expected. He told the story of the Fulda Conference and then mentioned that US Bishops Conference (NCWC) and others had accomplished even more than the Fulda Conference. He endorsed what Spellman had said concerning legislative powers, though he did not seem to be so absolute in wanting to deny legislative authority. He made a point of the fact that in all its long history the Fulda Conference has had no written statutes and he is against such statutes; simply proceed in a spirit of unity and charity. But, from what I recall concerning Cardinal Muench's comments on the Fulda Conference, this group did not even remotely resemble our NCWC until after the II World War. On Muench's suggestion they branched out to take in some of the functions like the various departments which are the essence of NCWC. Their meetings prior to the last war were more in the nature of study meetings. Now they are sponsoring such things as news service, etc.

Bishop McDevitt probably made the best speech. Taking exception to the expression "Mere auxiliares" appearing in the schema in connection with the membership in the Episcopal Conferences he made a loathing attack on the idea of treating auxiliaries and even coadjutors as mere messenger boys to the bishop or mere functionaries in the administration of confirmation and sometimes holy orders. He wants all titular bishops who discharge some office in their diocese to be members of the Conference with a deliberative vote. He said he could not understand why the council fathers (some of them cardinals) who argued so long and eloquently for collegiality are so reluctant to permit titular bishops a deliberative vote in the conference or participation in the administration of the diocese. McDevitt's speech created a bit of a sensation. Carli, as relator, had introduced Chapter III, and he also spoke as an individual Council Father. He appealed to his "patron

saints", Ruffini, Browns and Ottaviani in condemning episcopal conferences by saying they can not be based on the vote of October 30 because that was of doubtful validity. This is the line which had been stated by the ultra-conservatives, more to downgrade collegiality than to prevent episcopal conferences.

When all is said and done, I am of the opinion that it is not logical to base a claim for legislative authority on the collegiality of the bishops. The collegiality takes for granted that "all" bishops in union with the Holy Father make up the collegiality. I do not understand how you can take them piece-meal and consider each group as exercising their authority on the basis of collegiality of the whole body of bishops.

There was a total of three speakers on Chapter II, carried over from yesterday after termination of debate, and 13 spoke on Chapter III.

Felici announced that the schema on Ecumenism would be taken up as soon as the schema "De Episcopis, etc" was completed.

At 5:00 PM. I went to the Casa, first to have Ray take me to Fini's for a fitting of a cassock being made for me, and then to be present at the speech by Father Franzen to the periti. Father Franzen gave an excellent dogmatics, scriptural and historical statement of the argument for collegiality. But I think he was a bit weak when he tried to apply these arguments for Episcopal Conferences, insofar as authority by divine right to exercise legislative powers. The question stated above was not answered.

After the meeting at the Casa we went over to the Scoglio di Frisio, on via Merulana near St. Mary Major for a dinner. We were guests of Archbishop Binz. He had invited all suffragans and auxiliaries of the Province and all bishops whose place of origin was in the Province. Among the latter were Bishops Soenneker, Treinen, Hodap, S J., Henry, Kociszko. It was a most pleasant evening, though it rained as we were coming home at 9:30 PM.

Today started early for me. I said the community Mass for the nuns at 5:55 AM. I find that I do not function as well at that hour anymore as I did in the days when I was chaplain at St. John's Hospital, Fargo!

NOVEMBER 14: 67th General Assembly; Card Doepfner presiding: number present 2168

Announced the death of the Superior General of the Trappist Fathers, Fr. Sortais. Archbishop Byrne had a dinner date with him for Saturday. The Abp himself was confined to bed with a cold and asked Bishop Biskup, his auxiliary, to tell the Superior General at the session that he would not be able to come. The first thing Biskup heard after the business meeting was that the Superior General died last night!

Felici announced that the Eucharistic Congress in Bombay will be held the last days of November and first days of December 1964; but there will be no conflict with the session of the Council. The latter will be arranged in a way that there will be no conflict with the Eucharistic Congress.

The ushers distributed Latin copies of the Apostolic Letter of Paul VI on the fourth centennial of the establishment of theological seminaries by the Council of Trent. Everyone received a Latin copy and Felici announced that tomorrow we may obtain copies in the vernacular to be distributed at the entrances to St. Peter's. During the course of the debate, the vote on the

schema pertaining to communications was taken, one ballot for the Introduction and first chapter and a second for the second chapter. Then Felici announced the result of the votes at the end of the meeting. He stated that the final vote on the whole schema would be taken next week on a day to be determined later.

Bishop Stourm made the "relatio" before we voted on "De Instrumentis..."

In speaking on episcopal conferences Siri said he was talking for practically all Italian bishops. He wanted the whole matter simplified. He endorsed some things said by Spellman and by Meyer. He stressed that such conferences are merely authorized by law and are not of divine right because of collegiality. He was more moderate in his speech than I had expected.

Cardinal Wyszynski's story of the Polish Conference of bishops is most interesting. It meets more often than other such conferences; has a more elaborate preparation of the agenda for the meeting and exercises great moral pressure on the bishops to conform to the decisions made. In matters liturgical they regard the action of the conference as mandatory.

At 11:30 AM. Cardinal Doepfner called for a standing vote on the question of terminating debate on Chapter III. Nearly unanimous. He announced that those who would speak at tomorrow's session on Chapter III are reminded that those who spoke by virtue of Art 57 of the Regolumenta merely repeated what had already been said many times. He intimated that the rule of no repetition would be strictly enforced.

Suenens took the chair to preside at the discussion of Chapter IV of the schema "De episcopis..." etc.

Bishop Carli made the "relatio" for the fourth chapter.

All told, today there were ten speakers on Chapter III before termination of debate and five speakers on chapter four. Fifteen who had been announced as speakers were cut off by the vote to terminate discussion.

Archbishop Roberts gave me a petition to be directed to the Moderators and the Holy Father asking for reform of the Curia and especially the Holy Office. He did not tell me who prepared and is circulating the petition even though I asked him directly. The document is well prepared. It quotes from the opening address of the Holy Father on the opening of the second session on September 29 and also to the speech to the Curia itself on September 21. Then it proceeds to make suggestions for reform as spelled out by the Holy Father in the quotations.. At the end of the document there is a suggestion that the petition be directed to the Holy Father and/or to the Moderators. Unless this is vigorously pushed, it will accomplish little. Furthermore it is too late in the session to accomplish anything now. There is a great weakness in the petition. It does not mention the fact that in his allocution to the Curia, Pope Paul indicated that the reform of the Curia should come from within. I am sure that the Holy Father will want to give them a chance to reorganize themselves.

A few new quips about the Council:

SPELLMAN, "When the General Secretary says "Exeant Omnos" it seems that the Holy Spirit is being sent out."

+++++

After the discussion on the schema's "De Ecclesia" and "De Episcopis" etc., it seems that the bishops will have all the power, the priests all the work, and the deacons all the fun"

+++++

Hereafter, since the establishment of a new chair of theology, the Lateran will grant the following degrees: Licentiate in Sacred Theology; and Doctorate in Sacred Theology and a Doctorate in Excommunications."

NOVEMBER 15: 68th Gen. Assembly; Card Suenens presiding; number present 2168

Announcements: On Sunday morning at 9:00 the Holy Father will transfer the relics of St. Cyril and Methodius to the Church of St. Clement.

Sunday afternoon the Pope will appear in St. Peter's for the first public veneration of Vincent Romano, a new Blessed. Monday there will be a vote on the work of the Liturgical Commission in connection with the "modi" that had been submitted on the First Chapter. The announcement wasn't too clear to me; but it seems there will be one ballot in which we are free to vote "placet" or "non placet" in approval or disapproval of the manner in which the Commission handled the modi that were submitted. Most Fathers were surprised at this vote because we had been of the impression that the only voting remaining on the Liturgy was in connection with the modi submitted on chapters II, III and IV. Now it seems that there is to be another vote on each chapter, with the ballot on Monday covering the Introduction and Chapter I. The vote on chapter one seems a bit ridiculous after we had been telling our people for a year that final action had been taken on Chapter I, aside from promulgation by the Holy Father. We spoke often of the general principles established in Chapter I and that there would be no more balloting on that matter.

There were four speakers who continued the discussion of Chapter III. Cardinal Lefebvre was the only one who made a real contribution to the subject. He made an effort to give a more exact definition of "Collegiality," and then proceeded to spell out the relationship between the Pope as head and bishops as members of the Coetus Episcoporum. The Cardinal's speech was quite effective and was directed to the end of soothing ruffled feelings resulting from the acrid debate on this subject. It also clarified the situation regarding episcopal conferences, showing how national groups could function as a part of the collegiality.

At 10:27 Felici interrupted the proceedings to ask everyone to return to his place because of important announcements. Somewhat later he made the announcements stated above. The copy of the Liturgical Constitution containing the text and also the modi and emendations in the Introduction and Chapter I was distributed during the course of debate.

Thirteen speakers took the floor to discuss Chapter IV, with Suenens continuing as Moderator. On the whole, the debate was dull. Actually there isn't much to stir up debate in the matter of the division or suppression or unification of dioceses. The Orientals expressed some strong feelings regarding "personal dioceses." Bishop Khoereich of Lebanon (Maronite) complained that the Oriental Church does not have adequate territorial arrangements in the areas where the Latin Church predominates. It was a familiar tune of being denied proper consideration in dealing with the Oriental Church, and as usual his complaints had merit.

It was quite a surprise to us all when at 11:45 the list of speakers on this Chapter was exhausted and no vote to terminate discussion was needed. Cardinal Suenens called Cardinal Marella to give a summation of the Chapter in his capacity as chairman of the Council Commission which has developed the schema "De Episcopis."

Felici then announced that on Monday, November 18 we would begin discussion of the schema on Ecumenism.

Cardinal Tisserant closed the meeting with just an Our Father since it was not yet 12:00 noon and the Angelus was therefore omitted.

The big event of the day was the audience with the Holy Father at 5:30 PM. in the Clementine Hall. Pope Paul appeared promptly at 5:30 and took his place at a chair set on a single step ahead of the regular stairway leading to the permanent throne. He looked most cheerful and vigorous. Cardinal Spellman spoke before the Holy Father did, extended the greetings and good wishes of the more than 150 bishops present and reciting a few of the things about the church in US of which we are proud. Some of us felt that Spellman placed too much emphasis on the generosity of the people in the US in support of their parishes, education, charities, and missions - home and foreign. It would have been better to let the Holy Father refer to such matters while he stressed the strong parochial life. He did begin by giving statistics of the number of bishops, priests, lay brothers, nuns and the total number of Catholics, with a concluding sentence - "and they almost all go to Mass regularly."

The Holy Father started by talking Italian off the cuff for a minute and then read his prepared speech in English. His English is halting and the accent very pronounced; Bishop Cleven said the same was true of his German in their audience a week ago. After the prepared speech His Holiness went off into more *ex tempore* remarks in Italian. He paid a beautiful tribute to the nuns and the school system which they have made possible. He quoted Pope Pius XII who had called the nuns "the glory of the Church in the United States".

Before the Holy Father left he gave us faculties to give the papal blessing with plenary indulgence and also to authorize pastors to give the blessing to their own people in each parish.

Then His Holiness went to shake hands with the Cardinals, but didn't stop there. He greeted every person present. He remembered Cardinal Muench when I mentioned that I was the Bishop of Fargo and asked whether I was the Cardinal's successor. He then said a few words in praise of the Cardinal.

The Holy Father's kindness and friendliness made a deep impression on all of us. We left the Clementine Hall on a cloud!

NOVEMBER 16: The first thing this morning I saw a story in the DAILY AMERICAN about Ottaviani. On page 7 there was a headline in small letters as follows "Say Ottaviani Considered Resigning." The AP story says that a small furore was stirred up in the Vatican yesterday by a story in "a French newspaper" to the effect that Cardinal Ottaviani had considered offering his resignation as Secretary of the Holy Office. They then told of the exchange between Frings and Ottaviani last Friday, and then went on to say that Le Monde, an influential Paris newspaper, reported yesterday that Pope Paul had seen Cardinal Frings in audience last Friday after his speech in the Council. It also stated that after seeing Frings the Pope saw Siri, Antoniutti and Ottaviani. The Pope however was supposed to have told Frings that he approved his stand. Ottaviani was supposed to have appealed to Paul VI for support of his stand and was troubled over his failure to get such support.

It is possible that this story is not cut out of whole cloth, but it certainly contains little foundation in fact. In the first place I happen to have good authority for saying that Frings did not have an audience with the Holy Father that Friday evening. Bishop Cleven had dinner with Frings last Sunday, November 10. Frings told him that on Friday evening "he had gone to the Vatican for

a conference with a high official who is close to the Holy Father." This person told Frings that the Pope "was highly pleased" with his statement on the Council floor that morning. Hence it is not true that he had an audience with the Pope. The Vatican also denied that the Holy Father had any audience that evening with either Frings or Ottaviani - that is they said there was "no record of such audiences."

At ten this morning we went to the Cavalieri-Hilton for the concluding session of the meeting of the bishops- and a historic meeting it was.

Archbishop Hallinan took the floor at Spellman's request to complete the report on the liturgy. He gave an excellent presentation of the present status of the Constitution on the Liturgy. In the first place he announced that we would vote this next week on the matters remaining to be considered and explained the status of the various votes "iuxta modum" in connection with chapters II, III and IV. We gained some of the points, but lost the point which would have provided for the collects in the vernacular and the point concerning the phrase "singulis in casibus" in connection with the use of the vernacular in the breviary. He then stated that it was certain that the Holy Father will promulgate the Constitution on the liturgy on November 29.

That raised the question about what to do during the interim, a point which was taken up in a haphazard way just before the close of the meeting last Tuesday. But this time we were dealing with another man. Hallinan came prepared. After giving a clear and concise statement of the situation he proposed four motions for our action which would provide for constructive action as soon as the Constitution was promulgated.

When the Bishops, especially Cardinal Ritter, saw the obstructionist attitude of Spellman and McIntyre, the bishops as a whole began to demand action now. The procedure was exactly according to the most elegant parliamentary procedures, but it was effective. It was amusing to see Ritter gesticulating (he was out of Spellman's range of vision) to us in the audience to rise and demand a vote. All four motions were carried by over 140 votes to 5 or 6 negative votes. Cardinal McIntyre demanded a vote by ballot instead of acclamation, and Spellman (rightly) insisted on granting that request, since according to parliamentary law anyone may demand a secret vote. Even though this was correct procedure, McIntyre lost face more than ever. He certainly did not succeed in getting an adverse vote; on the contrary if any of the bishops had misgivings, I am sure the tactics of McIntyre and Spellman created a reaction. This was also apparent in the grilling they gave Hallinan about our right to vote as yet because the section on episcopal conferences had not yet been voted in the Council or approved by the Holy Father. Patiently, Hallinan went over that section in the Constitution of the Liturgy again, word for word, which stated that existing episcopal conferences of whatever nature can act now.

The result is that action can be taken immediately to make preparations for the interim period. One motion made calling a meeting of the bishops next spring mandatory. In this way we should be in a position to use the vernacular in certain rites (Mass, sacraments and breviary) before the end of next summer. We will see.

While I was making this entry, Bishop Hoch dropped in to tell me of a conversation which he had with Bishop Hakim after supper this evening. Hakim had been to Paris for a few days (I believe for the ordination of a deacon for his diocese). He came back with the story that a report is current in Paris to the effect that Msgr. Cosgrove of the Holy Office categorically denied all the charges made against the Holy Office by Frings et alii. He was quoted as saying that all these charges simply are lies. This is another instance of how reports of events can be

distorted. In this case, it would appear that the reports represent the lies rather than that Msgr. Cosgrove called the charges lies.

Cosgrove actually was present at a press conference and did answer some questions and made statements concerning the attacks against the Holy Office. Since he is an important official of the Holy Office and has served there under Ottaviani for years, it is to be expected that he would defend the Holy Office. At the same time it is not surprising that in his defense he should follow the line used by Ottaviani when he defended the Holy Office against the charges made. Of course I do not consider Ottaviani's line of defense, and therefore also that of Cosgrove, an effective vindication of the Holy Office. They say: a) before anyone is condemned his writings are carefully studied; b) this is not done in a haphazard manner; experts from the Roman Universities are consulted and their opinion is respected in forming a decision; and most of all c) the Holy Father personally approves every decision that is made in cases like this.

Certainly Cosgrove's reassertion of this argument is by no stretch of the imagination calling anybody a liar, as the rumor had it in Paris. Such tactics are as vicious as anything imputed to the Holy Office.

On the other hand Ottaviani does not deny, and neither did Cosgrove deny, the fact that individual theologians and other writers are condemned without a hearing, with being notified of the reasons of their condemnation and without an opportunity to emend their writings or correct errors charged against them by the Holy Office. Frings never denied (he made no reference to the technique used by the Holy Office) that such cases were given detailed study by the Holy Office. What he, and most of the bishops and world as a whole with him complain about, is the method pursued in trying to preserve the purity of faith and morals. The Star Chamber methods are entirely out of date and as Frings said, a scandal in our age. Hence, Cosgrove was as wrong as Ottaviani in the defense of the Holy Office because neither of them met the real issue - namely the injustice and the cruelty of condemning a man without a hearing and with an opportunity for defense. In our day, we simply can not swallow something like this.

Furthermore, the manner in which decisions are implemented are also disgusting. It is not usual for the Holy Office to notify an individual directly of the punishment being inflicted, after they arrived at a decision in such a high-handed manner. They will send word to an ordinary, local or personal, and tell them frequently to inform their subject in question that they may no longer publish works on their special subject, or they must be removed from their teaching office or other position, or they must desist from further pursuit of their specialty. Generally the ordinary is told that he is not to disclose to his subject the reason why this limitation is placed on him!

Bishop Hakim told a story involving him which illustrates this point. He received a letter to remove a priest, a member of a religious order, from a certain position. He spoke to the superior, who knew nothing of the matter and had no knowledge of any shortcomings on the part of his subject or any defects in his performance of his duties. There had been no word from the Holy Office to Bishop Hakim or the man's superior concerning the nature of the charges. Hakim went to Rome and called on a high official in the Holy Office; he was told that he must see Ottaviani in a matter of such importance. Ottaviani was "too busy" to give him a hearing. So Hakim, not wanting to be denied, went to the Holy Father (John) and told his story. He was told to go back to Ottaviani, he will find time to receive you!

That Ottaviani did, without delay. Hakim charged Ottaviani with unfairness for not informing him of the reasons for the action and the nature of the charges. He still did not get the information, but the matter was dismissed with the statement: "we must have been misinformed!" But, a year later another letter came to Hakim from the Holy Office to have the same name removed; this time also without any information concerning the reasons. Again Hakim came to Rome and saw Ottaviani and again he demanded to know the reasons. This time he was told that certainly he must know the reasons because he himself had written the Holy Office to give them the information! It did not help when Hakim solemnly declared that he knew nothing against this man and had never written a letter about him to the Holy Office or to anybody else. All he knew was that the man is capable, dedicated and to his knowledge, entirely innocent of any wrongdoing. But all of this was to no avail. In spite of the fact that someone was forging Hakim's name AND ATTACKING THIS MAN behind Hakim's back and behind the back of his superior, Hakim was ordered to see that he was removed.

I do not think there is a single person in the Council who wants to destroy the Holy Office or prevent any action towards protection of the purity of faith and morals. From the nature of the case, there must be some check on the writings of theologians, historians, exegetes, etc. Everyone understands that in the field of speculative theology and in the field of research work done on any subject, individuals, no matter how expert, can go wrong in their techniques or judgments and the Church has the duty and responsibility to check these matters. There is a hazard in any work of research no matter how scholarly the procedure is. A true scholar will not object to being checked, and it is only one guilty of intellectual pride who will refuse to accept correction.

But it is equally true that you cannot, in the long run, protect purity of faith and morals and cannot keep the teachings relevant to the people in succeeding generations if you employ methods that are unjust, cruel and actually dishonest; it is dishonest at anytime and in any cause to suppress the truth.

I have never heard anybody in the Council chamber pursue this line of argument in the condemnation of the Holy Office. It is not sufficient to attack the Holy Office or the Curia generally with broad accusations; to get this matter settled we must make some constructive suggestions for a plan of providing what we actually need, namely, real and valid exercise of the magisterium of the Church in the development of her teachings from generation to generation as human knowledge develops. We have to offer some suggestions which will achieve this purpose without destroying human rights or discouraging scholarly pursuits in the field of theology, philosophy, ecclesiology and the natural sciences.

Bishop Hakim also told Bishop Hoch that he had been with the African Bishops this afternoon and learned that a petition is being circulated among the Council Fathers asking the Holy Father to intervene in the matter of the reorganization of the Curia and the question of collegiality. It is becoming obvious that Ottaviani will prevent the theological commission from being guided by the straw vote conducted some time ago. He will not accept the idea of collegiality and apparently will try to prevent the subject from coming to the floor for a vote, where he knows it will be accepted. Hakim said that he learned from the African bishops that 600 names have already been signed to the petition in endorsement of its requests. They hoped to get 1000 names before the petition is turned over to the Holy Father personally or to the Moderators.

NOVEMBER 17: The first thing that caught my eye on the front page of the DAILY AMERICAN this morning (even before I found the football scores which I looked for first) was the top

headline over the left column of the front page which read as follows: "Pope May Intervene in Impasse." The AP story indicated that there is a possibility of a direct intervention on the question of the shared power between the Pontiff and the bishops. Paul VI had called a meeting of the Moderators, the Presidency (called steering committee), the coordinating commission, the General Secretary and the subsecretaries and remained in session with them for four hours. At the end of the meeting - so says the DAILY AMERICAN - there was no communiqué issued. They said, that it is general knowledge that a petition has been circulating, asking the Pope to spell out how he wants the bishops to share his government of the Church. The DAILY AMERICAN reported that the petition was supposedly handed to the Holy Father by the Moderators. It would be interesting to know whether this petition is the same which the African bishops had yesterday afternoon. I wouldn't be surprised if there were several such circulating.

I had the following here as guests for dinner this noon: Msgr. Giovannetti, Father Ulric Beste, O.S.B., Father Colman Barry, O.S.B, Father Godfrey Diekmann, OSB, and Msgr. Bernhard Hack, a canon of St. Mary Major. I asked them to come because I wanted to show them a bit of hospitality and also because I wanted Father Colman to get acquainted with Msgr. Giovannetti and Msgr. Hack. Before they left Father Colman did succeed in making an appointment with Msgr. Giovannetti and Msgr. Hack for the coming week. Speaking of Father Colman, he is getting along very well in Rome with his interviews with different people who can give him information that is useful for him in connection with the biography of Cardinal Muench.

At dinner we had a regular riot. Both Msgr. Giovannetti and Msgr. Hack got started on telling their experiences in connection with their work with Cardinal Muench. I am sure that Father Colman will be able to get a great deal of information from them, though I am not so sure that their separate accounts will agree on all points!

Father Lessard dropped in for supper this evening. We went over to the Bob Kaiser's for an hour to meet with the regular patrons of their regular Sunday evening open house. I met Michael Novak and his wife and saw Dr. Robert McAfee Brown.

Bob Kaiser gave us some copies of a memorandum which had been prepared by John Cogley, Bob Kaiser and Michael Novak and endorsed by Father John Courtney Murray, Father Jean Danielou and Father Jorge Mejia. They insisted that the decree "De Instrumentis Communicationis Socialis" hardly fits in with the tenor of a Council called to make the Church relevant to modern man. It is not an aggiornamento, but a step backward. They listed five headings under which the documents fails of its purpose. The copies are being circulated in the hope that the final approval of the same will be denied.

I must confess that I had not studied this document carefully when it was presented to us for preliminary vote the other day. Now I intend to vote negatively on it.

Father Lynch of Vatican Radio was at Kaiser's tonight. He urged getting more taped radio programs before we return to the States. I promised that I would try to get Dr. Cushman of the Theological Department at Duke University for an interview.

As we were leaving Father Lynch also stated he had heard that Pope Paul VI does not consider this the proper time for a definite stand on the question of collegiality. He said that this concept is dead for the present session at least. It seems that Ottaviani and his followers got Italian politicians to put pressure on the Pope. The argument is that if the Italian Curia is

internationalized, the Church will lose its influence of Italian politics and the country will become dominated by the Communists.

Father Godfrey told me today of the saying which became current in the Liturgical Commission during the first session:

"Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo;
Hallinan, Martin et Jenny
Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra;
Wagner, McManus et Martimort."

This couplet was inspired by the fact that these six men really fought for the reform of the liturgy.

NOVEMBER 18: 69th. General Assembly; Card Agagianian presiding; number present 2090
One speaker requested to speak on Chapter IV of the schema "De Episcopis" even though the names on the list as of last Friday had been exhausted. They certainly go out of their way in safeguarding freedom of expression, even though it is not apparent by what right or rule this man was given the floor at this time.

The speaker in this case was Bishop Valloppilly of India who spoke in the name of the Oriental hierarchy of India. He insisted that whenever there are more members of a minority rite than can be properly cared for in a parish or a special territorial diocese overlapping the diocese of the majority should be set up in spite of the problem involved with having overlapping territories in different dioceses of different rites. He gave the example of the Malabar rite which always had problems and conflicts until they got their own ordinary and then made remarkable progress.

Cardinal Lercaro made the "relatio" on the procedure of the Liturgical Commission regarding the "modi." All of the chapters have been approved individually. But in Chapters II and III the votes for the chapters (Placet) did not constitute a two thirds majority, aside from the votes "iuxta modum" and the votes "iuxta modum" did not in any case reach a two thirds majority to provide acceptance of the same, the "modi" will be considered according to Art 61, par. 5 of the rules. According to Art 39 only a simple majority will be required for voting on the "modi". But there are a number of "modi" of such importance that a special vote will be held on them. It is hoped that the entire action on the Liturgy will be completed by Friday, November 22.

Bishop Martin of Nicolet in Canada gave the "relatio" covering the modi in the Introduction and Chapter I of the Liturgy. The vote on these was taken during the session with just a single ballot covering the entire matter.

Cardinal Cicognani made his first appearance on the floor during this second session when he made the relatio on ecumenism in General.

Archbishop Martin of Rouen made the "relatio" on Chapters I, II and III. He made a very good presentation of the subject and provided some excellent ideas about the nature of ecumenism and the proper approach to the same in practice. He ended his presentation on a very dramatic tone when he lead up to a very effective use of the words UBI CARITAS ET AMOR, IBI DEUS

There was some discrepancy, however, between the presentations made by Cicognani and Martin. The former indicated that ecumenism was originally Catholic and is very old going back to Pius XI, Leo XIII, to the Councils of Lyons and Florence. The latter stated it was

something new, confining himself to the phase of the subject which corresponds to what we are trying to do today and in the form in which it was developed by the Protestant groups in our generation.

Cardinal Tappouni wanted the Oriental Orthodox Church treated separately from the Protestants.

Ruffini could not refrain from stating that the word "ecumenical" is not used in the sense of its original meaning but in a meaning given to it by Protestants; and therefore the word should be dropped. (He himself would probably drop dead if he suddenly found himself standing next to a Protestant or was forced into a situation where he had to talk to one!) As is usual with him, he found something wrong with every single phase of ecumenism.

There were nine speakers on the subject of ecumenism. Maximos IV was the last of the speakers. He said many fine things about the schema, but did say that Chapter IV on the Jews is entirely out of place since ecumenism treats of the relations between Christian churches. This was obviously a play to gallery for the benefit of the Arabs, in spite of the fact that the chapter specifically and emphatically excluded all political overtones and insisted that this was strictly and only a religious document. It is easy to understand that he had to say something for the benefit of the Arabs who make up the members of the Melkite rite which he represents. It is also true that he doesn't get along with Nasser. Normally his schedule called for work among the Melkites in Jordan etc. during the summer and in Egypt during the winter. Because of problems with Nasser he has not been in Egypt for some years. It is hard for the people from the USA to understand how political overtones enter into so very many religious considerations in Europe and the Near East.

As might be expected, Cardinal De Arriba of Terragona just doesn't like ecumenism. It is dangerous to encourage our people to enter dialogue and contrary to the laws concerning the prohibition of books. The schema must include an exhortation to protestants to refrain from proselytism. It is strange that he didn't think of the expedient of providing religious instruction to children and adults as an antidote to proselytism; there would be no successful proselytism among a well instructed laity. De Arriba again came back to the old argument they have always used in favor of religious persecution, namely, that only the Catholic Church has any right to evangelize. Here again one would like to ask him: "Why don't you evangelize your own people?"

Ritter approved the schema in the name of a large number of American bishops. Theologically and historically it brings the end to the Counter-reformation.

NOVEMBER 19: 70th Gen. Assembly; Card. Agagianian presiding: number present 2182 Felici announced that there would be four ballots tomorrow on Chapter II of the Liturgy, three on the "modi" and one on the chapter as a whole.

The remaining "relatios" on Ecumenism were made today: Archbishop Bukatko on Chapter III pertaining to the Oriental Church; Bea on Chapter IV pertaining to the Jews; and De Smedt on Chapter V, pertaining to the subject of Religious Liberty. Bukatko's "relatio" was somewhat prosaic and scholarly.

Bea again stressed that the chapter on the Jews is a religious document and has absolutely nothing to do with any political or economic questions. He gave a good review of the scriptural matters involved, clearly showing that we can find no basis in scriptures for anti-Semitism. The

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE gave this matter more consideration in the November 20 edition than they gave to the question of religious liberty. This news story indicated that Bea's argument was calculated to cleanse every Christian mind of any remnant of anti-Semitism and to give the lie to Nazism which had appealed to the Scriptures for their policy of extermination of Jews. In fact the headline to the story was as follows: "Vatican II Move on Jews Called Reply to Nazism." This might represent considerable misplacement of emphasis in the story of Bea's "relatio" and the 70th General Assembly as a whole. The story also intimated that the Vatican, prior to publication of the Chapter on Jews, through the Secretariat had informed the Arab nations that the declaration concerning anti-Semitism did not constitute Vatican recognition of the State of Israeli. As the Herald-Tribune indicated Bea received a good round of applause as he concluded his "relatio".

Then Bishop De Smedt took the floor for the "relatio" on the long-awaited Chapter V covering the subject of religious liberty, which Ottaviani had originally resisted so stoutly and the Secretariat for Unity so strongly insisted on. De Smedt, early in his "relatio" stated that this draft-schema had the approval of the dogmatic Commission. The vote, as reported by Cardinal Koenig was 18 to 5 in favor of the document when it was passed by the subcommission.

De Smedt's presentation of the ten full pages of closely printed text was simply magnificent. No other speech made in this second session has given me such a thrill. De Smedt is a great orator and he threw everything he had into the presentation of his "relatio". The whole document has to be read to be appreciated. It is a classic, which, I am sure will be quoted many, many times. He can only hope and pray that the ideas got through to some many of the prelates from the Latin countries.

De Smedt concluded his by saying that he presented for our consideration the historical review of the continuity and progressive development of the doctrine of religious liberty. He also admitted very frankly that certain other texts from papal documents could be quoted which differ in a material way from the citations he had made. But he pleaded that these quotations not be taken out of contexts "ne faciatis piscem natum extra aquam."

In his reference to the Holy Office he stated that the "nihil obstat" had been given, after careful scrutiny of the text, and he thanked the members of the Theological Commission for the helpful suggestion they had made.

At this stage it is difficult to know what the fate of the whole document on ecumenism in general will be, especially the chapter on religious liberty.

I forgot to mention yesterday's entry that we had a meeting at the North American College at 4:00 PM, November 18 devoted to the question of ecumenism. The program was not arranged in a satisfactory manner. Gus Weigel gave a good presentation of the subject of "dialogue". He had some wonderful ideas. But, I was sitting next to Father Stransky, who keeps grumbling about the fact that Weigel was talking only about one phase, the intellectual phase, of ecumenism and gave a distorted view. He was so excited over the matter that I finally got up and raised the question of Weigel's inadequate treatment and suggested that Father Stransky be given the floor. (Periti are invited to these meetings, but usually do not talk unless the floor is offered to them, not requested by them.) The situation was a bit embarrassing because Weigel had left as soon as he finished speaking because of another engagement and therefore was not there to defend himself. Stransky spoke briefly, stating that the dialogue merely provides the intellectual basis for real ecumenism, which is

accomplished through the action of the Holy Spirit in the souls of those who have prepared themselves for the blessing of the Spirit.

This does not detract from the fact that what Weigel said about dialogue was excellent. In fact, Bishop Hoch got a good recording of his speech and when I return to the States I plan to borrow Bishop Hoch's tape so that Larry can transcribe Weigel's remarks for me.

There was a humorous interlude because of Bishop Hoch's recorder. He wanted to set his machine on "record" as one of the men started speaking and by mistake set it on "play-back", much to his embarrassment and the speaker's surprise. At the moment nobody but Bishop Hoch knew exactly what happened, but everybody was surprised and amused.

The debate on ecumenism this morning followed the "relations." There were nine speakers today. The reaction was pretty much the same right down the line - opposition from the Italians and especially the Spanish and approval, with a varied degree of reservation, by the others.

The annual meeting of the Catholic Church Extension Society was at the Hilton tonight. While the general pattern was much the same as in former years, there was a tremendous difference in the general tone of the meeting because Archbishop O'Brien was not there. I believe he had missed only one meeting from the time he joined Extension until he died, and that was the time he had serious surgery a day or two before the meeting.

The highlight of the evening was the speech given by Cardinal Cicognani after the dinner. It was entirely *ex tempore* and I should say "from the heart" rather than "off the cuff." He ended by inviting all of us to call on him if he can be helpful to us "because", he said "I will always be your Apostolic Delegate." He had spoken less than five minutes, but his remarks made a deep impression.

NOVEMBER 20: 71st Assembly; Card. Agagianian presiding; number present 2182
Announcements: Those wishing to speak on Chapter I of "De Oecumenismo" are asked to hand in their requests today. I hope this means that they will stop talking on the Schema in general tomorrow.

On Thursday we will vote on the "modi" for Chapter III of the Liturgical schema. On Friday we will vote on the general propositions pertaining to the remaining chapters of the Liturgy followed by the final vote on the entire constitution on the Liturgy. (What a historic day that will be when the first project receives its final action and is sent on to the Holy Father for promulgation!)

Next Monday the final vote on the schema "De Instrumentis, etc" will be taken. I hope and pray that this will be defeated. The danger is that if it is accepted and released along with the schema on the liturgy, which would be promulgated on the same day, the latter could be completely overlooked as the news agencies jump on the schema concerning public media of news and entertainment. From the standpoint of public relations that could be a terrible blow. It would be tragic if the first action of a definitive nature taken by the Council would be something that is severely criticized because it is the very opposite of what John XXIII called for by way of updating the Church. At the same time we would lose a wonderful opportunity to show that we really are in the process of updating the Church if the promulgation of the schema on the liturgy were overlooked because of the criticism of the other schema.

Today we voted on three "modi", one general proposition and the whole of Chapter II of the liturgy. This complicated arrangement was due to the fact that there were three "modi" of some importance that were dealt with individually which received a separate ballot for each; then there was another ballot approving the many other minor changes in globo, and finally a ballot approving the amended form of the entire chapter. The results of the ballots are given elsewhere.

Twenty-seven speakers were announced, of whom 13 got a chance to talk and 14 are being carried over. There seems to be little chance for all of them to get an opportunity to speak.

Cardinal Meyer was the first to talk today; he took up only about four minutes. He approved the schema and took pains to defend including the chapters of Jews and on Religious liberty in this schema since these two problems are intimately bound up with the problems of ecumenism.

Bacci took exactly the opposite line that Cardinal Meyer had taken. He admitted that Chapters IV and V are good, but having nothing to do with ecumenism and should be treated separately. Then he announced that on October 30 he was refused permission to speak and would appeal to the Holy Father to vindicate his rights! A little later in the meeting Cardinal Agagianian offered the following explanation: Immediately before the vote which came up that morning, Bacci came to the table of the Moderators and asked that a defect in the proposition to be voted on should be corrected; i.e. "Ius primatiale" should be changed to "Ius primatus." However the Moderators unanimously agreed that the wording was clear enough as it stood for faithful and pastors and that the clear definition of Vaticano I was in no way compromised by the wording. So in the long run Bacci succeeded only in making himself look ridiculous and he certainly weakened whatever validity there had been in his intervention.

Archbishop Morcillo of Spain in a guarded manner spoke favorably of the schema! We are making progress when we have some of the Spanish bishops on our side.

The tone of Archbishop Baudoux's speech was excellent. It certainly was very much different from the tone of Archbishop Cabana's speech a year ago when he talked about "false irenicism" in dealing with Protestants. Archbishop Baudoux certainly has caught the spirit of John XXIII on this point and made an excellent presentation of the same in a brief statement.

Archbishop Heenan of Westminster gave what is in my mind the best speech on this subject coming from any English speaking Council Fathers. He spoke out firmly and clearly for an active program of ecumenism, keeping the immediate and the ultimate objects clearly in proper perspective. This short speech of Heenan's will provide some important guidelines in carrying on an ecumenical program in any diocese.

Ferreira, a Bishop from Portugal praised the biblical foundation of the schema but appealed for a scholastic approach. There is no sin in scholasticism, but in a lack of the same! At least he was interested in doing something about ecumenism. De Uriarte, Vicar Apostolic from Peru was a riot and had the Fathers laughing during most of his speech. An admonition by the Moderator to discuss ecumenism as it is defined in the schema had no effect. This man had a bellowing voice which he used for all it was worth. I went out while he was speaking to wait for Archbishop Gawlina in the main transept; the speaker's voice reverberated under the dome like the thunder used to reverberate among the hills back on the farm in Wisconsin when I was a youngster. The only difference was that in this case I was not quite as frightened as I was then.

Archbishop Gawlina, who had been in Germany shortly before Bishop Muench came there as Apostolic Administrator, came with us to have dinner here at Salvator Mundi this noon. He had agreed to meet at the Porta Sta. Martha, but for some reason or other couldn't get together until each of us had walked over half of Vatican City behind St. Peter's. We got to Salvator Mundi only at 1:00 PM.

The interview of Archbishop Gawlina during the dinner was recorded by Bishop Hoch. I had failed to reach Father Colman this morning to have him here for the interview. The Archbishop gave some very valuable information which was exact. He had brought along some typed pages from his Memoirs (which he says he would not dare to publish as yet) to which he referred. This enabled him to give exact dates, names of persons and places, and impressions. The information which he gave was not very extensive but it filled in for Father Colman details concerning the very important episode of the coming of the Vatican Mission headed by Archbishop Chiarlo. He also gave the principal points of General Eisenhower's remarks when Chiarlo presented his credentials as well as the reaction of Gen. Bedle Smith to the whole situation. Archbishop Gawlina is a very venerable figure whose life was not a bed of roses during the war years when he was a general in the Polish Army while serving as Military Vicar. He carried an even heavier burden after his homeland was ravaged first by the Nazis and then by the Communists. His memories will certainly make interesting reading if they are ever published.

I talked to Father Yzermans this evening. I asked him to find out when Dr. and Mrs. Cushman could come here for dinner. I would invite several others to the party. I would also ask Dr. Cushman to make a tape with me for radio broadcast in Fargo. I would like to get his reaction to the Council from the standpoint of an American Protestant Observer. He is from Duke University.

NOVEMBER 21: 72nd Gen. Assembly; Agagianian providing; number present 2186
There was dead silence in the council hall as Felici made the announcement that the number of Commission members would be increased to 30 for each commission. That means that all commissions would have the same number of members along with the Secretariat for Unity. He asked that the individual episcopal conferences have special meetings immediately in order to nominate their candidates and that the various episcopal conferences collaborate and agree upon the same candidates in so far as possible. The slates are to be turned in on Monday when they will be printed and distributed to us on Wednesday for a vote on Thursday. A copy of this announcement is being printed for distribution tomorrow. There was quite a let-down after this announcement; it does not come anywhere near accomplishing the objective we had in mind. We do not need bigger commissions. We need some chairmen of the commissions who will allow them to function in a manner which will permit them to interpret the mind of the Council. What we need is that some of the members of the commissions be fired, or least that the commission as a whole would be allowed to elect its own chairman and secretary. The device of permitting each commission, after it is increased to 30, to elect another vice chairman and secretary is very obviously a cover up. It will accomplish exactly nothing, if the announced changes are all that will be done with the commissions.

Bishop Spulbeck of Meisen gave the "relatio" for the third chapter of the Liturgy on which we voted today. We voted, during the course of the morning, on three "modi", one special proposition concerning the other "modi" and then on the chapter as a unity. Each of the ballots was won by a huge margin. Even the "modus" which would liberalize the schema so as to

permit the vernacular in the entire rite of administration of all sacraments, including the sacramental form, was passed by a very comfortable margin, drawing only 335 "non placets".

At 11:10 Agagianian called for a standing vote on termination of the debate on the schema in general. As usual the vote was nearly unanimous. The names of fourteen speakers had been carried over from yesterday and nineteen new names were added! Seven got a chance to talk today on the schema in general; which means that 26 were cut off. I wonder how many of those will insist on talking tomorrow!

Among the speakers today, Flores of Spain was quite surprising by taking a stand that conformed entirely with our own attitude. He was followed by Florit of Florence; and that was something quite different. He gave every evidence of completely lacking any understanding whatsoever of any concept of what ecumenism means. His speech was a masterpiece of talking out both sides of his mouth; pretending to be interested in ecumenism on the one hand then advocating repressive measure on the other. He apparently was quite conscious of the controversial nature of his speech and tried to soften it by saying that he had a letter from one of his "constituents" who wrote: "In Concilio neque victores neque victi habentur."

One speaker went over his time quite a bit and Agagianian asked him to stop when he ignored the bell; all to no avail. Agagianian asked him three times to stop, but the man just went on, so finally he interfered a fourth time sharply and with emphasis when the man finally gave up.

Agagianian asked Abp. Martin of Rouen to summarize the discussion of the schema in general and then asked for a vote whether the schema in its first three chapters are acceptable as a basis for discussion. The vote was as follows: 2052 present: 1966 placet; and 86 non placet.

Cardinal Lercaro took over as Chairman of the Assembly. There were five speakers today who discussed the First Chapter on ecumenism. The first speaker, Archbishop Nicodemo, Archbishop of Bari in Italy just doesn't like the idea of ecumenism and he didn't hesitate to tear it apart. He wanted to change the whole tone of the schema by means of emendations he suggested.

As usual, Bishop Carli of Segni had to have his say, this in spite of the fact that he had already sent in 18 emendation of the first chapter; 11 of the second chapter; and 15 of the third chapter, forty-four in all, which were printed in the pamphlet containing the emendations submitted in writing prior to the second session.

NOVEMBER 22: 73rd Gen. Assembly; Lercaro presiding; number present 2178

This was one of the really historical sessions of the entire council so far. It was the first time that a final vote on a complete schema was taken! This occasion will long be remembered, not only those who were trying to promote the apostolate of the liturgy since its beginnings, but also many of the council fathers who came here last year in October with little understanding of and less interest in the subject. Even the most optimistic of the promoters of the liturgy who came a year ago never dreamed that we would get half of what was contained in the original schema, to say nothing about an end result which went far beyond the original schema proposed! And that with a vote which for all practical purposes could be considered unanimous. The 19 negative votes in the last ballot really represented a tattered remnant of the hard core of resistance.

I could hardly believe my eyes when I read the L'Osservatore Romano for November 23. The headline was as follows:

APPROVAZIONE QUAST UNANIME
DELLO SCHEMA SOLL LITURGIA
Votanti 2178 - Placet 2159

A year ago, such a headline would have been unthinkable; during the progress of the debate the official reports published in L'Osservatore were such as to lead people to believe that there was only a half-hearted interest in the subject! While the hard core resistance is still as hard as ever, if not hardening, the feeling in the Council as a whole has certainly taken off in the direction of bringing the Church more into contact with modern world.

I thought of Father Virgil and the days back in 1925 and 1926 when Virgil started the Liturgical Movement in the US. and he was working feverishly getting some material into the hands of the few priests who were interested and I used to help him by doing a great deal of typing and proof-reading for him. (He fired me as a proof-reader because I missed more mistakes than I corrected!) I am sure that in his wildest dreams Father Virgil did not expect to see the changes in public worship of the Church which were made official in the action of the Council today. At the same time, I never expected to see even the small improvement which I visualized to become a reality during my own life time. The thrill with which I witnessed the proceedings today is something I will never forget.

This was, indeed, a busy Assembly; only the speeches were dull! We received the following documents: A printed copy of the announcement made yesterday by Felici concerning the election of new members of the various commissions. A report from the Commission on Faith and Morals on what they have done to date. This is a pitiful report, indicating that only a number of subcommissions had been appointed. It is true, the number of interventions on "De Ecclesia" and "De Episcopis..." is astronomical: 2200 in one category. But at the rate this commission is working we will not get a chance to act on those schemata until 1965. I can see why there is much discussion of the possibility that there will be no session in 1964.

The "Modi" on the schema Communications.

Felici also announced that a most important ballot was coming up at 10:45 AM and that all Fathers are to be in their place at that time. He also announced that on Monday the document on St. Peter's would be distributed at the various entrances and copies would be available in the language of our choice. He did not explain what the nature of the document is.

Before beginning the debate for the day, Lercaro asked for the relations to be made in connection with the voting on the Liturgy today. Bishop Martin of Nicollet, Bishop Zauner of Austria, Abbot D'Amato of St. Paul's Outside of the Walls, Bishop Carlo Rossi presented a relatio on the various "modi" and chapters on which we were to vote today, after Cardinal Lercaro had made the relatio for the liturgy as a whole.

There were four speakers only who insisted on talking on the schema in genere. Fifteen speakers were announced to discuss chapter I, of whom six actually got a chance to talk.

Lercaro asked those who wanted to speak on Chapter II should submit their requests along with their summary today. He also announced that there would be a vote on the "modi" on Communications on Monday.

The Holy Father is to offer a Mass in St. Peter's at 9:00 for the deceased cardinals and bishops of the last year.

At approximately 11:35 Felici announced that all prior ballots on the liturgy had been taken and that we would at this time proceed to the ballot on the entire Liturgical schema. The number of the ballot was 129. The speaking then continued until just shortly after 12:00 when Felici was called to the podium to announce the result of this last ballot. We all expected that the vote would be practically unanimous and therefore were not surprised when he announced that of 2178 t votes, 2158 were "placet"; 19 "non-placet" and 1 invalid. But nevertheless there was a great cheer and the loudest round of applause heard so far in the council hall. Applause is really prohibited, and in cases where the rule was violated in the past, the applause usually came from the end of the hall where the younger bishops (usually called Boy Scouts) are sitting. But this time the applause was universal (I couldn't see Ottaviani or Dante!) Lercaro then paid a great tribute to the members of the Liturgical Commission, its chairman and members, for their hard labors during the many months since the council opened in 1962. One could tell that he was as thrilled as we because his voice quavered as he talked. The Assembly was closed at that time with the announcement that the next Assembly would be held on Monday.

For some time I had planned a trip to Naples by car for this weekend and was quite delighted when the weather this morning was perfect and remained so throughout the day. Bishop Hoch, Father Lessard, Father Potter and myself took off in a holiday spirit for Sorrento. We planned to stay at a hotel in Sorrento on Friday and Saturday nights, spending Saturday on Capri and driving to Amalfi, Salerno, Pompeii, Naples and probably Monte Casino and then back to Rome on Sunday.

We got three blocks south from Salvator Mundi and one block west. As Father Lessard made the turn to the south again and had crossed the center of the intersection a young lad of 18 hit the rear left door with a light motorcycle. I was sitting on the left in the rear seat, but was not hit by the flying glass because I was leaning over to look at the map with Bishop Hoch, figuring out the distance to Naples! I did get some of the glass in my coat pocket!

The driver of the motorcycle had been approaching and entered the intersection without looking ahead at all. He was watching some boys at a news stand on the left side of the street. He did not see us until he has only three or four feet from the car. When he did see us, Father Potter, who had seen him coming without slowing down, said to Ray "watch this lad". Gerry said afterwards that when the boy did see us, he just froze. Actually, if he had reacted immediately he could have applied his brakes and swerved his cycle the 18" which would have been enough to miss us. As it was he hit the rear left door with the front wheel of the cycle and his head hit the small triangular window in the door. He did not break the big glass in the door.

They picked up the boy immediately (he was fully conscious) and a passing motorist took him to a general hospital nearby. He had to be taken to a general hospital, and not a private hospital, otherwise he would have been brought here to Salvator Mundi which was closer.

Father Lessard called the police who came. One of them brought Bishop Hoch and myself back to Salvator Mundi, twenty minutes after we left - with our gala trip to Naples at an end.

We got a report later in the evening that the boy was not seriously injured. He has a broken collar bone and will be hospitalized probably as much as thirty days. Thank God, the Mercedes is covered with every possible kind of insurance.

++++++

Father Lessard and Father Potter got back here at about 4:00 PM. Our car was still in shape to drive and we considered for a moment the possibility of still going to Sorrento, but gave it

up. They stayed here for supper and we visited till eight, when the two of them left my room to start back to the Casa.

I had just locked my door preparatory to slipping into pajamas and robe. I wanted to finish my office and retire early after all the excitement. Then there was a banging at the door and Father Potter rushed in saying: President Kennedy has been assassinated and is dying. We turned on the radio just on time to get the words: "The President is dead". We stayed with the radio till after 10:00 and everybody seemed to make my room as headquarters for news. The shock of the announcement and the stories that followed shocked the Europeans living here as much as it did us. We were all relatively in a state of shock.

Probably the most unlikely story that I have heard during the second session of the Council was told to me this noon at lunch by Father Placid Jordan. A friend of Father Placid's (I don't recall whether he was a priest or journalist) and also well known to Cardinal Suenens, called on the Cardinal and said to him: "Your Eminence, there are many rumors floating around to the effect that you are to be the next cardinal secretary of state. Is there any foundation to these rumors?" The Cardinal said, "Yes there is." "It is also stated that Cardinal Cicognani has submitted his resignation because of his age, and that Your Eminence is to succeed him. Is there any foundation to that rumor?" "Yes there is?" "Does Your Eminence expect to be appointed cardinal secretary of state soon?" "That I do not know. His Holiness has changed his mind and does not plan to accept Cardinal Cicognani's resignation. His Holiness has asked me to accept the appointment as under-secretary with the specific task of supervising the process of reforming the Roman Curia. I do not know as yet whether I will accept such an appointment!" This is an indication of the type of rumors that are floating around; this probably is no more unlikely as other stories, but I am sure that few, if any people would take the story seriously.

NOVEMBER 23: Even though I have had my radio on very little today, the shock of the death of President Kennedy is widespread, not only among those from the States who live here, but among everybody. Cardinal Koenig is probably more deeply touched than other non-Americans. He had always spoken very kindly of Kennedy and often asked questions about him. There is real concern about the future of Europe and the rest of the world. People here do not realize that a change in administration can be achieved as quickly in a major nation as it can in the US. Everyone is concerned about the possible impact of Kennedy's death on domestic conditions and foreign relations, but the people here are much more concerned about that detail than most people from the US would be.

That morning a meeting of the US bishops called by Cardinal Spellman for 11:15 at the North American College was delayed a half hour because Spellman himself failed to show up or advise anybody that he would not be there. Cardinal McIntyre was late also; but we finally got started close to 12:00 noon when McIntyre came and presided. The first matter taken up at the meeting, upon the suggestion of Archbishop Boyle, was to issue a statement in the name of the American Bishops in Rome for the Council. Bishop Hannan of Washington came prepared with a draft statement (also at the suggestion of Archbishop O'Boyle) to be giving the NC News Service for release as a tribute to President Kennedy. A number of emendations were suggested from the floor and he ended with an truly excellent statement.

It was then decided that Archbishop O'Boyle, who had an appointment to see Cardinal Cicognani in any case, approach him with the request that the Council Mass on Monday be celebrated by a US prelate for President Kennedy.

Then we got down to the business of carrying out the mandate received in connection with the election of additional members to the various conciliar commissions. In the announcement of this matter it was made clear that the different existing episcopal conferences have a meeting for the purpose designating candidates for positions on the commissions. The different conferences were also advised to collaborate with each other in producing a list of candidates from which the council fathers could easily choose. These lists were to be turned over to the General Secretariat by Monday, they are to be printed and distributed to us on Wednesday, and the election is to be on Thursday.

Bishop Cleven told me this morning that the Germans along with the central European groups had met. They decided that the German speaking group already had adequate representation on the Commissions and therefore would not submit any names of bishops from their areas. They had a meeting with representatives of 17 conferences to agree upon a common slate of candidates and wanted to know whether the US bishops would join that group.

Before the meeting this morning I told Archbishop Krol about this and suggested that we probably had adequate representation on the commissions, since among the elected members ours was the large group of any national hierarchy. (Taking into consideration those appointed by Pope John, the Italians outnumber us.) I suggested to Archbishop Krol that it might be good strategy if we did not submit any other names from among our own group, but accept the group of candidates selected by the 17 conferences Cardinal McIntyre gave over the handling of this matter from the floor to Archbishop Krol. The latter did not go along with the idea of not presenting any names. He felt that we could well use representation on some of the commissions.

At this point Bishop Weldon announced that he and Bishop Primeau, at the informal request of Cardinal Spellman, had been working with this group of conferences and that at least one of them had attended the different meetings. They were to meet with the same group at 5:00 PM today. They sought authorization to speak on behalf of the US bishops in working out a slate of candidates. This authorization was voted unanimously.

Archbishop Krol then went down the line on the list of commissions and US Bishops serving on each. In most instances the group did not suggest any addition to the US membership; we did however suggest an additional candidate to a few commissions and three additional members to the Secretariat for Christian Unity.

On the whole this matter worked out quite well. Archbishop Krol makes a good chairman of a meeting of that type. The request was made that we be furnished with a list of the candidates that would be sent to the General Secretariat as a guide to us in our voting next Thursday. That would be over and above the complete list which the General Secretariat is planning on printing and distributing to us on Wednesday.

Archbishop Hallinan then spoke briefly on the basis of his experience in the work of the Liturgical Commission. He stated bluntly that what we need least is more members on the Commissions. And the election of an additional chairman and secretary isn't going to provide any appreciable relief either. The big problem so far in the Council is the fact that there are no working rules drafted for the commissions. There is a very detailed set working rules for the General Assemblies; but there is nothing to serve as a guide or as a lever to exert pressure in the conduct of the meetings of the commissions. That was the reason why the progress in the Liturgical commission was so slow. Cardinal Larraona, the chairman, just sat on the whole thing for weeks and weeks during the first session. That is the reason why the Liturgical

schema was not promulgated last year, as could easily have been done. In fact we didn't have much time to spare even in the second session because Larraona didn't do anything about getting the Liturgy to a final vote and ready for promulgation until there was pressure exerted from above.

Hence Archbishop Hallinan suggested that we use all the pressure we can in whatever quarters we can to have a set of rules promulgated definitely outlining the procedure to be followed in the work of the commissions. The chairman should be under orders to follow such a set of rules exactly in calling meetings, frequency of meetings, agenda at meetings, etc. etc. The lack of such a set of rules is now the cause of the delay in the Commission on Faith and Morals. Ottaviani is just sitting on it. Even though the Council indicated by a 6 to 1 vote a month ago that it is in favor of including the notion of collegiality in the decrees on the Church, Ottaviani simply refuses even to talk about the subject and will send a schema back to the floor eventually that doesn't even mention the subject. That is why the vast majority of the Council are being ignored and never will get a chance to even have a vote on the subject.

The big difficulty is that the majority of the Chairmen on the Commissions, who are the heads of the corresponding congregations, feel that they are the judges of what can go before the Council whereas their function is simply to implement the will of the Council Fathers as manifested in the debate on the floor and the voting that takes place there. Now they seem to feel in some of the commissions that it is up to them to decide what will and will not be put into the final decrees or constitutions. He had a good example of that in some of the "modi" on the liturgy. In spite of the fact that very large numbers proposed exactly the same "modus" the commission refused to give us a chance to vote, while we did vote on some which had only a very few council fathers backing them.

So I hope that something will be done before the next session to put some order and justice into the proceedings of the commissions as recommended by Archbishop Hallinan.

The question of the vote on the schema concerning communications was brought up by Bishop Weldon. From what he said it seems that the Moderators, especially Cardinal Doepfner, have blocked a vote on this Schema for quite some time. It was supposed to have come up for a vote quite some time ago, shortly after the individual chapters were approved by a large majority. According to Weldon's story, Felici was approached in the matter. He indicated that the General Secretariat was not interfering. He said the difficulty was with the moderators. This sounds as though it might be true because the German speaking block has been quite emphatically opposed to this schema. It is not clear just why their opposition developed after it had been approved overwhelmingly at the time the vote was taken on individual chapters.

On the plea that the council would look a bit silly if, after such overwhelming approval, a negative vote was cast now which could have the effect of throwing the whole thing out of the window, Bishop Weldon suggested that this schema be given a favorable vote.

Bishop Zuroweste then took the floor. He very obviously was quite angry and spoke with considerable feeling. He endorsed what Bishop Weldon had said and then added that no question was raised about this schema until Bob Kaiser, John Cogley and Novak circulated a statement pointing out some very grave defects in the schema at least they considered them grave defects. Another argument used by them was that if at the end of the session the liturgy schema and the communications schema were promulgated, the world press should

concentrate on objectionable features of the communications schema and we would get very bad publicity on this schema and the one on the liturgy would be overlooked.

Bishop Zuroweste complained bitterly about the abuse of press privileges by these three men who gained access to documents which are at least technically sub secreto and used their privileged position to do what in Congress would be considered lobbying. He emphasized that if any newspaper man in Washington used his press credentials in that way they would be withdrawn immediately.

It is a bit confusing! I don't know just what to do. Bishops Weldon and Zuroweste admitted that the schema is a "weak" document; Bob Kaiser called it trivial in content and dangerous in its possible effects. I find it a little difficult to see just why Kaiser and others are making such a fuss; one of their objections at least is being taken care of by one of the "modi" we will work on tomorrow. On the other hand, I do not see Bishop Weldon's point in saying that it would be embarrassing to reverse ourselves after having voted so strongly in favor of the document. But I would certainly prefer to face a temporary embarrassment now rather than have the Church saddled permanently with an objectionable document which would be used again and again by journalists to complain about repressive measures in connection with public media of information and entertainment.

It must also be kept in mind that the opposition stirred up by Kaiser and the others is not the only opposition. Bishop Cleven tells me that the European group is very strongly opposed to the schema; and they had heard nothing about the document prepared by Kaiser until I mentioned it to him. That may explain why Doepfner, according to Weldon's report is sitting on the schema.

Just a final thought: I do not think that Doepfner should be encouraged to prevent such a matter to come up for a vote. Opposition to a schema is one thing; but to use an official position to prevent the council fathers from expressing themselves on a subject is quite another thing. That is exactly what we have been complaining about in connection Ottaviani's tactics in not acknowledging the straw vote on collegiality and refusing to let it come to the floor for a vote.

NOVEMBER 24: Bishop Hoch invited Father Dick Mahowald and Father Gerry Potter for dinner. The four of us made a tape running 1 1/2 hours on the progress of the Council. I doubt whether it will be very effective because I gained the impression that it was a bit too stiff and formal. That could be effective only if manuscripts were carefully prepared in advance; something we didn't do. As it is, I doubt whether the recording will be effective.

Aside from going out for a walk, I spent the entire day here in the room, but didn't even get a nap because we spent over two hours making the tape.

NOVEMBER 25: 74th Gen. Assembly; Card Lercaro presiding; number present 2132 Archbishop Felici announced that on December 4 at 9:00 AM there will be a solemn session at which there will be a formal approval (presume promulgation) of the schemata already approved by the council fathers in General Assemblies. That means we can go home with the liturgy schema and that on communications approved and promulgated. That isn't very much after two sessions running two months each; but at least we can feel happy over the fact that a tremendous step toward updating the Church has been taken in the action taken regarding the liturgy.

On December 3 the Mass at 9:00 AM will be in the presence of the Holy Father. After the Mass, there is to be a commemoration of the fourth centennial of the council of Trent. Cardinal Urbani of Venice will preach the commemorative sermon.

It was also announced that there would be a Solemn Pontifical Requiem Mass for President Kennedy this afternoon at 5:00 in St. John Lateran. There was nothing said concerning our request to have the Mass at 9:00 this morning celebrated by a US prelate for President Kennedy. Apparently that was considered unnecessary so long as there was to be a much more solemn service this afternoon. All of us from Salvator Mundi were at St. John Lateran this afternoon. It was most impressive. The place was so crowded that many had to stand even in the sanctuary. We came late because of the traffic jam in the streets leading to St. John Lateran; as a result there was no more seating room and I had to stand throughout the ceremony and was only about a dozen feet away from the catafalco. The radio said tonight that practically (fere tutti) cardinals were present. The entire apse was filled with bishops and Cardinals. There must have been at least a thousand bishops present. The entire diplomatic corps and Italian Government (what there is of it now in one of their periodic crises) were there. What space wasn't taken in the transept and the entire nave of the huge church was simply packed.

The music was beautifully rendered, but the selection of music was simply atrocious. They sang a requiem which was no more devotional or liturgical than a concert piece. It would have made a tremendous difference if they had invited the schola from St. Anselm's to sing the requiem in the gregorian chant.

We had a few very tense minutes during the session this morning. Cardinal Lercaro announced that Cardinal Tisserant, the senior member of the presidency, had requested the privilege of the floor. He stated that this morning, at several entrances to St. Peter's, a memorandum signed by about 25 council fathers was distributed to a large number of the fathers. This memorandum was not distributed at Porta St. Martha which we always use to enter St. Peter's each morning. I saw the copy which Bishop Holmes-Siedle had received.

The memorandum was very brief. It merely stated that the undersigned (the names actually were typed on the stencil and reproduced) council fathers strongly urged a negative vote on the Schema on communications when that would come up for the final ballot as scheduled this morning.

Cardinal Tisserant denounced this action by these Council Fathers in very sharp terms. He reminded the fathers that this schema had already been overwhelmingly approved when it was proposed for vote by individual chapters. He stated that such action on matters already approved by the vast majority was calculated to disturb conciliar tranquillity, threatens the peace within the Council and utterly unworthy of such a body.

Then a little later when the final vote on the entire schema was coming up, Lercaro announced that one of the council fathers whose name appeared on the memorandum had notified the Moderators that he had never signed anyet vote came within a few more than 200 votes of defeating the schema. I feel quite sure that enough votes were switched as a result of the disclosures made to change the outcome of the ballot.

I was very much opposed to this schema on communications: most of the council fathers felt that it was weak. I voted against it, none the less. But I do feel that the action by the laymen (Kaisers Cogley and Nowak) as well as the distribution of the memorandum at St. Peter's

doors this morning not only caused sufficient reaction to insure passing the schema, but also did much harm to the spirit of the council. I do not feel that laymen, no matter what their capacity should do any lobbying. And no one, council father, periti, or laymen should distribute such material at St. Peter's, inside or on its steps. That is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the rules governing the council. We resent it when the conservative elements apply pressure in an improper manner; why should it be considered fair when the liberals do it?

At the same time, I am entirely in agreement with the practice of having questions discussed in the meetings of the various episcopal conferences and then to have the conferences exchange memoranda, petitions or speakers in order to develop support for a particular point of view or opposition to the same. That is an integral part of developing the thinking of the council fathers. But any undignified tactics should be ruled out.

Nine bishops spoke this morning. Leger and Ritter as well as Bea made excellent presentations of the subject. Some of the Italians and Spaniards just don't seem to be able to grasp the elemental idea of ecumenism. Their attitude is that those not formally in the Church are heretics or schismatics and therefore everything they believe or do must be condemned. This is probably putting it too bluntly and in an exaggerated manner; but their constant repetition of the same narrow view makes one impatient.

At 11:34 Lercaro asked for termination of debate. He apologized for doing this when there still were so many (15) who had asked for permission to speak. But he pointed out that only a few General Assemblies remain for this session and they do want to complete discussion on this schema, including the chapters on Jews and on Religious Freedom. The vote was nearly unanimous. It is a strange phenomenon that in every instance the vote on termination of debate has been nearly unanimous yet there always are enough who still want to talk to make the debate endless if everybody were given a chance.

Cardinal Doepfner took over the chair to begin discussion of the second chapter of the schema on ecumenism. The only Cardinal to speak today on this chapter was Monreal of Spain. He suggested so many changes and additions which, if adopted, would destroy all ecumenical value of the document.

Bishop Darmancier of Polynesia made some very excellent suggestions which would greatly improve the ecumenical value of the schema. One of the problems which we are going to face on the local level is how to arrange the dialogue that is to be encouraged. The question of common prayer, for instance is a case in point. What prayers? With whom? etc.

NOVEMBER 26: 75th Gen. Assembly: Card. Doepfner presiding; number present 2131
The Secretary General read a statement expressing the gratitude of the US Bishops for the condolence expressed to them on the occasion of the death of our President, for their participation in the ceremonies at St. John Lateran last night and for the prayers offered for the President, for our country and the peace of the world.

Six speakers were announced for speeches on Chapter I on Ecumenism.
Thirty-five speakers were announced as having requested permission to speak on Chapter II. Doepfner pleaded with the Fathers to make their talks brief, to avoid repetition and also to have more of them join forces and have one speaker express the sentiments of many. He reminded us that there were only a few General Assemblies for this session. This seemed to have a slight effect on those who spoke on chapter I, but there was no appreciable change of pace on the part of those who spoke on Chapter II.

Bishop Compagnone of Italy laid a good foundation for the speech that Bishop Leven was to give immediately after him. He referred to the Text in Mat 16 "Tu es Petrus" as words which must be kept with the same fidelity and reverence as the form of a sacrament.

Then came Bishop Leven, Auxiliary of San Antonio! (His remarks are well summarized in the report received this evening from the NCWC Office.) Many US Bishops on many occasions have complained of the fact that we are subjected to criticism by prelates from other parts of the world who themselves are at the head of dioceses where the spirit of religion and its practice are very weak; where they haven't even a suggestion of the vigorous parish life that we have. It was inevitable that sooner or later this matter would come out into the open on the Council floor. Well, Bishop Leven spoke out today briefly, but very forcibly. His words of criticism were as bold and to the point as those used by Frings some weeks ago; but there was this difference - Frings mentioned the Holy Office directly while Bishop Leven used the indefinite "they." The nearest thing to identifying anyone directly came when he referred to the speaker that preceded him as an example of what he meant when he said that many have used the text "Tu es Petrus..." as if it were the only text in the Bible.

Bishop Leven appeared at the press conference this afternoon and repeated in English the remarks that he made in the Aula this morning. Bishop Hoch made a recording of the whole conference and got a perfect recording of Bishop Leven's speech. I am sure that this speech will be publicized as much as any other speech made this session with the exception of the exchange between Frings and Ottaviani.

Whether the sharpness of remarks was wise or not remains to be seen. His tone was probably a bit too petulant. I could tell from Cardinal Koenig's reaction at table this noon that he did not think the speech a wise move. I recall that on a previous occasion when one of the Italian bishops had spoken critically of the idea of ecumenism and religious freedom. I made a remark to the effect that the bishops in Italy, Spain and South American would not have to fear ecumenism if they would instruct their people in their religion. Cardinal Koenig quietly said "That is your opinion." This noon his comment on Bishop Leven's speech was that "I don't like to fight." Attendance at Mass is not too good in Austria. One can understand that he and ordinaries in other countries with the same problem would feel sensitive on a subject like this, especially when it is stated so boldly, bluntly and indiscriminately as Bishop Leven did today.

The speech was the sole topic of conversation at the press conference today. Msgr. Bandas said that it was the sole topic of discussion in the meeting of the Commission on Seminaries this afternoon. I am sure it was the principal topic of conversation in most places where Council Fathers were gathered today in large or small groups. Reference was made to it today already in the newscast over the American Forces Network.

After Bishop Leven finished talking there was a spontaneous outburst of applause; but Cardinal Doepfner reacted immediately and said quite sharply "ommitatur plausus". We finally got to the second chapter in this morning's Assembly at 10:45.

Cardinal Gracias spoke first on this chapter. As usual he brought in some proverbs in English - "If we don't hang together we will all hang separately - The world is too strong for a divided Christianity." He also put in a plug for the Eucharistic Congress in Bombay in 1964.

Bishop Himmer of Belgium was the final speaker. He went on and on, even after his bell rang and after Cardinal Doepfner called him to say that his time was up. He was a most eloquent

speaker who knew Latin perfectly. He had at least twice as much in his written speech as he could possibly deliver, so when his time ran out he hurried over his text trying to summarize what he had written. Like one of the previous speakers, he emphasized the need of self-examination to determine whether we are discharging our pastoral responsibilities. Finally Doepfner stopped him effectively by saying "Examen conscientiae valde nobis prodest; sed non in hac aula"

All told there were six speakers today on Chapter I and eleven on Chapter II, with twenty-four left over. No doubt there will be more requests to speak on Chapter II so it is difficult to see how we can possibly get to any discussion of the Chapter of the Jews and the one on Religious Liberty. The most that seems possible now is a vote on those two chapters IV and V of the schema on ecumenism to determine whether they will be acceptable for debate. As I understand the rules, if such a vote is taken and it proves to be favorable, no changes can be made in the same during the period between sessions by the Secretariat.

NOVEMBER 27: 76th. Gen. Assembly; Card Doepfner presiding; number present 2122 Felici announced that the ballot for the election of additional members of the commission and Secretariat for Unity will be distributed today and collected tomorrow at 10:30 along with the attendance cards. He called attention to the fact that the space for signatures was indicated through error; no ballot is to be signed. Only one name is to be put into a given perforated section of the ballots. In indicating the name of the one for whom you wish to vote, print it in block letters, giving the name, surname and name of diocese. This is necessary for proper identification because in many instances there are several bishops with the same name.

They also distributed a printed list of the schedules of candidates submitted by the various groups of episcopal conferences. Along with our usual report from the NCWC tonight we received a list of candidates with the notation that this was being sent at the request of Cardinal Ritter. I presume this is the slate of candidates agreed upon by the group of 17 episcopal conferences at which we were represented by Bishop Weldon and Bishop Primeau. We had asked for such a list at our meeting last Saturday.

Seven bishops spoke on Chapter II at 10:37. Doepfner called for a standing vote on termination of debate. We had started with 47 names on the list, which means that 40 were cut off. It seems that the Moderators are determined to cut debate short after a subject has been exhausted and succeeding speaker do no more than repeat. Cardinal Suenens took over the chair at the beginning of the debate on Chapter III.

Cardinal Bacci was the first to speak on chapter III. He started by saying that the words "et auctoritate!" is to be added after "...vivere in caritate." He seems to be one of those who have no concept of the meaning and purpose of ecumenism!

Bacci returned again to the five propositions on which we voted weeks ago, at which time he claimed he was denied an opportunity to speak. He said his objection was not linguistic, but theological because of dangerous ambiguity in the wording of one of the propositions. After he finished speaking Cardinal Suenens said rather curtly that in the opinion of the Moderators there was no ambiguity or confusion of the terminology.

Maximos spoke next and among other things asked that the Latin Church not have jurisdiction all over the world, including mission areas; but that jurisdiction be given to the rite most suited to the mentality of the people involved. He also vigorously objected to the

suggestion made by some speakers that there be only one code of Canon law for the entire world.

Bishop Dwyer from England gave an excellent speech in which he said he wanted to enlighten some of the Council Fathers, who have few Catholics in their Jurisdictions about "dialogue." There must be clarity as well as charity. He said those who speak so fervently against ecumenism probably haven't got a single Protestant in their diocese! He indicated that in his diocese one half of all marriages are mixed marriages, which gives rise to an entirely different problem than in dioceses without Protestants.

Bishop Holmes-Siedle said that the London Times on Tuesday, November 26 carried a story under bold headlines that some of the copies of the memorandum on "Communications" that was distributed on Monday were confiscated. The story went on to say that as Felici approached St. Peter's that morning he noticed a priest handing out these copies. He immediately ordered the priest to stop; but the latter refused. Felici then summoned a Vatican police who confiscated the copies which the priest had. I have heard no one else refer to this incident and did not notice it in any of the papers, so I have no idea whether the report is accurate.

A week ago I had arranged with Sister Veronica for use of the private dining room today. This morning at breakfast, Sister tells me, that Maximos asked her to set an extra place for a lady who would be a guest at dinner with him. Sister said she was told that this dining room was for clergy only. He then asked to use the private dining room; she then explained that she had promised it to me a week ago and that I have seven guests already invited. He was quite unhappy when the only possible arrangement would be to have him eat in the East dining room with his guest. This room is not reserved exclusively for clergy. Dr. and Mrs. Cushman, an observer from Duke University was here along with Fr. Colman, Fr. Placid, Fr. Yzermans and Bishop Hoch. We made arrangements for an interview with Dr. Cushman to be taped at Vatican Radio on Friday at 4:30 PM.

NOVEMBER 28: 77th. General Assembly; Card Suenens presiding; number present 2192
Announcements: The Holy Father will receive the periti in audience on Saturday at 7:15 PM. The secretaries of Council Fathers on Monday at 7:15 PM and the chauffeurs at 7:15 PM. Felici had considerable difficulty trying to give a Latin equivalent of chauffeur and ended up by using the Italian: "Autista," much to the amusement of the assembly.

Fourteen speakers were announced as having requested to speak on Chapter II under the terms of Art 57, paragraph 6.

Archbishop D'Souza who was second on the list after Frings, announced that in view of the large number announced by the Gen. Secretary, he would not impose on the council fathers but would turn in his manuscript to the general secretary. There was loud and long applause without any interference by the Moderator. While D'Souza withdrew his name but an Archbishop from Brazil added his name to the list after the original announcement so we were back where we started. The venerable had nothing new too say except to make a rather trite exhortation that the sanctity spoken of in the second chapter be practiced to give a good example.

Frings spoke briefly. He began by saying that what has been said at the Council and by the popes convinces him that the ecumenical movement is from the Holy Spirit.

Abbot Benedict Reetz, head of the Beuronese Congregation of the Benedictines made a great plea for a better scriptural basis for theological writings and cooperation with Protestant scholars in scientific scripture study. He mentioned the work being done at Beuron on the "Vetus Latina" which was an international project with Protestant and Catholic scholars working side by side. Abbot Benedict also cited examples of devotions and writings that are excesses and give scandal: e.g. rosary of the tears of Mary's; a book on the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of St. Joseph, etc.

As the speeches on Chapter II droned on with only rarely a new idea, more and more of the council fathers left their places. The three sections directly opposite from my place did not have one third of the seats occupied at 10:45. I was told later that the coffee bars were so jammed that it was scarcely possible to hold a cup of coffee and entirely impossible to move about. The area outside of the aula in the side naves were swarming with council fathers. It seems strange that the speakers could be so thin skinned as not to notice that hardly anybody was paying attention to what was being said. It was quite obvious that the great majority of those who did stay in the aula couldn't care less about what was being said. Even after D'Souza received such enthusiastic applause after relinquishing his opportunity to speak, not one of the other men listed followed his example. All of this is evidence of the fact that we need another review of the technique of conducting the general assemblies. Certainly, they should throw out the rule inserted this past summer (Art. 57 par 6) which allows a man to speak even after the vote to terminate debate has been taken, if he gets five men to endorse his request. It seems strange that five people can thwart the will of 2100! This is not a democratic procedure; nor a rational one, for that matter.

At 11:37 AM we finally got back to the speakers on Chapter III. Patriarch Paul Menuchi the Maronites, Patriarch of Lebanon began by saying: ".. jam pluria a pluribus pleuries dicta et repitita sunt". But he did come up with a new idea and that a good one. He compared the approach to the ecumenical program to the three stages of growth in the ascetic life: Purgative - purges out all past prejudices; Illuminative - experience and appreciation of each others spiritual treasures; unitive - in God's good time will come union of the followers of Christ.

Two different council fathers mentioned to me that the Americans certainly had enough candidates for the new positions on the Commissions. We had thought in our meeting that we were very conservative regarding the number of candidates; but the rest of the world seems quite sensitive on this point. We will see how the voting comes out tomorrow. If few Americans are elected, it will be a rebuke to us; if most or all of them are elected it will be a compliment. The fact that our candidates were integrated in the list proposed by the large group of conferences will mean that many will follow that list down the line from most of the countries represented. In that case, a clean sweep on our part would not be as much of a compliment; as defeat would be a real rebuke. The fathers would have to go out of their way to drop US names from the list, but merely follow least resistance if they have no objection to a candidate that comes from the US

I saw Father Gus Weigel this morning before the opening of the session and had just a minute's conversation with him. He said there isn't a chance in the world of getting a vote on the fourth and fifth chapters of the ecumenical schema. There was a meeting of the Unity Secretariate last night and Cardinal Bea made the statement that he had no hope of seeing that the chapter on the Jews and on Religious Freedom will be presented for vote on the question of whether they would be acceptable as a basis of discussion. If such a vote were successfully taken, there would be no chance of having anyone bury these chapters; but if they do not come on the floor again this session, there is grave danger that both items could just

get lost (accidentally or on purpose, as we used to say as kids) in the shuffle. If that happens, it will be a serious blow to the prestige of the Council and a serious setback from the stand point of public relations. Father Weigel said, "Of course, rumors in Rome can change every half hour; but this one, coming from Cardinal Bea, is pretty close to being absolutely authentic. The manner in which the remaining general assemblies are being cluttered up makes it seem quite sure that Bea is correct.

NOVEMBER 29: 78th Assembly; Card Suenens presiding; number present 2094

The Council fathers were asked by the Pope to consider most carefully the Constitution on the Liturgy and the Decree on the Means of Communication; they should pray for the help of the Holy Spirit before the final vote in the public session next Wednesday, December 4. He made it plain that there is no infallible definition involved in this constitution and decree; infallible definitions can be made only when the text states that fact and the same is made very clear to the council fathers. But doctrines which are not infallibly defined, still are an expression of the authentic magisterium of the Church and should be respected as such. He stated specifically, according to Felici's announcement that these two documents in question are disciplinary.

The "unofficial announcement" was made by Felici that the next session of the council will run from September 14 to November 20 next year - 1964. This is not entirely certain, but practically so; the official announcement will come in due time.

Any important observations on the message to the priests of the world which is planned for publication in the name of the Council are to be turned in to the Secretariat before 2:00 PM on Saturday. This document will be considered on Monday, December 2.

The names of eight speakers on Chapter 3 were carried over from yesterday; twelve new names were added to the list, and eleven talked today, leaving nine names still on the list - plus any new names which will be added.

Bishop Goody of Australia gave an excellent review of ecumenism as it should be practiced in a pluralistic country. His remarks are very apt for us. He made an important observation. We should not merely talk about a sweet list of things which we have in common, but also a clear and friendly statement on those things which can be changed and those which are essential and immutable, e.g. Anglican Orders.

Bishop Helmsing made a strong appeal to change the word "communities" in the title of the second section of this chapter to "churches." We use that term regularly in conversation and we give offense by using another term which is purely a sociological and not an ecclesiological term.

Bishop Helmsing closed his speech with an earnest request in the name of "many council fathers" that chapters four and five be brought to a vote in order to determine their acceptability for debate.

The results of Thursday's vote for the new members of the various commissions was announced. The result was practically a clean sweep for all candidates for the slate of candidates prepared by the group of ecclesiastical conferences with which we collaborated. Several names on that list (six I believe) were not elected. Of the Americans nominated Bishop Leven was the only one not elected. One important change was made in that Bishop Cantero of Spain, whose name was not on our list, was elected nevertheless. That is important because he is very active in the causes of Religious Freedom in Spain. One of the

few voices in that country speaking up strongly in that cause. The press generally refers to this move of enlarging the Commissions as an effort on Paul VI's part to strengthen the "liberal" position in the Council. Whether that will actually be the result, remains to be seen. The big stumbling block is still there, namely, the fact that the presidents of each commission, who are the heads of the corresponding congregations in the curia, are still entrenched in their positions. And also the presidency, which probably was responsible for delaying the vote on the chapters on Jews and Religious Liberty is also still there.

Yet the New York Herald Tribune for November 30 carried a long story on the election of the new members to the Commissions. They had a two column headline on the first page, upper left corner, which read as follows Liberal Bishops Sweep Vatican Council Election. Farther down in the story they did refer to our disappointment in not getting a vote on chapters four and five.

The interim between the second and third sessions will probably be as important as the third session itself. For that reason it is a real break for us that the third session was not put off to 1965. With men like Bea so extremely old, it is important that as much as possible be accomplished while they are still active and competent.

This afternoon I interviewed Dr. Robert E. Cushman, Dean of the School of Theology at Duke University in Durham N C. He did an excellent job in fielding the questions I asked and I am quite sure the tape can be used, not only for a radio broadcast, but also in some meetings with ministerial and student groups.

NOVEMBER 30: Last night I worked till after eleven preparing a story for CAN News on the second session of the Council. This morning I revised it and typed it in order to get it into the mail by noon. There were many interruptions - as is usually the case on "free-days" when there is much visiting back and forth - but I did manage to get the envelope off to the Chancery Office before noon.

This evening I had dinner at home, but went out with Bishop Hoch after he returned from a dinner engagement with his grandnephew and wife. We went to the Kaiser's who were having their final "open house" for this session. Since we got there a bit late, the crowd was no longer so big. But there was no let-down on the gossip concerning the Council. As usual several of the Jesuit Fathers were there. They had a bit of a game going, seeing who could remember the most limericks. Some of these limericks were really witty and highly amusing; others were a bit on the uncharitable side.

Father Lynch, of Vatican Radio was there. He is spending most of his time these days working of the big preparations for the Loyola (Rome Branch) convocation next Monday night at which honorary degrees are being conferred on Gronchi and Segni. The story is that Cardinal Bea was also to receive an honorary degree at the same convocation, but this was vetoed by the Congregation on Seminaries and University Studies! Then some of the Curia people wonder why there is a feeling of bitterness towards the Curia widespread among the council fathers and others. Father Lynch also told me that they had sent invitations to the entire Italian hierarchy, including all cardinals. They had a letter of acknowledgment from Cardinal Siri. The first paragraph of the letter was most polite and complimentary to the Rome Branch of Loyola. But in the second paragraph Siri expressed his regrets that he couldn't come "because the Holy Father is receiving the entire Italian hierarchy in audience at 6:00 PM on Monday. The Loyola convocation is at exactly the same time. This convocation had been scheduled months ago and the invitations sent late in October already. Papal audiences are scheduled

only a few days in advance. This was obviously planned by somebody in order to prevent the Italian bishops from attending. I understood that many of these bishops had indicated they would attend and a large percent of them were expected - no doubt too many to suit those who are not happy over any progress made by the Jesuits in this town. Now, obviously, there will be no Italian bishops present. The conservative Italian press will no doubt mention this fact - without an explanation of the reason for the fact. The political and ecclesiastical conservatives apparently do not want to allow the Italian Episcopate to become too independent or too much influenced by the corrupting influence of "the bishops from the outside." They hate to see any downgrading of the Roman Curia or the Italian Episcopate. They fear that as a result, the Italian people would lose confidence in the Curia and the episcopate and would turn toward the communists in even great numbers than they now do.

Father Lynch also indicated that the "mechanical problems" (feedback from the individual units into the central PA system) in connection with the simultaneous translation system were solved immediately. Phillips sent down an engineer from Holland as soon as the problem was discovered. He diagnosed and remedied the problem in a day or two.

The story is that when the system was ready to go into operation early in November, individual units were offered to some bishops on an experimental basis; but, as the story goes - these particular individuals were not interested since they understood the Latin readily. So the units were neatly wrapped up again and put back into the shipping containers - and there they are to this day! This seems incredible; but the fact does remain that there hasn't been a word said about this equipment since the announcement late in October that they had some mechanical difficulties which must be remedied before the system can be used. Father Lessard told me that a number of the priests at the Casa had been designated as translators, but they are waiting for further instructions, which obviously will not be forthcoming during this session!

Father Lynch also told me that he arranged and actually did play the taped recording of the press conference which took place the afternoon of the day when Bishop Leven spoke in the aula. I heard the recording that Bishop Hoch made; it was a riot. Father Lynch insists that he had that played over Vatican Radio in one of their regular news broadcasts. That I find a bit difficult to believe because I am sure there would have been some repercussions if the tape actually was aired.

DECEMBER 1: Father Potter, George Wertin and Ken Gallagher were here for dinner. Father Lessard was too busy in the audience office to be able to get away. George Wertin is to be ordained on December 17. Father Potter will remain in Rome until after the ordination.

Maximos IV had been having various Observers here for a meal at different times during the last two weeks. The Anglican Bishop of Ripon and Canon Pawley were here on Friday. Today the two Russian Orthodox Observers were here. Both of them are extremely handsome men, quite young and very friendly. I do not believe that the "Secretary" who dogged them at every step last year was here today. At least he was not in evidence.

Bishop Hoch has been getting brief interviews from everybody he could contact recently. The big surprise came when the Russian Orthodox Observers consented to being interviewed. One of them knows enough English to be able to communicate without too much difficulty; the second one knows only Russian. Nothing very significant was said in the interview: but it is a rather notable fact that the man consented to say anything at all for recording on tape.

This evening we were guests at the Casa Santa Maria. Father Lessard called yesterday to say that there would be a panel discussion this evening, with Father Bernard Haering, Father Hans Kueng, Father Francis Xavier Murphy and Bob Kaiser were on the panel. Father Lessard asked Bishop Hoch and myself to be there by 7:00 since he was to take a group out to dinner before the panel. In the group at dinner besides Father Lessard were Bishop Hoch, Father Haering, Father Murphy, Bob Kaiser, Father Tobin, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown and myself. We went to the "Necci", just a stones throw from the Casa. Apparently this is a popular place for the clergy since there wasn't any guest there except priests by the time we left at 8:45. Of course, few of the lay people would show up for a dinner out before 9:00 PM.

I had a most interesting time during the meal, being engaged in conversation with Father Haering who sat next to me throughout almost the entire meal. Father Haering is an irrepressible optimist. He said that he still has hopes that the Holy Father will intervene before Wednesday's close of the session to ask for a preliminary vote on the fourth and fifth chapters of the ecumenical schema. This seems almost a physical impossibility since there is only one real working session left, and that is tomorrow. They never call for a vote on any material or proposition unless the matter has been submitted to us for consideration the day before. That has not been done and therefore I do not see how we can vote on anything tomorrow. But that did not seem to discourage Father Haering!

Haering is on the Commission on Faith and Morals as a peritus. He said that the first chapter on "de Ecclesia" dealing with the Church as a mystery has been completely processed by the Commission. He insists that the chapter, which will be presented to us for debate at the beginning of the next session has been greatly improved over the original draft-schema. As a result of the interventions made during the long debate many ideas were incorporated into the schema by the commission on the basis of suggestions made during the debate. He said that in spite of the many complaints about the snail's pace at which we proceed during those early days of the session (there hasn't been much improvement as yet) the prolonged and deliberate debate was really providential. The concept of the Church as mystery or sacrament as presented in the first draft of the schema was not at all fully matured. It still isn't perfect; nevertheless there has been a very evident process of maturing going on both during the debate of the floor and especially during the sharp debates in the meetings of the Commissions. Father Haering said, with a suggestion of a smile, that such men as Dino Staffa, Ruffini, Ottaviani, Parente were unwittingly some of the "heroes" of this second session because their persistent harping on the ultra conservative line which permits of no possibility of any maturing of our ecclesiology forced the rest of the theologians to reassess and restate their own propositions. This had the effect of making the present chapter on the Church as a mystery a much more finished document by the time it is presented on the floor for vote next September. Among the "heroes" Haering also mentioned the names of Carli and Florit.

In connection with Dino Staffa, Haering reported that in a published article recently the Assessor of the Congregation of Seminaries and University Studies had put into print a statement that went something like this: "The Vatican is the source and the foundation of all power and authority in the Church!" Such a statement seems quite incredible. If he had said that Christ or even the pope is the source of power and authority in the Church one could only applaud the statements but the Vatican!!!! I had never heard of any Vatican official putting the case that clearly and bluntly for the attitude that the Curia really rules the Church and that the Holy Father is merely a front for the Curia. I'm sorry that I have forgotten the name of the periodical in which this statement is supposed to have appeared; I will try to get this information from Haering if I can.

I was very much surprised to hear from Haering that the progressive element in the Commission on Faith and Morals has control at this time to a point where they can get things done in the processing of the schemata that will represent the mind of the Council. He added that with the new members who were elected to the commission they will be in complete control. I mentioned that Ottaviani is still the Chairman and can "sit" on anything which he doesn't like. Father Haering hastened to correct me. He said the question of collegiality will remain in the second chapter on "de Ecclesia" and will be reported for vote in a form that represents a great advance in the process of maturing that doctrine over the stage it had reached at the time when the schema was prepared. The mixed commission appointed in this matter has much to do with this development. He pointed to the fact that the subcommissions are being elected by the Commission, not appointed by the chairman. In answer to my complaint that we need a new chairman more than we need new members, Haering said that it was out of the question to expect the Holy Father simply to change the rules in a way that would eliminate Ottaviani by telling the commissions to elect their chairman and reorganize the entire commissions. He said what we will have is that the new vice chairman and secretary to be elected will be eased into the positions in an active manner by having the Holy Father use the expedient of telling some of the "old" members that they should devote themselves to their work in the Congregations and "just not bother" to go to the commission meetings! Haering furthermore insisted that the election of the additional members was very important because it added some very fine progressive theologians to the commission, especially Abbot Butler of England.

The panel at the Casa started a little after nine and ran to about 10:35. This was clearly a case where the Redemptorists stole the show. Haering and Murphy really gave a good account of themselves. Haering repeated much of what he had told me at table, but also added many significant ideas. He also did the best job in fielding the questions that were asked by the priests who made up the audience - the largest at the Casa this year. They used all the standing room they had.

Hans Kueng very obviously is at a handicap when he speaks without exact preparation of his text because he is not too familiar with the English and frequently gropes for words when dwelling on some technical point. But he did say something of importance when he called attention to the fact that the really top-notch German scripture scholars are not even in Rome, to say nothing about being on the commissions as periti. Aside from that he mentioned that the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem and Biblicum in Rome are not represented among the periti on any of the commissions. He rightly pointed out that this was a serious omission because the work in the Council up to this time has not had an adequate scriptural foundation. He made a strong plea that this be remedied. He admitted that it is true we have a number of German bishops and others who were well exegetes before becoming bishops. We also have Cardinal Bea at the head of the very important Secretariat for unity. But all these men have been out of the field of research for ten or more years, during which time the biblical science has made tremendous strides. This is true in both the Protestant and Catholic field. As a consequence our exegesis is ten to fifteen years behind times in the Council. We are not getting the solid scriptural basis that we should have for the work of the Council. Kueng said he was not trying to detract from the outstanding scholarship of Barnabas Ahern; but we do not have enough like him in the Council, though there are many available in Germany, Jerusalem, Rome, France and the US.

After the meeting I went up to Ray Lessard's room where Bob Kaiser, Hans Kueng and several of the priests from the Casa gathered. We didn't leave till after 11:30 PM. Bob Kaiser brought me back and it was about midnight when I got to bed!

Haering had also mentioned at the table that John Courtenay Murray was very influential in getting the Subcommittee on the dogmatic commission approve the chapter on religious freedom. He spoke at length to the subcommittee. He also told me that Cardinal Spellman was instrumental in getting Murray to Rome as a peritus. He had been excluded from nomination last year, just as some of the people in Germany, Austria and France had been told to stay at home! It could be that before the Council ends, some of the conservatives living in Rome may be told to stay at home!

Bishop Hoch just walked in after running off the tape of last night's meeting. He said the recording was excellent and the other priests who heard it said it was the best tape that Bishop Hoch has - referring to content as well as good reproduction.

Bishop Hoch has gotten into the act in composing limericks. He came up with the following:

There was a Tex bishop named Leven
who carried a six-shooter or seven
Who put in a clip, shot from his hip
and sent hundreds of bishops to heaven!

DECEMBER 2: 79th (and last) Gen. Assembly; Agagianian Presiding; number present 2110
The Mass this morning was celebrated by Archbishop Ngo Din Thuc of Vietnam as a memorial Mass for his two brothers who were slain last month. Among those receiving communion at the Mass was a nephew of the Archbishop's; his father was one of those who was killed by the revolutionaries.

Announcements: We are to be at our stations at 8:30 AM, on Wednesday for the procession into St. Peter's Basilica in preparation for the Solemn Public Session which will close the second session. I plan to go with Bishop O'Connor directly to our places in the aula since he can not negotiate the long walk and many steps involved in the route of the procession. We are to be vested with cope and mitre.

Tomorrow a Motu Proprio of Paul VI is to be distributed containing the grant of many faculties which we use regularly but for which we had to write periodically.

The pastoral message for priests will be delayed because the written suggestions filed by the council fathers were so numerous and pertained to essential points in the document that the matter could not possibly be properly edited before the close of the second session.

Between Sessions the council fathers should send their suggestions on any of the schemata to the General Secretariat before January 31. The schemata which have already been discussed will be sent to the council fathers after the commissions have processed the emendations. The commissions will also work on the schemata which have not as yet been discussed, so that these can be reduced to the essential points and then sent to the council fathers along with the written emendations received before January 31.

During the session this morning we received an Italian pamphlet containing parts of the report which the Holy Father made last year in his diocesan paper while he was Archbishop of Milan.

Fourteen speakers were announced for today but only twelve actually spoke. The other two must have withdrawn their names because the list of speakers was exhausted before 11:30.

Ruffini had to have his last fling for this session; and it was typical. He speaks with a finality that makes one think he believes that there really is nothing that remains to be said after he gets through. The tone of his remarks was not anything like what we would expect in an ecumenical dialogue; I don't believe he has the vaguest concept of what such dialogue really is. He stated our case bluntly and in an extreme form. He gave the impression that he takes the position towards the non-Catholics that "this is what we believe; you had better conform to that position and come into the Church."

Bishop Muldoon of Australia was the second speaker after Ruffini. His tone was entirely different, though his speech will not be accepted with enthusiasm by all Protestants. He wants the 14th to 18th line on page 23 deleted. It gives a false summary of the rise of Protestantism. If those lines stand, we will have war; if they are deleted we can have peace. He also indicated that we can not take it for granted that all non-Catholics are in good faith. Many are like eagles hovering over us asking what they can distort in the Church. Furthermore he deprecated the attitude of some bishops who have said on the floor that we should all get down on our knees and confess our faults and those of our predecessors. They forget the "If" in Pope Paul's speech. He ended by saying "if they feel that way they should go to a good confessor; but they should spare us,"

Abbot Butler asked for special treatment of the Anglicans. They have a scriptural and patristic tradition; and they have been specially active in the ecumenics movement.

Bishop Hengsbach spoke briefly on the schema on the lay apostolate. The commission had hoped it would be discussed in this session. He asked that emendations be sent in writing and the commission will work further on the Schema before the next session.

Cardinal Bea thanked the members of the commission and the council fathers for the work done on the first three chapters on ecumenism. He stated that the only reason why the fourth and fifth chapters did not come to the floor for debate was the fact that there was not enough time. He repeated the statement again with emphasis. He apparently is trying his best to prevent any more feeling developing on this point.

We also received a printed report, signed by Lercaro, of the work of the presidency. This report indicated that the discussion did not drag as badly as many felt during the course of the session. In the report he indicated the number of days devoted to each chapter of the various schemata. Just seeing it on paper made it seem less tedious than it actually was in experience during the past two months.

DECEMBER 3: There was special commemoration of the fourth centenary of the Council of Trent. The Holy Father was present; Cardinal Cicognani celebrated a low Mass; and Cardinal Urbani preached the sermon - an hour and five minutes of it. The sermon had been translated into the major languages and we received them before the Mass; which made it easy to follow the text. The sermon was scholarly, but not particularly effective. He tried to carry water on both shoulders. He did say some striking things about the Council of Trent which would give comfort to those who want to maintain the status quo and those who want to press forward with the program of updating the Church.

After the sermon two lay auditors, the French and the Italian representatives in that group, spoke. Since they spoke in French and Italian, I could not follow their speeches.

Finally Felici read a Motu Proprio of Paul VI in which he granted certain faculties which in the past were included in the quinquennials, and many more for which we had to get special rescripts in the past. There were forty items in this list of faculties. While this will relieve us of much nuisance in writing for faculties or renewals thereof, it did not get to the root of the question. These faculties were "granted" to us; they were not acknowledged as a part of the ordinary jurisdiction of the pastoral powers we have jure divino by virtue of episcopal consecration, which was the central point at issue in the discussion of the relationship of the bishops to the Holy See.

COUNCIL DIARY
THIRD SESSION
1964

SEPTEMBER 14: The formal opening of the Third Session of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican was observed in St. Peter's this morning. If I may back-track a bit, we arrived in Rome at noon on Friday, September 11 on a charter flight via Scandinavian Airlines Service, after a ten hour trip from Chicago. There was fog and rain in Chicago which delayed traffic in and out of O'Hare field about an hour. But once we took off at 8:00 PM CDT, we were beyond the bad weather in a matter of minutes. Cardinal Ritter was on our flight which carried a little over ninety persons, counting in the thirty who boarded in Montreal. Cardinal McGuigan was in the latter group. The flight left nothing to be desired. We were airborne for 9 hours and 15 min. and were on the ground 45 min. in Montreal. Aside from very mild turbulence the last 15 minutes there wasn't a ripple. The food was excellent; the only complaint we had was that SAS served too much too often. Upon arrival over Fumacino airport outside of Rome we were stacked up in a flight pattern for twenty minutes. It seems that one of the landing strips was under repair which threw too much of a load onto the other strip. NCWC had buses waiting for us. In typical Italian fashion, the unloading of the luggage was delayed for a half hour with the result that it was 2:00 PM before we reached Salvator Mundi Hospital.

Some of the familiar faces during the previous sessions are missing at this time. Bishop O'Connor is not here this year; he sent Bishop Hastrich, his auxiliary, instead. Bishop Tracy is ill in the hospital so he and Msgr. Finucan are also missing. Bishop Bona is not coming to the third session at all. But the others, including Cardinal Koenig are back, though the party accompany Maximus IV Saigh is not as last year. Archbishop Nabaab is not well, but is expected to recover sufficiently to permit him to come within a few weeks. Archbishop Hakim is still in the States, but will be here before the end of the month.

This year I am back in the "penthouse" on the fifth floor of the hospital.. We have a rather select group! Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop Hakim, Archbishop Bryne, Bishop Hoch and myself.. Father Lessard is in his old room just next to mine, the room he had occupied while living with the Cardinal.

Saturday and Sunday were very quiet, About all I got done was to unpack my luggage and get the room in working order. There was the usual problem of readjusting to the new time schedule which is seven hours ahead of Fargo time. The hot, humid weather did not help getting used to the new sleeping hours.

Things seem to be unusually quiet. There were some sympathetic editorials in the DAILY AMERICAN and the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, but the wild speculation of last year is pretty much missing in the press this year. This does not mean, however, that there is nothing going on behind the scenes or that there are no wild rumors afloat. I simply haven't gotten around to visit any of the people who might know and are willing to discuss the situation.

The two principal topics of conversation were the Holy Father's announcement that women auditors will be admitted to some of the public congregations and also some of the regular working congregations during this session. Just how much this will mean, remains to be seen; though it seems that in the mind of the Holy Father this is just another touch which he is adding to his program of following through with John's "Aggiornamento."

The other point of great interest was the fact that the Mass at the opening of the third session would have the Holy Father concelebrating with 24 council fathers.

This brings me to the opening ceremony this morning. We were in our places at 8:30 AM. The tribunes for the periti and others were filled and all available space in the transept and the apse was crowded. Only the seats reserved for the council fathers were not filled entirely. At the far end there perhaps were 200 vacant seats.

At 9:10 AM the procession from the Vatican appeared (last year the Holy Father was a full hour late, which made it seem like absolute punctuality when he appeared only ten minutes late this year.) Pope Paul was carried in on the sedia gestatoria. He did not look as tired as he did a year ago.

We had been supplied with the complete text of the Mass for the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross as it was celebrated today. This made it possible for near perfect participation by the council fathers because all of the music for the congregation was given.

The ceremony was beautifully planned and executed. The altar of the confessio had been enlarged so that the 24 concelebrants could conveniently take their places around it. This is a sign of the times that the huge baroque candlesticks and crucifix which had always stood on the altar of the confessio were replaced with a small, plain crucifix and six candlesticks consisting of a plain bowl resting on four short legs or knobs to keep them straight. Furthermore the Holy Father and the concelebrants wore ample vestments (not the conical monstrosities) made of a deep red, plain material with green bandings. This is the first time that Mass was celebrated at the altar of the confessio in anything but the extremely old design of Roman vestments.

The simple but striking pattern of the enlarged altar with its appointments and the vestments of the concelebrants were in line with the whole liturgy performed for this occasion. It is a bit difficult to say whether it was a pontifical high Mass, chanted Mass or low Mass. One would not consider it a solemn pontifical high Mass because there were no deacons of honor or deacon and subdeacon of the Mass, nor was the throne used. It might best be characterized as a low Mass with the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo Sanctum and Agnus Dei chanted by the whole congregation. The preface was recited by the Holy Father and all concelebrants while the pater noster was recited by the whole congregation.

After the Credo the schola composed of students from different colleges and monasteries lead the "Prayer of the Peoples" to which the entire congregation responded. This prayer of the people was simply and beautifully done, much better than I had ever heard it elsewhere. They simply put the special petitions into a form which permitted them to use the chant of the litany with the congregation responding "Te rogamus audi nos." It was most impressive.

It was terribly hot and sultry in St. Peter's. By the time we arrived just before 8:30 the people who had been there much earlier already were vigorously fanning themselves. Just before the consecration Cardinal McIntyre passed out completely - though later reports say he merely was overcome by the heat and had no heart or other kind of attack. The wags already are busy: "The Cardinal just couldn't take it to witness such participation and was completely knocked out by the sight of it!" Dr. Oscar Cullman, one of the Protestant observers also fainted.

The Holy Father spoke about forty minutes after the Mass. He spelled out in surprising detail the question of collegiality (without using the term) and left no doubt but what he wanted greater participation in the administration of the Church by the episcopate. I am sure that his speech will be interpreted as an encouragement to the so called progressive element in the Council. He did not issue any orders to the council fathers. but the manner in which he described the needs of the church today and the review he made at the action of First Vatican in the field of "de Ecclesia" both in the things that were actually defined and those which were not defined because of the interruption of the council, left no doubt in anybody's mind about his wishes to have the Council do something about bringing the episcopate actively into the practical administration of the universal church.

The Holy Father concluded his speech by addressing himself to the lay auditors, the women auditors and the Protestant and other observers, the latter with particular emotion.

The function closed with the profession of faith by the council fathers who were participating for the first time and the announcement that the 80th General Assembly will be held tomorrow beginning at 9:00 AM and that the matter under discussion will be Chapter 7 of De Ecclesia.

Another thought in connection with the Mass this morning: (I would have to find something to criticize!) the only discordant note was the Sistine Choir; they, fortunately, sang only two hymns, but these were in the same baroque style as everything else they do. It is quite obvious that the entire liturgical reform has remained completely outside of the knowledge and interest of the person or persons in charge of the Sistine Choir. This is a warning to us that frequently we will be subjected to this type of music during the morning Mass.

Today there was another evidence that the ultra-conservatives whether they be in the Curia or members of the US hierarchy will not miss an opportunity to prevent expression of the more liberal viewpoint. Msgr. George Higgins, Father Sheerin of the Catholic World and Father Bernard Haering, CSSR were dropped from the press panel which has been sponsored by the NCWC News Service. This action was taken without prior notice to or discussion of the reasons for this summary procedure with the people involved. In their place the following were appointed to this press panel: Father John King, OMI of the Catholic University who is the successor of Msgr. Fenton on the theological faculty and editorship of the Ecclesiastical Review (he was hand-picked and groomed by Fenton himself) and Msgr. George Shea, Rector of the Seminary at Darlington, N. J.

I may be guilty of rash judgment or false suspicion, but it would seem that this realignment of the press panel may have been arranged, if not ordered by the Apostolic Delegate. Actually, it is not too surprising that this action was taken because last year the press panel had been largely responsible for the fact that the press, both secular and religious, were given detailed explanations of the council action which emphasized the more liberal viewpoint. The changes in the panel will certainly have a definite effect on the manner in which the council action will be interpreted to the press. It will be interesting to see what effect this will have on the news stories generally. In this connection it is also interesting to note that Father Bernard Haering was selected by Pope Paul VI to conduct the annual retreat which his holiness made!

SEPTEMBER 15: 80th General Assembly: Agagianian presiding: present 2170
Mass began a half hour late because the council fathers were given their seat numbers. Since those numbers are based on the attendance yesterday at the formal opening, it is quite likely that we will receive new numbers before very long. Many council fathers were not present yesterday. My new number is S362 as compared to D396 last year.

Cardinal Tisserant, the Dean of the college of cardinals, made the opening address, a copy of which was distributed to us later. One interesting point in the address was an exhortation to all concerned to cooperate in bringing the work of the Council to a close during this session, if at all possible. He hastened to add that this was not an order to end the Council with this session, but it was an exhortation to all to expedite the work as much as possible.

At different times during today's Assembly we received a copy of Tisserant's speech as just mentioned; a copy of the Holy Father's encyclical ECCLESIAM SUAM; the new list of the council fathers (this gives the names of all who were eligible to attend the Council as of a few weeks ago, not the list of those actually present); a pamphlet outlining a plan for voting on the schema "de Ecclesia." This is in the form of a "quaesitum" and we will be given an opportunity to vote on the question of approving or disapproving this plan; and a Votum from the members of the Biblical Commission on the scriptural basis for paragraph #22 of this schema which is the heart of the question concerning collegiality.

Felici, as may be expected at this opening session had a number of announcements to make. When we heard his familiar voice we knew that we were back to work again! He emphasized the fact that many weighty questions would be under discussion and would be voted on in this session. For that reason it is essential that the council fathers spend as much time as possible in the council chambers. For that reason the coffee bars will not open until 11:00 AM. He added that no amount of pounding at the door would gain earlier admission for anybody. Felici bolstered that statement with additional announcements during the morning, at one time practically ordering everybody back to his seat. We have had very few occasions when so many council fathers were in their proper places during a regular general assembly. Apparently a continued campaign to keep everybody in the council chamber will be carried on.

The subject under discussion this morning was the VII chapter of the schema "de Ecclesia." Felici announced that four cardinals, one Patriarch (Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem) and nine other council fathers asked for an opportunity to speak. This is the first time during this Council that a complete chapter was disposed of during the discussions in a single day. Every one who asked, was given an opportunity to speak. It was rather remarkable that in spite of all the extras such as announcements, etc. fourteen council father spoke. The program ran over to 12:35. Agagianian reminded us that the assemblies regularly would run to approximately 12:30. According to the procedure followed in previous sessions, at least three speakers would have been carried over.

Felici spent considerable time explaining the program of voting on "de Ecclesia". It is quite obvious that this procedure will save much time. Chapters I, IV and V will be disposed of with a single ballot. II will have a total of five ballots; III which is one of the most controversial chapters in the entire agenda, will have a total of 39 ballots on individual articles and one ballot on the chapter as a whole. VI will have two ballots. The Moderators are to determine how chapters VII and VIII are to be voted.

The pamphlet contains a reprint of the latest form of Chapter III as emended indicating in the margin exactly what is being suggested for vote in each of the 39 ballots on that chapter. Chapter III is the one dealing with the question of the constitution of the hierarchy in the church with specific reference to the episcopate. It seems quite obvious that the council fathers will agree to the procedure for voting that is proposed; what the result of the votes will be in each of the details is something entirely different.

(inserted page, not in the numbering sequence)

I. Ego infrascriptus censeo, ut in capite de Beata Maria Virgine omittatur vox "mediatricis" (in schemate De Ecclesia, pag. 203, lin 4-6). Ratio:

a) Ex una parte in schemate bene et fuse exponitur functio Beatae Mariae Virginis in oeconomia, salutis tum in terris tum in coelo (pag. 202-203), et ita additio vocis "mediatricis" prorsus inutilis est;

b) Ex altera parte tamen vox "mediatricis" ansam praebet aequivocationum in praxi pastorali praesertim, sub respectu oecumenico novas et superfluas creat difficultates, nimis recedit a locutione, biblica, quae soli Christo hanc vocem adiudicat (1 Tim.2,5: unus et mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Iesus), non est traditionalis. Hisce vox in declaratione conciliari emnino vitanda est.

II. Censeo insuper in capite de Beata Maria Virgine non esse addendam mentionem Virginis Tanquam matris Ecclesiae. Ratio:

a) Locutio est hucusque satis rara, nimis recens, non traditionalis;

b) Christifidelibus orientalibus incognita;

c) Praebet difficultates theologicas, cum Virgo sit membrum Ecclesiae;

d) Affert difficultates summas oecumenicas;

e) Et insuper adeo parum constat de sensu determinato talis locutionis, ut a Concilio adhiberi non debeat. Ansam praebet aequivocationum et susceptibilis est male intellectu, ita ut bene et recte intellegatur unaquaque vice subtiles (et in praxi pastorali christifidelibus sat difficiles captu) exigat explicationes);

f) Id quod forte veri sub hac locutione intellegi potest, quoad rem in isto capite fuse exponitur, ita ut additio praefatae locutionis praeterea inutilis est.

(Subsignatio+)_____

(Archi)episcopusin

Remae, die.....mensis Septembris 1964.

The Votum from the Biblical Commission was requested by the Holy Father personally. Since this votum was sought without warning and was requested at a very early date, only the members of the Commission resident in Rome were asked for their opinion. In the Votum it is evident that the majority opinion favored the schema on the Church right down the line. But they did say that the succession of the Popes from St. Peter and the episcopate from the body of the Apostles can not be proven conclusively (non constat) from Scripture alone. They did however, agree that there is a scriptural basis in these texts for the belief that Our Lord wished the apostolic college established by Himself to remain until the end of the world.

In connection with this matter Cardinal Koenig told an interesting story at table this noon. He indicated that Archbishop Parente of the Holy Office now supports the view favoring collegiality! He (Parente) stated that he was convinced of this viewpoint, contrary to his former views in the matter by the discussions that took place in the subcommission on the subject on

which he served. From other sources I heard that there was a rather heated clash between Ottaviani and Parente on this subject. This is a development that no one would have expected - to have Parente on our side! I was over to the Marist Fathers' Generalate for dinner tonight. Father Buckley, the Superior General corroborated this story substantially.

It is good to see that Sanche de Gramont, the correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune is in Rome again this year. He is doing an excellent job in interpreting the work of the Council for his paper, the Parish edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Just how much of his material appears in the New York edition I can not say. He made reference to the change that has taken place in the press panel and expresses considerable chagrin over this development. I am afraid that this move will result in more inaccurate reporting, such as was so common during the first session when an effort was made to keep everything secret.

The press reaction to the Pope's speech on Monday universally is expression of the conviction that His Holiness definitely favored the liberal viewpoint in the matter of the constitution of the church and the question of collegiality even though he studiously avoided use of that expression.

I received the first issue of Council Digest this evening. As was the case last year, it is excellent. It gives a good summary of the speeches and conveys all information concerning the announcements that were made; in matters where we receive copies of speeches that are made or proposals submitted to us, the Digest merely refers to the subject but does not repeat the text which would be useless since we have official copies. It is not surprising that other English speaking national groups are anxious to receive copies of the Council Digest.

SEPTEMBER 16: 81st General Assembly; Lercaro presiding; present 2204
Felici announced that those who wish to speak on religious liberty must submit their manuscripts today or tomorrow.

In spite of the fact that we thought yesterday the end had come to the discussion of Chapter VII of de Ecclesia, three speakers on that topic were announced for today: Cardinal Suenens, Bishop Ancel and . Twenty speakers were announced for discussion of the Chapter on the Blessed Mother, of whom 17 got the opportunity to speak today. It is becoming quite obvious that the pressure will be maintained during this session to get things done quickly. Aside from the fact that Felici makes frequent references to being away from the Council chamber too much, the work is speeded up in every possible manner. The fact that we are already voting on "de Ecclesia" in the second General Assembly of this session whereas we did not start voting on the Liturgy until some weeks had passed during the second session gives evidence of the different attitude being taken by those who are responsible for keeping the program moving. The Moderators are not hamstrung as much this year as they were a year ago.

Cardinal Suenens did not add anything to his popularity with his speech this morning. He devoted his remarks to the question of canonization. He made a plea for simplification of the procedure because the present method of determining who was eligible for canonizations involved such huge expenses that only large religious orders can afford to promote a canonization, whereas lay people and the secular clergy are rarely canonized. His statement that six European countries account for 90% of the canonizations was very much resented, especially by some of the Italian bishops. I don't think that there would be much enthusiasm anywhere for his suggestion that local episcopal conferences be given the task of working up cases for canonizations with merely a final approval coming from Rome. I, for one, would not

become enthused over a plan that would require us to conduct such proceedings on the diocesan level.

Archbishop Roy of Quebec read the "relatio" for the chapter on the Blessed Virgin, preparatory to beginning the discussion of this chapter.

At this point Felici took the floor to announce that we would vote immediately on the proposal for a special procedure in the balloting on "de Ecclesia. This is ballot number 134 and outcome was as follows:

Total ballots 2204; Placet 2170; Non Placet 32; invalid 2.

This leaves no doubt about how the council fathers generally feel about simplifying the balloting on this complex problem as much as possible. Even at that I suspect that it will take ten sessions before balloting on "de Ecclesia" is completed. That is not too much time, if you consider how important the outcome of the balloting is to the future of the Church. What we hope for is not merely a two thirds majority, but practical unanimity in the votes. A large minority opposed to the basic ideal of the schema would weaken our whole position. An experience such as we had with the Constitution on the liturgy is most desirable.

As usual, Ruffini was the first to speak on the new chapter. As usual, he also picked a word to criticize here and there and found fault with the use of some of the scripture texts.

Leger asked for a complete revision (renovatio) of Mariology. He strongly pleaded for elimination of all titles and forms of cult which can not be absolutely and clearly established as valid on the basis of the scriptures and tradition. He also pleaded for a detailed regulation of the cult of the Blessed Mother to eliminate all danger of excesses, if not outright superstitious practices.

Doepfner indicated that in general the schema was acceptable; but he also asked for a complete and accurate statement on traditional Mariology.

Bea was also most emphatic in his statements. Specifically he wants the title of "mediatrix" to be eliminated because of the danger of creating a false impression.. He suggested a declaration on only the basic principles which could be firmly supported by scripture and tradition. He opposed any statement that would mention many details that are difficult of proof. That would be poor pastoral policy and bad ecumenism. Bea, as usual, went overtime, but for the first time he was called on it by the chairman.

At 11:30 Felici took the floor to announce that at 11:45 there would be a vote on the first chapter of "de Ecclesia." He said that those who vote placet iuxta modum could turn in their "modus" tomorrow. Bishop A.M. Charue of Namur made the "relatio" on this first chapter. Felici then reminded the council fathers once more to return to their place for the vote that was coming up. He said: "Velint patres ad sua loca remeare!" The result of the ballot on the first chapter was not announced. We were told that voting on chapter two of "de Ecclesia" would begin tomorrow. Since it will involve five ballots, it is questionable whether that chapter can be completed in tomorrow's general congregation.

We left the council hall at 12:30 sharp.

Cardinal Koenig added another note to his remarks about Parente's change of mind (or heart) on the question of collegiality. Koenig said that when Parente had made his relatio on behalf of the sub-commission, twenty-seven of the full commission membership voted to accept the

relation; one voted against acceptance of the same. Yes, the negative vote came from Ottaviani!

I was over to the Marist Generalate last night for dinner - their place is a few blocks down the street, although the name of the street changed from Viale Murale Gianicolensi to Alexander Poerio just a block down the street. There was a large group at the dinner; many of them live at the Marist house. Practically everybody at the table was either a missionary bishop or superior general of some religious congregations. Father Buckley, Marist Superior General made a most gracious host and the evening was most pleasant.

SEPTEMBER 17: 82nd General Assembly; Lercaro presiding: present 2270

The Moderators announced that anyone who still wanted to speak on Chapter VII would have to get endorsement from 70 council fathers. Apparently debate on that subject is closed. When we get through with Chapter VIII we will take up the Cura Animarum. They provided us with an index showing the different parts as taken from the schema on Bishops and Government of Dioceses.

Felici announced the results of voting on Chapter I of "de Ecclesia" and then we proceeded to the four ballots on different parts of Chapter II. The results of these four ballots were announced before the end of this Assembly, and we were told that the vote on the chapter as a whole will be taken tomorrow. On Monday we will begin voting Chapter III. Just how long that will take is a guess; there will be 40 ballots on this one chapter.

The results of the balloting on Chapters I & III followed the same pattern as the voting on the liturgy last year: viz., it was near unanimous. There was 63 votes iuxta modum on Chapter I. Technically this chapter has been adopted unchanged, but Felici announced that the 63 Modi will be studied. If any are considered worth presentation to the Council, the Moderators will arrange to do so. Tomorrow we will receive a schedule of the voting on Chapter III to allow us to be prepared better for the voting. This is another indication of the division of opinion that is expected on the subject of collegiality. Realizing the importance of the outcome of this subject, they want us to give thorough study to the subject in order to prepare ourselves for the voting.

The Moderators indicated the following deadlines for submitting summaries of speeches: De Divino Revelatione, September 25; De Apostolatu Laicorum, September 28. Written recommendations on other schemas, propositions, etc. October 1. But we were told that summaries of speeches on "De Libertate Religiosa" must be turned in today or tomorrow. Why such a rush in the one subject that is more controversial than any other? One would suspect that they deliberately want to cut down the possibility of preparing properly for that discussion!

In spite of the fact that so much time was taken for relations and announcements, to say nothing of the balloting with its consequent announcements, sixteen speakers appeared on the schema "de Beata." This exhausted the listed of speakers scheduled for this chapter; it could be that a few more will ask to speak tomorrow. If not, the subject will be closed unless 70 fathers petition to speak later.

The discussion of this schema did not stir up as much controversy as had been expected. The majority seemed opposed to mentioning the word "mediatrix" at all. Every body pleaded for strong exhortations to preachers to be restrained in their sermons, and in general asked for careful control of the cult of the Virgin in order to prevent excesses.

Several references were made to the adverse effect that unrestrained statements concerning Mariology would have on ecumenism. Bishop Ancel made an interesting observation: he asked that the vote, when the time comes for balloting on this subject, be practically unanimous; otherwise the public press would surely report divisions of opinion with a consequent harm to the devotion to Our Lady on the part of the lay people.

The weather was uncomfortable again today as the result of a siroco. At the North American College, the auditorium became almost impossibly hot by the end of the meeting this afternoon.

The first meeting of the US Bishops was held. This meeting was called and planned with great haste because of the announcement that those planning interventions on the subject of religious liberty must turn in their summaries today or tomorrow. Bishop Cushing presided at the opening of the meeting just long enough to give us a chance of going through the forms of "reorganizing" which took the form of a simple motion that we should continue as last year with Archbishop Boland as chairman. That was unfortunate because Archbishop Boland does a very poor job and does not seem able to keep things from going off at a tangent with everybody talking at one time.

Father John Courtney Murray gave a masterful presentation of the theological and philosophical background of the subject. He would have been a bit more effective if he had not gone into so much detail; as it was he talked nearly an hour. But nevertheless he was most effective.

Father Connell, CSsR and Msgr. Shea of the Darlington seminary also spoke. Both of these men had absolutely a closed mind and said that it simply was theologically impossible for the Church to make any declaration on religious liberty because it would be in violation of conscience and contrary to Catholic discipline. I felt sorry for them, because in the discussion that followed they were completely ignored and action was taken to arrange for a committee to get busy tonight to select about five bishops, the one or other not US bishops, to make interventions with a view to perfecting the statement that will be debated.

One of the interesting bits of news was received with applause, namely Cushing's announcements that he will talk on both subjects, religious liberty and the Jews.

SEPTEMBER 18: 83rd General Assembly; Doepfner presiding; present 2190

The customary commemorative issue of stamps, at the opening of each of the three sessions of the Council, were issued today for the third session. This issue was related primarily to the special visit of the Holy Father to the Holy Land at Christmas time.

Felici announced that the accident insurance which the Vatican carries to cover all Council Fathers while attending the Council has been renewed. We were told that in case of accident we were to report to the Administrative Secretariat of the Council.

Felici announced the outcome of the ballot on Chapter II "de Ecclesia" as a whole, but did it in such a hurried manner that he apparently received many requests immediately to repeat the announcement. After the next speaker completed his speech, Doepfner announced that the Secretary General would repeat the announcement at the request of many Council fathers. There were only 19 negative votes on this chapter, but there were 553 votes iuxta modum.

Bishop Holmes-Siedle had told me yesterday that practically all missionary bishops, especially those in Africa, were promoting a "modum" to be inserted in this chapter to emphasize the fact that the missionary activity of the Church is a direct responsibility of all bishops. This is one of the primary corollaries of the doctrine of collegiality. This matter is stated quite clearly in other sections of "de Ecclesia" but apparently the missionaries wanted an explicit statement of the principle at this point. I voted iuxta modum and turned in the modus as suggested by Bishop Holmes-Siedle on the form which he provided. Apparently many others did the same. Even though 553 votes were cast iuxta modum, there were not enough to prevent the simple placet votes from reaching a 2/3 majority because there were 1615 placets. Technically the Chapter was approved as is, but Felici indicated that the modi would be studied and a vote authorized if in the opinion of the Moderators such a vote is justified.

The manner in which Felici had read the report on the ballot and made other announcements at this and previous General Assemblies reminded one of a dormitory prefect in the seminary. Especially when he is referring to presence on the Council floor and ask the council fathers to return to their places. he takes a very patronizing tone of voice.

Cardinals Frings and Alfrink and Bishop Laureano Castan Lacoma, of Siguenza-Guadalajara in Spain spoke what could be the last words on the schema "de Beata." Bishop Lacoma made some sharply critical remarks about Bishop Mendez', of Cuenivaca, remarks in his closing speech yesterday. He accused Bishop Mendez of being flippant and irreverent in some references made to Our Lady.

All of those who spoke today on the schema on the Blessed Mother had a supporting petition of more than 70 bishops; otherwise they could not have spoken. Alfrink stated that he spoke for 124 council fathers from various nations.

Doepfner announced that portions of the schema "De Pastoralis Episcoporum Nunere" had already been discussed in the second session. These are no longer open to discussion; hence those speaking on this schema must confine themselves to those paragraphs which were not contained in last year's draft. We have received a schedule showing exactly which items are still to be debated.

Thirteen council fathers spoke today on the pastoral responsibilities of bishops. Four other speakers who had been announced did not get a chance to speak today.

Bishop Pildain of the Canary Islands made the headlines in a very impassioned condemnation of interference on the part of civil authorities in the appointment of bishops. Bishop Holmes-Siedle explained that there was a personal reason for Bishop Pildain's attitude of bitterness towards civil authorities. He had been kicked out of Spain by Franco and relegated to the Canary Islands! At the same time Cardinal Doepfner keeping on the line he had followed last year of holding speakers strictly to the topic under discussion, Bishop Pildain objected that his remarks are based on statements made by the relator and therefore were pertinent. A minute later Doepfner interrupted again and asked Bishop Pildain to bring his speech to a close. The latter was in no great hurry to comply, but continued his speech for some time.

An amusing incident occurred when Cardinal referred to Bishop Foley of England as Folai, not only once but each time he pronounced the name! Not only that, Doepfner called Foley also for talking beside the point. This interruption was very much to the point because Foley was really preaching a sermon on pastoral theology, making a special plea for priests to know their

people better. What he said was good, but it actually would be in place only in a class of pastoral theology or a clergy retreat.

Archbishop Lucey spoke very well on the subject of the CCD. But here again Doepfner interrupted to say that the subject was *praeter rem*. Lucey explained that religious education was a basic pastoral responsibility. A few sentences later Doepfner interrupted again, so Lucey merely said *dixi* and sat down. It is too bad that Lucey when asked by Doepfner to indicate just which article he wished to amend and to which his remarks applied did not answer that He was speaking on article #28, page 18, lines 3 sqq of the schema. That article enumerates the basic pastoral responsibilities and mentioned religious education among others. That is exactly what Lucey was talking about, but he did not relate it to this particular article. He merely wanted to get in a good plug for CCD. He had not paid any attention to the specific point which he was trying to amplify.

This exemplifies the method of procedure in council debate. The schemata are like bills introduced into a legislature; they are the basis of the discussion. Any remarks made in debate should be related to a given article in the schema under discussion. Hence Archbishop Lucey should have started by asking that Art. 28 should be amplified to include a specific exhortation to follow the orders of St. Pius X and successors to have the CCD organized in every parish.

SEPTEMBER 19: This was the first free day of the session, and it was welcomed with enthusiasm. Because of the sultry weather, attendance at the General Assemblies took a great deal out of us, added to which was the fact that most of us missed considerable sleep. Hence the day was spent in making up sleep and getting a few letters written.

News stories on the Council today mostly stressed Bishop Pildain's speech about interference by civil authorities in the appointment of bishops. In the news roundup over AFN at 6:00 this evening there was a "special report" from CBS in Rome which was an excellent summary of the first week of this session. It is amazing how much detailed knowledge the reporter had on what takes place in the council chamber. He mentioned the details of the voting, along with the fact that there are 39 propositions in the third chapter of schema on which we would vote. He must have seen a copy of the schedule for this voting extending over the next seven General Assemblies which was handed out to us yesterday. The reporter correctly pointed out that in the vote on these propositions we would be deciding the crucial issues in the whole schema of "de Ecclesia."

Went downtown this afternoon with Father Lessard to inquire about a reliquary for Dr. Fortney. Lelli Gary had nothing suitable in stock but has some new designs on order. It will take two weeks to get some information.

During these days the States seem far away, with no contact except through the papers and news dispatches. But one thing still holds my interest; that is the fight the Yanks are making for the championship. As of this morning they were on top. I hope Yogi Berra makes it this year!

SEPTEMBER 20: This is the sleepest day I have yet experienced in Rome at any time. It seems simply impossible to get caught up on sleep to a point where I can get along with the seven or eight hours that are normal for me. And, sleepiness is simply overpowering: you can not resist, no matter what the time of the day or the pressure of work! Fortunately this is Sunday. Even with two extra naps I found time to do a bit of reading. The September 26,

1964 copy (Why do magazines insist on dating their issues from five days to a week ahead?) of AMERICA came in last night. John Cogley's Roman Diary giving his impressions of the second session has a good bit of humor. Bishop Henry told of the nun in a parish where he stayed for a while after being consecrated a bishop, who carefully taught the children to say "Bless me Your Excellency, for I have sinned." It was inevitable that before very long it came out: "Bless me, your hex on me, for I have sinned". Cogley used the story to illustrate "the baroque folderol with which the hierarchy burdens itself."

Later in the same issue Father Charles Davis, S.J. of St. Edmunds College, Ware in England devotes a brief column under "Theological Asides" to the same subject. He says "at a time when the President of the United States can exercise his office in a business suit, a local bishop should be able to make his authority visible without adopting the dress of a feudal lord of imperial court dignitary." Father Davis makes a point. He said it is rather incongruous that there should be such a fear of having democracy also being allowed that makes its imprint on the externals of the Church just as happened during her course through the imperial, feudal and monarchical societies of the past. At first when suggestions for doing away with the old feudal trappings, not only in the Vatican where they are retained in their entirety but also on the local level where the Bishop still wears the cappa magna and other relics of feudalism, I reacted quite negatively. But the more I read about it or think on the subject the more I am coming to the conviction that we can well do without these things. I am at least all for doing away with kissing the ring of a bishop by anybody at any time. Furthermore, why should the ring, even be necessary since, unlike most feudal lords of the past, bishops have learned to write enough to sign their own names and do not require a signet ring any longer! We are a hierarchical organization and it is quite necessary that means be adopted in every age of the Church to have our people understand the nature and mission of the hierarchy. That we should do in terms that are intelligible to each generation, not in maintaining relics of a past that is dead. Our people simply know nothing about the feudal age except what they see in the movies; and there the feudal lord is more often depicted as a tyrant than as a channel of a benevolent, God-given authority to teach the word of God and govern the Church of Christ.

SEPTEMBER 21: 84th General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; present 2220
The council fathers were really "shook" when Felici announced the death of Archbishop Gawlina. The Archbishop had spoken a few days ago and was scheduled to speak again this morning. At the end of the Assembly Felici also announced the death of Archbishop Leo Nigris, Philippino and secretary general of the Pontifical Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

Since the seat numbers issued last week were based on the attendance of council fathers at the opening session (many were absent) we were assigned new numbers today. Mine is now S372. For once I have an end seat; my neighbor to the right is Bishop Blomjous, a White Father from Africa. He is a Hollander and a bishop in South Africa. He is the chairman of the episcopal conference in his area, and is reputed to be a brain.

Bishop Blomjous, who speaks both English and German very well, confirmed the rumor Abp. Edelby brought to Salvator Mundi this morning that fifteen Italian Cardinals presented a signed petition to the Holy Father asking him to withdraw the III Chapter on "de Ecclesia" from the floor in order to prevent voting on it; or at least to postpone the vote for a while. Bishop Blomjous version was that there actually were seventeen signatures. It is hard to understand that anyone would think that the Holy Father could seriously give any consideration to such a proposition in view of the strong statement he made in his opening address on September 14. He would lose face before the world and would destroy most of the power for good which the

Council has. As it turned out, the Holy Father completely disregarded the petition, if it really was presented, because we proceeded with the voting on schedule during this morning's assembly.

Cardinal, Dean of the college of cardinals and head of the Presidency reminded the Cardinals that penitential garb is to be worn on the Ember Days. He also rebuked the periti, all Italian, for distributing propaganda material on the subject of collegiality before the opening of the general assembly in St. Peter's square.

It was also announced that there would be a special ceremony in St. Peter's on Wednesday morning in connection with the translation of the major relic (head) of St. Andrew the Apostle. On that morning the General Congregation will begin only after this ceremony.

Announcements completed, we proceeded to the relationes in connection with the III Chapter of "de Ecclesia." Bishop Franic of Jugoslavia, (Zagreb) read the first relatio. It was a very earnest, almost desperate effort to discredit the whole doctrine on collegiality. He rehashed every argument which had been adduced by the opponents of collegiality. Actually he is a very persuasive speaker; his voice is perfect for such a large hall. All during the relationes, especially those of Franic, Koenig and Parente, the place was absolutely quiet with an almost complete absence of the usual background noises which can be very annoying when the council fathers have become bored by the speeches. Nobody was bored this morning; at least not till the relationes were over. It was quite obvious that at the moment Franic made some impression on many and a deep impression on some. Apparently Franic had sized up the situation realistically enough to know that most council fathers were already committed to their position (I wish I could feel sure that the commitment of the vast majority were in favor of collegiality) and that no matter what he said, or what anybody else after would say would have the effect of swinging many votes. Franic summed up his position in a way that led one to believe he was aware of a weakness in his overall position. In any case he inserted into his text of the relatio a statement something like this: The difficulties can be overcome through the addition of the following declaration: It is not the mind of the Council to determine disputed questions, such as those presented in this report; since in practice we all agree that the Pope can call for collegial action if he wills and that without him there can be no such action, it is not necessary to go into the disputed questions, which are only theoretical.

Cardinal prefaced his reading of the relatio with the statement that the report of Bishop Franic is not a "minority" report. The mind of the theological commission on these reports is that the four relationes constitute one report giving the pro and con of the complicated subject.

Koenig did an excellent job in reading the printed text of the relatio. It was very effective in balancing the picture after Bishop Franic. Archbishop Parente's relatio was awaited with more interest than any other. I am sure that none of the council fathers, including Parente himself, had ever expected to see him espouse the so-called liberal cause, especially on a subject that has so many implications, shall I say, poses so many threats to vested interests of the Curia, so eloquently and effectively. He started by saying that he is not speaking in his capacity as Assessor of the Holy Office, but as the simple archbishop of Thebes. He added: *Sum vox clamantis ex deserto, sed spero non in deserto.*"

Parente disposed of Franic's proposal above by citing Pope Paul's allocution on the opening day of this session at the point where the Holy Father committed the council fathers to the serious task of settling the question of the nature and function of the episcopate. "The Council

must discuss and, with the help of the Holy Spirit, decide the constitutional prerogatives of the episcopate." Archbishop Henriquez completed the relations - after 11:00 AM.

Much to the surprise of all of us Felici managed to get four ballots taken on Chapter III before the close of the general assembly, and he announced the results of two of these ballots. I was very much interested in the outcome of these ballots which were on the least controversial sections of the Chapter; they might give us a clue as to what we can expect when we ready the really basic propositions tomorrow (Felici announced that tomorrow there would be eight ballots to take care of - the two which could not be taken today and the six assigned to tomorrow in the original schedule of balloting. Of the four ballots taken today, only two were reported back; in the first there were 2166 placets to 53 non placets while in the second there were 2206 placets to 191 non-placets. This doesn't give us much of a clue as to what we can expect from the remaining ballots. At this point I am not too optimistic about the outcome; I may be badly mistaken, but it seems to me that if we can carry the day and get a 2/3 majority, it will be by a very slim margin.

Five speakers got a chance to talk on Chapter II on the pastoral duties of bishops. Leper made a plea for a much better understanding of the nature of pastoral responsibilities in our day. The schema is thinking too much in terms of the problems and civilization of the past. He pointed out that men of this generation are very different from those of the recent past; they are creatures of a technical age and can not be dealt with in terms of the past. His speech would be a good review of pastoral theology for the modern bishop since he covers the whole field from preaching the word of God to organizing the chancery office.

Cardinal Confalonieri spoke only briefly to suggest that the national episcopal conferences be more responsible for the immigrant peoples and transients (sailors) in their jurisdiction. They, being on the spot, would be best situated to know what the needs are.

The regular weekly study meeting of the US bishops has been moved up to Monday evening, beginning today. There was a good attendance considering the short notice. Archbishop Gonzales of Cebu in the Philippines was given the floor for "a few minutes" which turned out to be 17 minutes. He issued an invitation to US bishops to attend the fourth centennial of the coming of Spanish missionaries into the Philippines. If he had taken only two minutes he would have been more effective; as it was he insisted on giving; the whole history of the Church in his area before extending the invitation!

Bishop Primeau reported that the "International Committee" on the Council was greatly concerned about the various decrees and statements such as religious, Catholic schools, etc. which are to be voted on without debate. The feeling is that there should be some discussion on these matters before a vote is taken; if that would prolong the Council too long, then simply drop the items rather than have a final document that is unsatisfactory. He wanted authority to say that the US bishops would go along with that proposal; but we were reluctant to make such a haphazard decision. It is to be brought up at a later meeting after we have had time to study the matter in greater detail.

Archbishop Shehan reported on the committee to coordinate the presentation of the matter on religious liberty. The following will talk: Cushing, Meyer, Ritter, O'Boyle, Alter, Primeau, Hannan, Carbery, Wright and Shehan. It is quite obvious to me that they will never manage to get this many US bishops into this debate. But they are proceeding in an orderly manner to get a coordinated presentation made, in writing at least, if not all are given the chance to speak.

There were two excellent presentations made of the subject of collegiality. The first was by Father Sullivan, S.J. (the same who spoke to us last year on charism in the Church) just recently appointed the dean of the theological faculty at the Gregorian U. He amplified the relations made on the floor of the Council this morning and provided us with refutation of the points Franic had raised.

Father Kerrigan, an Irish Franciscan who is a member of the Biblical commission told us the whole story of the "Votum" which Pope Paul through Felici's office had requested of the Biblical Commission resident in Rome on the scriptural basis of collegiality.

The presentation which each of these men made of their topic was excellent. I can not repeat all they said; but they certainly cleared up many points which had given rise to some doubt or hesitation on the subject of collegiality from the doctrinal point of view. Cardinal Meyer added some remarks at the end of the program to round out a few points in the presentation. There was no discussion because the time limit for the meeting had passed, but everybody left with the feeling that he will be in a much better position to make up his mind on the points that must be voted tomorrow.

SEPTEMBER 22: 85th Gen. Assembly; Doepfner presiding, present 2248
Felici had a different version of the "EXEANT OMNES" this morning, viz.: FESTINENT OMNES EXIRE. His tone of voice was such that it meant "get the hell out of here" as clearly as the other formula.

The council fathers were much moved by the announcement of the death of Bishop Jesus Enciso. He died in his home diocese of Mallorca in Spain. He had been most active in the Conciliar Commission of the Liturgy and made the relatio on the final draft of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy last year.

The discussion of the schema "De Revelatione" will be taken up in three parts:
1) Introduction and Chapters I and II; Chapter III; and Chapters IV, V and VI.

The discussion of the declaration on Religious Liberty will begin tomorrow. One speaker remains on the list of those who were to speak on the Pastoral Office of Bishops. To this one will be added any council fathers who have a petition signed by 70 others requesting the opportunity to speak. Discussion on Religious Liberty will follow.

The two ballots on the schedule left over from yesterday and the six assigned to this date were taken care of in a remarkably short time. The final ballot of the day (the 12th on the schedule for Chapter III) was cast at approximately 11:00 AM. This meant that it took on an average little more than ten minutes to complete each ballot, from the time the blank ballot was distributed, marked by the council fathers, collected again by the ushers, processed in the "machine room", the results certified by the tellers, and turned over to Felici for publication. The results were published at intervals, with the last three announced just before the close of the Assembly.

As the meeting progressed it became quite evident that a tension was building up. This reached its climax as the 6th ballot of the morning, (the 10th on the schedule for Chapter III) was taken. This dealt with paragraph #22 which consists of a direct statement of collegiality as a divine institution, which was the crux of the whole chapter around which the other articles were built. As it happened, the 8th ballot on the schedule for this chapter had 328 negative

notes. The result of this and the following ballot were announced before we actually voted on the 10th ballot. It seemed as though the 10th ballot would very probably receive many more negatives, possibly enough to defeat it.

As it turned out, these fears were entirely unfounded. Actually the number of negative votes on the 10th ballot were 322 out of a total of 2243, representing just a tiny fraction less than 90% favorable vote; the 11th ballot had 313 out of a total of 2213 or 85.76%.

There was no outbreak of applause when these results were announced, but you could very obviously feel the relaxation of the tension which had built up during the voting.

When ballot #5 was announced by Felici there were no invalid ballots. His comment was: "*prima vice erat nullum votum nullum.*"

It is interesting to note that the results of the balloting today indicated a 9 to 1 majority in favor of collegiality in the key ballot as compared to approximately 7 to 1 majority on October 30 last year when the "straw" vote on the same subject was taken. Many had felt that many of those who voted for collegiality last session would vote against it this year because of the influence of the strong campaign carried on against including any statement on the subject in the constitution on the Church at this time. Actually it seemed that as in the case of Parente, the more the matter was studied the more became convinced not only of the truth of the doctrine but also the necessity of making a clear-cut statement at this time.

I am also convinced that the address of Pope Paul on September 14 also had much to do with the increase of the favorable vote. He quite pointedly asked for a clear and definite outline of the nature of the episcopate and its relationship to the primacy of the Pope. He wanted a completion of the work begun in Vatican I on this whole subject. In fact he referred to the fact that this was not done in Vatican I because of the abrupt ending of that Council because of the political turmoil.

While the balloting was going on there was a steady stream of speeches, 19 in all, representing all the names announced at the beginning. I did not pay too much attention to the speeches, but in looking over the summary in the COUNCIL DIGEST for today I noted that many fine things were said about the relationship of bishop to priests in the pastoral work in a diocese. It is an indication that the idea of collegiality will inspire much of the renewal in the programs of the various dioceses set up to achieve the renewal of John XXIII spoken so often.

SEPTEMBER 23: 86th Gen. Assembly: Suenens presiding; present 2254.

The Holy Father carried the relic of St. Andrew (Head in a beautiful silver case) and placed it on a pedestal before the Council altar. Pope Paul remained for the Mass celebrated by Cardinal Marella, the Vicar of Vatican City. After the Mass, Cardinal Koenig addressed the Council in the presence of the Holy Father. It was very well done; the Latin was flawless, the delivery excellent. The Cardinal used the occasion to make conciliatory remarks to the Orientals because of the meaning behind the gesture of returning the relics to the East from which it had been taken in 1462.

Felici had another new formula today to tell unauthorized persons to leave the Council aula: *Exeat omnes cum omni festinatione!* For the first time that I can remember, the photographers did not leave, but waited to take some pictures (still and movie) of Bishop Greco as he spoke and also of others. Apparently Felici did not notice this till later in the program; he told them in no uncertain terms to get out.

When the Holy Father left after Mass, he walked very quickly down through the center aisle to the first exit on the left where he disappeared in a very informal manner. He seemed to look less tired than anytime I saw him since the last session; his step was firm and he walked so fast that Dante and Capoferri could hardly keep up.

There were only two speakers that remained on the list for the schema on the Pastoral Duties of Bishops. Bishop Greco spoke in his capacity as the head of the CCD in the US. After Archbishop Lucey's experiences he did not take the chance of being told that the CCD was not pertinent to the chapter! He pointed out the fact that the schema in Art 12-14 and 17 deals with the essential phases of religious education, but passes over in the silence the fact that we need teachers. Through proper organization of the CCD this defect can be remedied. It strikes me as rather strange that the CCD is not so much as mentioned in the schema and no one except Lucey and Greco mentioned the matter. That is a symptom of the failure in so many parts of the world to provide a good program of religious education. That is at the root of the problems of the Church in this generation: there has been no adequate teaching of religion in the greater part of the Church for so many generations in the past.

There was some murmurings in the background and some lifting of eyebrows when Bishop Gonzales of Spain spoke on the nomination of bishops, especially when he manifested that the schemas should provide the following statement: In the selection of bishops, papal primacy and Oriental traditions remaining intact, 1) the competent episcopal conference should intervene 2) the diocesan presbyterium should be heard and 3) the opinion of the laity should not be over-looked! The good bishop has a point; but I am sure that any effort to implement such a plan would be difficult; it might create more problems than it would settle.

We now went over to the discussion of the draft-statement or declaration on Religious Liberty. Bishop De Smedt read the relatio. By comparison with the magnificent oration which he gave last year when the original document on that subject was brought to the floor as a chapter on ecumenism, the reading of the relatio did not create much of a sensation. There was some applause, but very weak compared to the ovation he received last year. It is easy to understand the difference because the relatio this time did not have to go to such great lengths to sell the idea of making such a declaration now. By this time the lines are pretty well drawn; the majority is for such a declaration; a very strong minority is determined that no such declaration is made, if one is made, it should be along the narrowest possible legalistic lines.

The big guns were really wheeled out when the list of speakers was announced: Ruffini, Quiroga, Leger, Cushing, Bueno, Meyer, Ritter, Silva Henriquez, Ottaviani among the Cardinals and Parente leading off right after Ottaviani.

Ruffini set the tone for the opposition; he was as rigid and inflexible as ever. The title of the declaration, while possible open to a correct interpretation, sounds bad. There is only one true religion; other religions can not be admitted. His argument can be summed up by saying: Truth is one, therefore only one religion is true; and again therefore, it alone can be free - it seems as simple as that to Ruffini. Since he lives in such a completely closed world, one can understand how he can insist on such a narrow attitude. He particularly attacked the idea that a State is not qualified to judge between different religions and therefore must treat them all alike without preference for any of them. He insists that the State can show special favors to one while merely tolerating the others. Ruffini was more intemperate in speech than usual.

Quiroga of Santiago in Spain was very critical of the declaration because it failed to give the full, undiminished Catholic doctrine of the Church. It is just about what is to be expected of the

one school of thought in Spain. They expect a statement to be tailored to their conditions in Spain. The ecumenical tone of the document, he claims, just does not fit their circumstances.

Cardinal Leger supported the declaration very emphatically. He did suggest that Art 26 should be rephrased and the whole basis of religious liberty delineated in such a manner as to make it comprehensible to non-believers. If they do not grasp the subject as vindicating man's dignity in the area of the exercise of his reason, the argument will have no cogency for him.

Cushing spoke in his usual style, which was surprisingly effective in such a large aula. I suspect that his text was prepared by or at least in consultation with John Courtney Murray. He made much of the fact that a declaration on this subject is eagerly awaited by the world, Catholic and non-Catholic, and the Church would do well to become an active protagonist of religious liberty. He asked that the doctrinal question involved should be stated even more clearly in order to avoid ambiguity. There was a great deal of applause when he concluded. He did run a long time over the allotted seven minutes, but fortunately Suenens did not interrupt him. There were others also who exceeded the time limit.

Bueno of Seville in Spain had a good point when he said that the present introduction, written when this was a chapter in the draft on Ecumenism, should be dropped and replaced by a solemn declaration proclaiming the religious freedom of all men by reason of their vocation and the natural dignity of the human person. But in his attitude, while not as reactionary as Ruffini, et al, he nevertheless to have the state repress the propagation of error over public media of communications. Teachers of error may have a right to preach their religion to those who want to listen, i.e., to those who attend their churches, but they should not be allowed to preach over the air and thus force their teachings onto those who are not interested.

Ritter is afraid that by uniting the declaration of religious liberty as a natural right of all men with the argument in defense of that position weakens the whole thing because it may give rise to endless argument. The nature of a declaration is simply to declare and not to prove. Ritter wants a shorter and simpler declaration which merely states the truths without lengthy argument.

Cardinal Koenig spoke of Cardinal Meyer's speech as being elegant. Meyer was well received and Koenig's description is certainly accurate.

Silva Henriquez of Chile said exactly the opposite of what has been said by the men from Spain. They claimed that this declaration would encourage indifferentism, He said definitely that it would not. He left no doubt but what he and the 58 bishops in whose name he spoke would work enthusiastically for a declaration like this. Ottaviani said just about what could be expected. He said bluntly that it is an exaggeration to say that anyone who sincerely obeys his conscience is to be deemed worthy of honor "Hoc non intelligo! "

Cekada of Yugoslavia interjected a new thought: a special commission should be appointed to petition the UN in writing to restate the obligation of nations to respect religious freedom and to spell out exactly in which fields such liberty must be granted – public worship, religious schools, press, etc.

Parente pulled a real fast one today. He actually was in line to be the first speaker after the cardinals. But things worked out in such a manner that he would have been the last one to speak before adjourning the assembly. When he was called, he asked to be excused until tomorrow because he was not feeling well. I suspect that he did not feel so well over the

contents of his prepared speech after hearing what has already been said and he therefore wanted an opportunity to redraft his speech to meet some of the things said by this morning's speakers. At the same time, by being on the program early in the day he will have a better audience! I could be doing him an injustice in this suspicion but there were many others who harbored the same suspicion.

SEPTEMBER 24: 87th Gen. Assembly; Suenens presiding; present 2228

It was announced that on September 30 the votes will be taken on the whole of chapters III, IV, V and VI of "de Ecclesia" will be taken. Koenig spoke with some feeling on religious liberty. He approves the schema in general but insisted that we can not remain silent on the subject of the complete disregard of the rights of conscience in communist countries.

Cardinal Browne disagreed with the whole schema. Parente quite obviously had done his manuscript over after yesterday's session since he referred to Ritter's proposal of yesterday to eliminate all controversial or disputed topics.

Bishop Pohlschneider praised the schema and said that if the same is adopted it will be regarded as a truly historic document. But he insisted that the right of parents to control the education of their children is a necessary element of religious liberty and should be specifically mentioned; the brief reference in Art 29 is not adequate.

Father Buckley, Superior General of the Marist Fathers criticized the manner in which the concept of a divine call is used as the basis of religious liberty. He said that is an incorrect use of the idea of the divine calling.

Bishop Primeau directly criticized those who say that this declaration on religious freedom is an encouragement of religious indifferentism and simply do not understand the subject under discussion!

Of the twenty speeches made today, eleven took an outright contrary view. The arguments of all were very much the same and the proceedings became quite dull as time went on. Among the other nine speakers some were a bit lukewarm in supporting the schema, though they all agreed that some such statement must be made. One of the points that disappoints me is the fact that the Germans remain so quiet. So far only Bishop Pohlschneider of Aachen has spoken at all; it is true, he supported the schema emphatically. I asked Bishop Clevin why none of their big men had spoken out; his answer was that this "question presents no problem to us in Germany." Such a statement seems quite incomprehensible to me coming from a German who is very intelligent and who was old enough to know and must still remember the Nazi persecution of the German Church during Hitler's times. If Cardinal Koenig saw fit to speak out, I don't see why Frings and Doepfner could not see their way clear to do so. I am sure the German group will be looking for our help again when the discussion of the revised schema "De Revelatione" comes up for discussion and vote. I wish they would understand that religious liberty is as important in some parts of the world as "De Revelatione" is in others.

The last ballot cast today was #24 on the list of the ballots in connection with Chapter III, and it was completed at exactly 10:55. Immediately thereafter there was a grand exodus again. Up until this time practically everybody had remained in his place as is indicated by the fact that; in the first five ballots today there was a variation only from a high 2228 to 2221 in the number of votes cast. Even in the sixth ballot there still were 2203 votes. But then about one third of the council fathers left their places en masse and by 11:20 there certainly were 2/3 who were away from their seats.

This afternoon Father Lessard and I went down town to do a bit of shopping. We stopped in the Piazza Pio XII where a very accommodating policeman in a shiny new white uniform helped us find a parking place. I was wearing ordinary street clothes. The good man did not realize that Father Lessard was fluent in Italian because he said, "Now doesn't that look elegant!" This represents a widespread feeling in Italy not only among clergy, but among laity as well, that it would be much better if the clergy appeared on the streets only with street clothes similar to ours. This is evident by the fact that considerable publicity was given in the secular press to the order of the bishop of Triest banning the use of the cassock except in rectory or in church. That was the first break in all of Italy on this subject.

SEPTEMBER 25: 88th Gen. Assembly; Suenens presiding; present 2198
This is the first day on which the attendance at this session was below 2200.

Today was also the first time we had Mass according to any of the non-Roman rites. Archbishop Benni celebrated according to the Syro-Antiochian rite. He is from Iraq. This is supposed to be the most ancient rite; it uses the modern equivalent of the Aramaic dialect spoken by Our Lord.

Council fathers who are not bishops were granted the same faculties for hearing confessions as bishops received in Pastoral Munus Art 2. This for the duration of the Council. New deadlines for submitting summaries of talks on various projects were announced today. Some concession has been made on the matter of voting seven different declarations without any debate; these documents replace various schemata which have been reduced to simple declarations. Felici announced the deadlines for summaries of speeches on these various declarations. These deadlines are on seven consecutive days beginning October 10 and ending October 16. Apparently the Concessions made on this point amounts to only one day's discussion for each item.

The procedure of handling these declarations will be changed: there will be no sending the declarations back to their respective commissions for processing the suggestions for amendments, changes, additions or omissions as is done in handling the other projects. After the discussion there will immediately be a ballot which will provide for votes iuxta modum. If however, there is a 2/3 majority of a simple placet, the text will stand unless the Moderators feels some iuxta modum should receive consideration.

Six ballots on Chapter III (#25 through #30) were taken today and the results were according to the general pattern already established in previous ballots. The highest number of non placets today was 63.

Twenty six speakers were announced today; there was no indication whether that represented all who applied or not. I suspect it did. The question is purely academic because at 11:40 AM Felici asked everybody to return to his place because the Moderator will propose a question to the vote of the council fathers. When the next speaker, Bishop Colombo, Archbishop of Milan, had finished Suenens asked for a standing vote on the question of terminating the debate on religious liberty. This is the first time such a vote was taken this year. In all previous instances in this session the number of speakers never was so great that they could not finish in the allotted number of assemblies.

Of the US bishops who had asked to talk O'Boyle, Shehan, Maloney and Wright were cut off. Apparently Wright was not too pleased because he was one of the very few who did not stand

when the vote was taken. I hope that none of them gets 70 signatures to a petition to speak next Monday. I believe that our viewpoint has had adequate representation. Furthermore the people who ask to speak after cloture has been invoked are not very popular. It could hurt our cause. At the same time the fact that during the past week the secular press almost invariably used the expression "American-backed project on religious liberty". It certainly would not help our cause if everybody got the notion that only the US bishops wanted this declaration and the one on the Jews.

Of the eleven speakers today seven gave support to the declaration, though all offered some suggestions for change. Archbishop Alter spoke very long and it was surprising that he was not cut off. He made a good presentation.

The most significant speech today was the last one, made by Archbishop Colombo who is the close confidant of Pope Paul and his successor as Archbishop of Milan. Colombo quoted from the speech of Paul made in the first session of the council when he was still Archbishop of Milan. His speech will carry a great deal of weight with the Italian episcopate and with many others of a conservative leaning in other parts of the world. It is an open secret that Colombo is very close to the Holy Father and that they are of one mind in many matters.

Bishop Cibrian of Bolivia practically summed up the conservative argument: they are against the text because it accords primacy to liberty and the human person rather than to God and the truth. They forget that God created men and He accorded primacy to man when he gave him free will.

Bea read the relatio on the revised statement concerning the Jews. He received a roar of applause when he finished. He was brought on today because over the weekend he will leave as head of the commission deputed to bring the major relic of St. Andrew to the East.

SEPTEMBER 26-27: After the regular schedule of five general assemblies during the week, we certainly welcomed the free days on Saturday and Sunday. Bishop Hoch and I walked down to Trastevere and spent a half hour shopping in Standa's. This is the nearest thing to a supermarket that one can find in Rome. They have a very wide variety of stock on hand, but the operation is not on a level with any American supermarket. There are cashiers spread all over the place. You take what you want and walk over to the cashier assigned to the particular display stand. What will prevent anybody from taking what he wants and walking out instead of to the cashier is not clear. I suppose they have some way of checking, but there is no evidence of it. The cashiers seem to be very young - I would guess that many of them are only fifteen to twenty years old.

Wrote a number of letters and spent most of the other time getting some more exercise and also a good long nap in the afternoon.

On Saturday I said Mass at the Generalate of the Christian Brothers on Via Aurelia. Brother Charles Henry, the Assistant to the Superior General came to pick me up at 7:45 AM. I had breakfast with them after Mass.

At 10:00 AM Bishop Hoch, Father Lessard and I took off for a drive to Montopoli to visit the house of the Paraclete Fathers. Father Virgil, the local superior was not in when we got there; a new pastor was being installed in the local parish church at Montopoli. So we took off to see the ancient Benedictine Monastery at Farfa a few kilometers across the valley and up the hill on the other side. There was a Mass in progress when we arrived, at which a girl made her

first Communion. As is customary, the girl was dressed in white. After the Mass the relatives and friends of the girl made quite a fuss in the church.

The Monastery at Farfa is not a regularly functioning unit of the Benedictine order at this time. There are only two monks stationed there; they belong to the community at St. Paul's outside of the Walls. The two monks showed us through the entire set-up aside from the regular monks cells and the section occupied by boys attending the school conducted there.

The oldest portion of the building dates back to the ninth century. There are some interesting specimens of floor tile done in colors and almost perfectly preserved. There also are a few remnants of frescoes dating back to the original building. The library is well kept and contains manuscripts and incunabula that are priceless. One thing I found very interesting in the library are sheets of the original Gregorian music on which the notes were indicated with an entirely different system of symbols than the square notes that we now use and which have been used for many centuries. The monks of Solemnes used these sheets in their research work in connection with the restoration of Gregorian chant early in the present century.

We got back to Rome early enough to have dinner at 2:00 PM and a nap by 3:30 PM.

Received word from Eleanor White that her Dad, my oldest brother Math, had very serious surgery earlier in September - not long after I left Fargo. He seems to have survived the operation in a satisfactory manner and is slowly recovering.

SEPTEMBER 28: 89th General Assembly; Agagianian presiding; present 2176.

It seems that Felici is diverting himself by playing some kind of game by changing the expressions used in making announcements. At the beginning today he referred to the council fathers as "Patres Ornatisissimi." Later when he was asking the council fathers to return to their places he addressed them as follows: "Adiant omens: qui sunt in suis sedibus et qui sunt in diaspora!"

We are to finish voting on Chapter III when ballots are cast on the three remaining propositions. On Wednesday there will be the voting on Chapters III, IV, V, and VI also. Chapter III will be voted on in two units: Art. 18 to 23 and Art. 24 to 29. This arrangement was made by the Moderators at the request of the Theological Commission.

Felici announced that votes *iuxta modum* cannot be handled by signing a list. Each council father who wants to submit a *modus* must do so personally by giving a signed copy at the time he turns in the ballot with a vote *iuxta modum*. But it seems that this does not militate against the practice of having only one representative of an episcopal conference submit the *modus* while the other members all vote a simple *placet*. Everybody is conscience of the need to keep the proceedings moving at a rapid pace and therefore they are looking for ways not to increase the work of the commissions. It is in the commissions that the worst bottle neck can occur. The Holy Father practically gave a mandate to complete "de Ecclesia" as well as the whole of Ecumenism, including the declarations of religious liberty and the Jews. Even though we are only beginning the third week of this session, we already can see that if the commissions have too much to do, we might be going home without final action of those items. We can count on all possible speed in the Secretariat for Christian Unity on the two declarations, but one never knows what to expect from the dogmatic commission.

There were four speakers announced for a final fling at the declaration on religious liberty: Abp. Heenan of Westminster; Bishop Ddungu of Masaka in Uganda (that spelling is correct); Bishop Wright of Pittsburgh; and Bishop Zoa of Yaunde in Cameroon.

Archbishop Heenan gave what is probably the best speech on the subject of religious liberty. He spoke in the name of many bishops. He gave the history of England as an example of real religious liberty since the emancipation act 1829 and stressed the fact that there was complete liberty in England for all churches even though they had an established church. They have all the freedom that we have been talking about and that without a concordat. The Council Digest for today gives a good summary of his speech. He disagreed with Cardinal Ritter, without mentioning his name, in the matter stating only principles without going into arguments about how these are established.

Bishop Wright spoke very well and very forcefully stressing the connection between religious liberty and the common good. He approached his subject from the philosophical point of view. There was no applause after Wright's speech, whereas there had been a prolonged round of applause for Heenan.

Zoa endorsed what Wright had said, but added that religious freedom must be defended with arguments that are universally valid and not merely with pragmatic arguments applicable to one country or generation.

De Judaeos et non-Christianis. The debate on this declaration began at approximately 10:45 AM. They really wheeled out their big guns for this one: ten cardinals, probably the most that ever spoke on one day.

Lienart started off by explaining some of the texts from the New Testament which are often adduced to prove that the Jews actually were an accursed nation.

Tappouni urged that the statement made in the previous session be repeated. He said that they wish only to avoid serious pastoral difficulties.

In all there were fourteen speakers on the declaration concerning non-Christians. Of these only Cardinal Tappouni opposed it. He said that they were not anti Jewish, but merely wished to avoid creating serious pastoral problems. He said that he wished to reiterate all statements made against this declaration in the last session, and that the whole thing should be deleted from the acts of the Council.

Of the others, even Ruffini supported the statement, but had to add a few barbs according to his usual style.

This afternoon we had our usual weekly study meeting. There was a discussion of the whole matter of votes iuxta modum. There is no clear understanding of the question whether only one should submit the modi while the others vote a simple placet, or whether everybody must submit the modi we are interested in.

We had an excellent lecture by Dr. Grillmeyer of the theological faculty at Frankfurt on the subject of "de Divina Revelatione." Unfortunately his German accent was so heavy that at times it was difficult to understand him. Yet, we got a great deal out of his talk and will be in a position to vote more intelligently on the question.

SEPTEMBER 29: 90th General Assembly; Agagianian presiding; present 2242
Felici cleared up some points regarding the votes iuxta modum; each council father must submit his own modi, signed by him. He also repeated the announcement about the voting on the various chapter. He also announced that debate on "de Revelatione" will begin tomorrow.

Twenty-one speakers were announced for today and all of them spoke. This clears the way for discussion of "de Revelatione" beginning tomorrow. Practically all speakers covered the same broad field; most of them stressed the importance of including all non-Christian religious groups. As one said, there are 400 million Moslems and only 13 million Jews; which so much fuss about a small group and only passing mention of others.

Heenan asked a very pointed question about who the periti were that emasculated the original statement and why did they do so? He said that unless we returned the statement that Jews were not deicides, both at the time of Christ and now, we will be accused of having decided that the statement absolving them a year ago was wrong and that the council fathers as a group agree they are deicides.

The last speaker (Descuffi of Turkey) got the floor at 12:30. He started by saying: "Parcite mihi, infelici ultimo oratori." He needed forgiveness because he talked too long and not entirely to the point. Only one, an Oriental, condemned the declaration outright.

Some interesting things happened today in the voting. The principle of the permanent diaconate was approved by a very narrow margin, getting only 39 votes more than the minimum required for a 2/3's majority. Everybody seemed conscious of the fact that this was a real test vote, and when Felici said he was about to announce the result of the 37th ballot on Chapter III the place became as still as a tomb. Because of the narrowness of the vote, there was no applause.

It is surprising that the margin of votes was much greater in the 38th ballot when the question of whether mature married men may, with the consent of the Holy Father, be ordained deacons on a permanent basis. It was not surprising that the 39th ballot dealing with ordination of young men as deacons without requiring celibacy was defeated by a wide margin. The great majority of the council fathers have a great fear of doing anything which in the course of generations would weaken the law of celibacy. This point obviously was very important in the minds of the Curia. Felici went to great lengths to make sure that the proposition was clearly understood; he read it over slowly so that the council fathers could make a copy if they wished.

In connection with the 39th proposition, it is interesting to note that we actually were asked to vote on the question of which on the surface meant placing a limit on the authority of the Holy Father; since the proposition was defeated it means that we are denying to the Holy Father the authority to permit ordination of young deacons without making celibacy mandatory!!

Hardly anybody left the hall until after the 39th ballot was taken; then at least half of the council fathers left at one time.

SEPTEMBER 30: 91st Gen. Assembly, Lercaro presiding; present 2242
Today we received a 63 page pamphlet in the form of ADNEXA to the schema on "The Church in the Modern World" In this document the authors of the schema provide an explanation of what they had in mind when composing the schema, which had to be kept short. The Adnexa will not be discussed on the floor.

Apparently there were rumors that the Bombay Congress would be postponed to allow for enough time to complete the work of the Council. Felici announced that there is no foundation to any such rumor. The Congress will begin on November 28th as originally planned. As an accommodation, those who voted placet iuxta modum on chapters of "de Ecclesia" today may turn in the modi tomorrow.

A standing vote was taken to approve the change in rules according to which Chapter III will be voted in two parts instead of as a unit. During this assembly we approved Chapters III through VI of "de Ecclesia" and also approved by a vote of 1505 to 698 the plan to make "de Religiosis" a separate chapter in "De Ecclesia."

A great deal of time was taken today to make relations. The first thing before voting began was a relatio by Bishop Wright of the dogmatic commission concerning Chapter IV of "de Ecclesia." Abbot Primate Benno Gut made the relation on Chapters V and VI. He ended by making an ex tempore plea for a special chapter for religious; after all "siamo buona gente!"

Franc made a long relatio on behalf of the minority in the dogmatic commission which dealt with the subject of "de Revelatione." He and the other six who voted against this schema wanted to hold out for tradition as a separate and independent source of revelation and objected to the fact that this point was not made an issue in the schema.

Archbishop Florit spent over a half hour giving the relatio on Chapter I and II of "de Revelatione." It was an extensive review of the history of the schema and also of the dogmatic principles involved. But, naturally, he did not go into detail concerning the dramatic events of October 1962 when John XXIII withdrew the schema after we had failed to vote it out and then appointed a new commission. It took the new commission until this summer to complete the work; and then they did not arrive at any unanimous decision. Apparently in answer to some of Franc's arguments Florit added some items to his relatio as printed, stressing the fact that recent studies concerning the ordinary teaching of the Church definitely show that there is no clear teaching in the ordinary magisterium with regard to the differences in content between scripture and tradition; the existence of both is constantly asserted without settling this disputed question.

There was no final speech on the declaration concerning Jews. He merely wanted to go on record in the name of 70 council fathers that more consideration should be given to the Moslems.

On "de Revelatione" Cardinals Ruffini, Doepfner and Meyer spoke. Of its very nature these discussions were difficult to follow because of their technical nature.

Following the General Assembly Bishops Hastrich, Hoch and I went to the Consistorial Congregation to turn in our quinquennial reports. Father Lessard presented us to Cardinal Confalonieri, the Cardinal Secretary of this congregation and acted as our interpreter. Only Bishop Hastrich in our group knew any Italian. The Cardinal was most gracious and quite effusive as well as humorous. When Father Lessard told the Cardinal that I was his ordinary, His Eminence was quite profuse in expressing his thanks to me. Then he went on with tongue in cheek saying Father Lessard is anything but competent, much to the chagrin of Father. The Cardinal continued in a serious vein to tell me of the trip to England on which Ray had served as an interpreter for Cardinal Confalonieri and Archbishop Carpino and also spoke in high praise of Ray's work in the congregation.

OCTOBER 1: 92nd General Assembly: Cardinal Lercaro presiding; present 2197
Felici said he had received many inquiries about the authority of the Adnexa to the schema on the Lay Apostolate which was distributed yesterday. He said that this is merely a private document distributed with the permission of the General Secretariat. The material contained in the Adnexa was prepared by the members of the commission on the Lay Apostolate and represents the mind of those members on the subjects covered. But, since it is a purely private document it enjoys no official status in the Council.

Later in the morning, 11:25, Felici made a correction of this announcement at the direction of the Moderators, and he very visibly found this correction most distasteful and almost seemed to choke over it: The Adnexa were prepared by the Commission of the Lay Apostolate at the direct order of the Coordinating Commission and therefore it is not a mere private document and will be explained by the relator. It will not be debated. The Dogmatic Commission collaborated with the Commission on the Lay Apostolate in the preparation of the document.

At the same time Felici requested prayers for the Superior General of the Jesuits, Father Janssens who suffered a severe stroke and is in critical condition.

'There were twenty speakers this morning; this was a real test of endurance since there were no breaks for voting. Of the twenty speakers almost all, including some Italians approve of the schema in general, but everyone had some criticisms of details and/or made suggestions for emendations. As might be expected Cardinal Browne did not accept the references to tradition. He said that Tradition does not grow, just as the Scriptures do not grow.

Archbishop Shehan spoke very well. He asked for a more specific and complete explanation of revelation. Someone should explain to him, however that pagina is pronounced pa'gina and not pagi'na.

The striking thing about the debate today was the fact that five Italians spoke today and everyone started by saying: mihi placet. It seems that the Italian bishops are picking up a little more courage and are speaking out on subjects which represent a liberal tendency.

Bishop Arattukulam of India spoke very slowly in the beginning. It seemed as though he was very timid. His speech was very long and when he saw that he might run out of time he speeded up to a point where he sounded like a machine gun. He had remarkably clear enunciation but it was impossible to follow him at that speed.

I saw Bishop Petit of Minevia in Wales; he is a close friend of many Australian bishops. Jokingly I repeated a bit of gossip I had heard to the effect that the Australian hierarchy at their last meeting conducted a regular inquisition to find out if and who made the very uncomplimentary remark about the Holy Father quoted in the religion section in the current issue of Time. It was no joke to Petit nor to the Australian hierarchy. They are convinced that none of their bishops made this remark.

Felici asked that we bring our copy of the schema on Ecumenism along tomorrow because an announcement is to be made about the schedule of voting on the first three chapters.

Father Lessard, Bishop Hoch, Bishop Hastrich and I attended the reception given my Mr. Reinhold, the American Ambassador at the Villa Taverna. It seems everybody who is anybody in Rome was there. The weather was perfect so they could use the extensive gardens which

surround the residence which made things much more pleasant than two years ago when it rained and the mob of people had to be kept in the house.

I met Dr. and Mrs. Cushman who had arrived in Rome only a day or two earlier. The Doctor is very eager to get together again with us for a dinner. He has some points he wishes to discuss; he specifically mentioned the problem in connection with recruiting their ministers. I plan to have them come here, probably sometime next week. Father Yzermans also got to Rome yesterday.

OCTOBER 2: 93rd General Assembly, Lercaro presiding; present 2119
Felici announced the complete schedule for the voting on Ecumenism. There will be a total of fourteen ballots distributed over Monday through Thursday of next week.

The schema on the Lay Apostolate will be discussed first in general after which a vote will be taken to accept or reject it as a basis of discussion. This same procedure will be followed with the other projects. It had not been done on "de Revelatione" because the schema had already been accepted in the previous session. The Church in the Modern World will follow the Lay Apostolate.

Sixteen speakers were announced for discussion of the introduction and first two chapters of De Revelatione. All sixteen of them spoke. Archbishop Flahiff was the last speaker on the list; in perfect Latin he stated that since Cardinal Meyer, Leger and Ricketts had already covered the matter he had in his manuscript he would relinquish his right to speak. (Applause)

The speeches brought out little that was new. Bishop Rupp of Monaco as usual played for a laugh at several stages of his speech. This was too obvious and detracted from the serious statement he made.

At 11:45 Felici asked all council fathers to return to their places for the vote on the order of balloting on Ecumenism which was scheduled for 12:00 noon (mentioned above). When the vote was taken Felici said that since he did not have bifocals and could not see that far, and asked the ushers to check their respective sections to see whether majority stood. The vote was practically unanimous.

After this vote, Cardinal Doepfner presided for the discussion of Chapters III and IV on De Revelatione.

Ruffini again was the first speaker. He said what he had said during the first session that he would not accept the concept of literary forms except under very specific and limited circumstances. He very obviously is not pleased with the whole schema.

Cardinal Koenig concluded the speaking schedule for this morning. It was with a great sense of relief that this session came to an end because it ushered in the weekend. The grind is beginning to tell.

Bishop Hock had invited Father Charles Davis, professor at St. Edmund's college, Ware for dinner. Father Godfrey, Bishop Speltz, Bishop Hacker, Bishop Treinen, Bishop Klein of Saskatoon were also there. Father Davis is making some tapes on the liturgy for Bishop Hoch to be used by his priests in preparation for the introduction of the vernacular into the Mass.

Father Davis is a delightful personality (incidentally not a Jesuit as I had always thought). He is extremely well informed on current trends in theology and very obviously a deeply dedicated person. One characteristic that stood out is his balance, he does not go off on a tangent. At the same time he is not afraid to suggest drastic remedies to meet changing circumstances.

OCTOBER 3: I never left the building today except to go over to the chapel for Mass this morning. I took most of the day to prepare the column for the November CANews; also sent along a brief story on Msgr. Giovannetti and a longer story on the third session of the Council up to now.

Radio reception is unusually good tonight. Will spend a little time listening to find out what will happen in the tight National League race.

OCTOBER 4: Got caught up with all my letters today. Father Lessard and I drove to Anzio and Nettuno, by way of Ostia. We visited the American Military Cemetery just outside of Nettuna. This place is beautifully kept.

After supper this evening Cardinal Koenig dropped in to see me. He was somewhat upset by the news release through NC News covering an interview given by Father Ernest Zizka, OSB which purports to tell the story of the Church in Czechoslovakia. The Cardinal says that the whole story is inaccurate and the result of a tour handled by agents of the communist government. It is because of things of this kind that His Eminence is so anxious to get good circulation for the story which he entrusted to Father Placid Jordan, for which I arranged the interview last week.

The Cardinal then gave me a copy of the letter (eleven typed pages) submitted to the Holy Father by the Seventeen Cardinals. He also gave me a copy of the 12 page "Adnexa" which accompanied the letter. Unfortunately the letter was in Italian, so the Cardinal kept that since I don't read Italian. The Adnexa are in Latin and represent a rehash of the treatise which Dino Staffa wrote in condemnation of collegiality. The two concluding paragraphs are interesting; hence I am quoting the same:

"Non intelligitur cur Commissioni theologicae formula 'Caput Ecclesiae', dicta de Romano Pontifice, displiceat (cfr Relationem de reiectione huius formulae in Suggestionibus S. Pontificis contentae, 'ut expressio sit magis concors cum locutione biblica, secundum quam Christus dicitur Caput Corporis, Petrus vero Pastor gregis; ' Relatio de n. 22, olim n. 16, littera M. pag.90). Formula 'totiusque Ecclesiae Caput' habetur iam in Decreto pro Graecis Concilii Florentini (.694) et repetitur a Concilio Vaticano I (D. 1826.)

"Neque potest sine quadam anxietate perspici Commissionem theologicam, propter rationes non nimis convincentes, quasdam Suggestiones a S. Pontifice missas, quibus genuina notio Primatus evidentius constabat, reiecisit: sic formulam 'iuxta capituli ordinationem exercendae' (Relatio de n. 22, olim n. 16, littera M. pag. 91; ubi constat Commissionem non esse secutam nec quidem formulam quaestionibus die 30 Oct. 1963 suffragatio Patrum propositis adiectam sed aliam magis vagam praetulisse) et formulam ' ipse (Papa) uni Domino devinctus' (Relatio de m. 22, olim n. 16, littera V. pag. 92s."

OCTOBER 5: 94th Gen. Assembly; Card Doepfner presiding; present 2112
Twenty-five speakers were announced today to discuss "De Revelatione." Of these, fifteen actually talked. We are once more faced with the slow, tedious and boring process of hammering out a conciliar document through seemingly endless speeches; just as we did in the case of the Liturgy, and I hope, the Church. After our experience with the liturgy one does not become quite so impatient as we did during the first and part of the second session,

knowing that this seems to be the method the Holy Spirit has employed to make His divine guidance operative.

There were different shades of opinion expressed concerning the chapters under discussion; but the great majority praised the schema while making many suggestions for emendations. There were no spectacular or heated statements made either pro or con.

Along with the debate, the program of balloting on the first chapter of ecumenism proceeded smoothly. When Felici made the first announcement about the balloting he pronounced the ecumenism in a manner that for all the world sounded like "communism"! Probably he thinks that the one is the same as the other! He has difficulty pronouncing the word (just like Spellman did with the word "microphonium" in the first session when he was taking his turn at president; maybe Felici chokes over the word Ecumenism.

In the balloting today we voted four times on the first four articles on ecumenism.

The total number of votes fluctuated between 2107 to 2112, while the negative votes were between 16 and 57. This means that as little as less than 1% and never more than 2 1/2% voted against the project. This is an indication that the very articulate minority never picked up much of a following in opposition to this project and that the minority grew smaller from what it was last year during the time of the debate.

In this connection a statement made by Msgr. Higgins this afternoon at the regular study meeting of the US bishops is very much to the point. He mentioned that if we follow the history of each of the schemata through the preparatory commissions onto the council hall during debate and then the action of the conciliar commission and final vote of the Council Fathers we will find that in every instance practically the document has been strengthened. Even the schema on the liturgy, which in the original form in which it came to the council floor was so liberal that Father Bugnini lost his job as secretary of the Commission and his teaching job at the Lateran (Cf the Diary during the first weeks of the first session). Nevertheless, by the time the Constitution on the Liturgy was promulgated it was a much stronger document than the original. This process of strengthening is particularly striking in the case of projects prepared by the dogmatic commission. In the case of the declaration on religious liberty, there was a bitter fight to get anything into the agenda on this subject at all. It was only after John XXIII had instructed the Secretariat on Christian Unity to prepare a document that anything got into the agenda; and it is history that every possible delaying tactic was used to keep from having the matter discussed in any form. The tactics succeeded to the extent of having it delayed till the third session, allowing only a relatio in the second session. But, once the council fathers got a chance to talk the same thing happened as in other matters; the document became much stronger as it was returned to the Secretariat for processing the emendations. Now the general feeling is that it will be voted for by a large majority.

For some mysterious reason the declaration on Jews and Other non-Christians was weakened during the period between sessions; but here again, the debate was such that a really strong statement will result from the process if mind of the council fathers expressed during the debate is fairly presented in the revised document.

Shortly after 12:00 noon Felici announced the death of Father Janssens, S.J., General of the Jesuits; the usual prayers were recited for him.

The story had made the rounds that a certain element among the Italian group tried to sabotage Chapter III of "De Ecclesia" in which the vote had been overwhelming for collegiality and permanent diaconate, by flooding the chapter with votes iuxta modum. It was said that was why Felici had so often repeated the rule regarding individual handling of modi and prohibiting one man to submit a modus for a whole group, while the one only voted iuxta modum and the rest of the group voted a simple placet. Today I received from Cardinal Koenig the evidence that this was actually true. The Cardinal gave me a sample of the modi that had been prepared by this group. There were 19 modi mimeographed and stapled together; many hundreds of these pamphlets were passed out. While there were many votes iuxta modum on that chapter, they did not come nearly close to preventing a 2/3's majority of simple placets.

Speaking of Cardinal Koenig, he asked me this morning whether Cardinal Ritter would speak today; I said "Why?" "Because the St. Louis Cardinals won the National League pennant last night!"

We had the weekly meeting of the US Bishops' study group this afternoon. Msgr. George Higgins gave us a run-down on the schema on the Church in the Modern World. He spoke almost exclusively on the matter of the layman in the Church. He gave a good summary and made some valuable suggestions for the manner of voting on this schema.

Father Kerrigan was back again to give us his personal views on the question of Scripture and Tradition, which is now under debate. One gained the impression that in his mind this whole problem was more a question of terminology than conflict of essential ideas. His presentation was clearer to me than the pamphlet which Father Congar had prepared for the Dutch Documentation papers.

We received a report from the meeting of the International Committee held on October 2. This committee submitted a letter to the Moderators asking that each of the propositions which are scheduled for voting without discussion should actually be adequately discussed. They made a special recommendation for Schema XIII, and ended by saying that if this schema is destined to be finished in this session it would be better that it be dropped rather than receive such summary treatment.

The whole question of the close of the Council was discussed. Archbishop Krol was asked, but he did not go into great detail; he passed the buck to Cardinal Meyer of the Presidency. The Cardinal said rather plainly that if they tried to finish with the close of this session on November 20, they simply could not do the job which these subjects required. He did say that if they followed the announced plans of having no discussion of the seven propositions, or even allowed a day for each, we could run out of matter for debate as early as the end of this month. But if these subjects are to be given the study that they require it will be a physical impossibility for the commissions to complete processing all the matters that have already have debated or will be debated in depth, besides these propositions there simply will have to be another session. Hence it seems that this matter of when we finish is still wide open. There is a feeling among most council fathers that they would like to get this job done so that they could return to the normal work in their dioceses; but I am sure that if the matter were seriously put up to the decision of the council fathers the overwhelming vote would be for an orderly procedure to provide for development of documents worthy of an ecumenical council even if it takes another session. A fourth session would not need to be long; but time has to be given to the commissions if the job is to be done right. There would be nothing for the council

fathers generally to do while the commissions work on the material that has been debated once we finished the debates.

In this connection the question may be asked: "Will we ever go back to a normal routine in our dioceses?" If the work of the Council is followed through and the mind of the council fathers really implemented, we will have a routine in the future that is different in many ways.

OCTOBER 6: 95th General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding: present 2168
Announced that the funeral of Father Janssens, Jesuit General, will be in the Gesu at 4:30 PM on Thursday, October 8

The Holy Father has decided that some parish priests are to be invited to attend the General Assemblies, especially those devoted to discussion of the priesthood, as representatives of all priests. Later this morning Felici announced that the Secretariat was already flooded with nominations of parish priests who should be invited to attend General Assemblies in this capacity. Felici's comment was: "Iam sunt designati!" Cardinal Koenig told us at dinner table that he has been asked to nominate two Austrian priests for this purpose; we have no idea of how many priests will be invited and from where.

Bishop Helmsing made the relatio on the second chapter on ecumenism before the voting on that chapter took place. Aside from one passage over which he stumbled a bit he did a good job reading his manuscript and he also did a good job explaining Art. 8 about which Abp. O'Boyle complained in yesterday's meeting of the US bishops at the North American College.

Speaking of Art. 8, I had quite a discussion of this matter with my neighbor, Bishop Blomjous who is a member of the commission that prepared this text. He made the point that conditions are so different in different parts of the world and so fluid generally that no effort should be made to pin down the technique of practicing ecumenical dialogue and encouraging and participating in common prayer for unity. What would be advisable in one place might not be desirable in another; what is called for under certain circumstances in a given area may not be advisable under other circumstances in the same area. In this connection it should be kept in mind that Art. 8 treats only of the case where special prayers are ordered for unity, and not of the whole general field of "communicatio" in sacris. There is here no question of admitting non-Catholics to Holy Communion. Hence the fears expressed by Abp O'Boyle and shared by others are not justified. Of course, there is always danger that some individual bishops or priests may go to extremes; that will happen, even though this matter is circumscribed by all kinds of restrictions. It is very likely that this matter will be clarified a great deal after the secretariat for Christian Unity issues the Directive which is being planned to provide guidelines for bishops and pastors in this field.

There were ten regular speakers on the final chapter of De Divine Revelation and three who filed applications late, but were allowed to speak because they had a petition signed by council fathers.

Carli was among the speakers. Aside from the fact that he followed Ruffini's line of argument, I was struck by the fact that he even talks like a young Ruffini! He has the same clipped fashion of speaking apodictically and with finality, just as Ruffini does.

Probably the most striking argument, one that not even Ruffini or Carli even hinted at was that advanced by Bishop Caminada of Ferentino in Italy. It is an argument which I thought was

dead and buried years ago. He said: Indiscriminate distribution of the Scriptures to the faithful can be dangerous because they are ignorant of basic Christian doctrine and unable to talk the solid food of the Scriptures." Apparently it never entered his head that if his people are ignorant they should be taught the truths of the Church and not denied contact with its principle source! This is another indication of the complete vacuum insofar as reality is concerned many of these people are living in.

A bit later Bishop Volk of Mainz in Germany came up with a much more sensible idea, namely, that this chapter should be better coordinated with the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in the articles in which it speaks of the ministry of the Word. Volk made a good point when he said that through revelation God not only communicates truth to the people of God but also communicates himself.

Bishop Boillon of France also made a good point in connection with the place of Scripture in Theology. Present theological manuals which use the rigid scholastic form of presentation are not really based on Scripture but merely use Scripture, as it were, to their theses with fragments from the Bible. He warned against having Denzinger replace the Bible!

The discussion this morning followed the same general pattern, aside from the few points mentioned above, that characterized the whole debate on De Revelatione. Most of them said, Schema mihi placet or valde placet, attamen.. It is getting to the point where the "attamen" is the key word in conciliar terminology! They begin with approval of the schema and then launch forth into a long technical and often scholarly oration on a point or several points of the schema with which they disagree. In fairness it should be added that many of these emendations represent valid ideas. This whole point reminds me of the comments made in Time magazine about the Holy Father's encyclical when they complained about his very cautious approach to any controversial point; they said the key word in the encyclical is "but".

Bishop Gonzales of Ossirinco, Columbia spoke the last word on the subject of "de Divina Revelatione." insofar as debate during a General Assembly is concerned. For that reason his speech enjoys some importance from the historian's point of view, even though it was almost unintelligible because of the pronounced accent.

Cardinal Suenens took over the chairmanship after completion of "De Divine Revelatione" and introduced Cardinal Cento who made the preliminary remarks on the schema: "de Apostolatu Laicorum". When Cardinal Cento spoke he reminded me of Father Isidore, OSB of St. John's Seminary, Collegeville. In the homiletics class forty years ago Isidore made a fetish of stressing the R's to a point where it was ridiculous. Well, in all these forty years I haven't heard another person roll the R's anywhere nearly as much as Father Isidore; Cento outdid Isidore by a mile.

While the regular business of the General Assembly was carried on, we cast ballots on Chapter II as a whole and then an additional four ballots of Chapter II. The only deviation from the regular line of overwhelming approval was the fact that there were 292 non placets cast against Article 8. Along with today's Council Digest we received a modus, sponsored by Archbishop O'Boyle providing for designation of the authority mentioned in this Article as the Episcopal Conference in each country. I am not using this modus since I intend to vote placet and leave it to each country to decide whether they want this matter determined by the individual ordinary or by the conference.

Sidelines: When a Spaniard says "hinc" it come out as "ink" Father Yzerman's definition of a Council: "a prolonged meeting at which the periti prepare learned interventions which are poorly read by the bishops for the benefit of the periti."

OCTOBER 7: 96th. General Assembly; Suenens presiding present 2177
About the only thing that was unusual today was Felici's new formula of dismissal of the general public after the Mass: "Omnes cum festintione egrediantur."

We received a revised text of the propositions on the priesthood which reflects the written interventions already made and which Felici asked be considered in the debate.

Today we voted on Chapter II as a unit. It received 32 non placet and 564 iuxta modum. No doubt consideration will be given to the modi to the extent that we will be given a chance to vote on some of them, especially the one regarding communicatio in sacris as regulated by the proper episcopal authority: which is it, the ordinary? the episcopal conference? There are many who want the council to nail down this point and require the episcopal conference and not the individual ordinary control this matter.

The other ballots were on the individual Articles of Chapter III which were considered in three groups. Felici read the entire texts which was most boring even though he read them with the speed of a machine gun. All of these articles were carried by 90% majority.

Bishop Hengsbach of Essen read the relatio on De Apostolatu Laicorum. He did an excellent job and had the good sense not to read the complete text which was rather lengthy.

After four had spoken, a standing vote showed overwhelming acceptance of the schema as a basis for detailed discussion.

Ritter said that the schema is too clerical, too juridical, and is concerned with Catholic Action to the exclusion of other forms of the apostolate.

Chabonneau raised a point which is important: the lay apostolate is not designed to pull us through a period of shortage of priests; it is a vocation in itself.

By and large there was much criticism on various grounds; no doubt the document will be greatly improved even though the process will be boring.

This evening Archbishop Byrne had the bishops of the Dubuque Province as guests, along with Bishop Hoch, Bishop Hastich and myself. Mrs. M. J. Connolly of Fargo phoned at 8:30 PM saying she had just gotten to the Hilton. She was supposed to have been here by noon; as a consequence she missed the audience this afternoon for which we had arranged a good ticket.

OCTOBER 8: 97th General Assembly; Suenens presiding; Present 2169.
The Council Fathers were reminded of the fact that tomorrow is the anniversary of the death of Pius XII.

The first in the order of business was the vote on Chapter III of Ecumenism as a unit. There were only 24 non placet votes and 296 votes iuxta modum. It is hardly likely that much attention will be paid to the modi since the placet votes were in such majority.

This was a real work-a-day Assembly. There were 18 speakers and a number of really significant speeches, the best of which probably that of Eugene D'Souza. In his usual good Latin well read he made a deep impression and received a good round of applause.

It is quite sure that the speeches made this morning will have considerable influence on the commission to rid the schema of its clericalism, and improve the dogmatic basis for the apostolate of the laity. They certainly can not ignore the insistent demands of council fathers to improve the draft. Of course, it is also true that Bishop D'Souza stepped on some tender toes in his reference to the use of lay people in many offices in and out of the Roman Curia.

Bishop Ziade, Maronite bishop of Beirut had a novel idea never proposed in the Council before. He said that reference to Canon Law of the western Church only both in this schema and in the Pastoral Munus gave the impression among the Orientals that these things don't apply to them. Therefore there should be only one code Commission for the "Catholic" and one Canon Law, instead of separate commissions and codes for the Eastern and Western churches.

This was a good session, even though it was quite a strain listening to 18 speeches. Some real contributions were made to the subject today.

On sunny days, if the speeches are prolonged and the proceedings become a bore, one can find some diversion in following the thin shaft of light which comes through the window of the small cupola over the side nave directly opposite my seat. By some strange twist of perspective this shaft of light moves in a straight line along the center aisle of the aula. It highlights the color of the marble pavement. Then as the days went by and the sun got lower in the sky the shaft of light followed the first row of seats, and then the second, etc.

One can see the drafts in this huge building as the sun light is reflected from the dust particles being churned by the movement of the air.

I like to think of the phenomenon of the very dramatic shaft of light as a reminder of light of the Holy Spirit guiding the Council fathers in the proceedings which so often seem pointless, dry and boring. Even the churning of the atmosphere by the intrigue, controversy and clash of opinions can not impede the steady march to an eventual constitution, decree or declaration that gives every evidence of divine guidance.

Some stories for the day: When the head of St. Andrew was delivered in Greece, the Orthodox Church ignored the matter: they wanted the head of Ruffini! (Another variation is "that the Germans wanted to send the head of Ruffini!")

On this day of the burial of Father Janssens, the former Jesuit General, somebody said: "Tomorrow it will be announced in the aula that Pope Paul has resigned to become the new General of the Jesuits; the reason given is that in this way he can rule the church without interference from the Collegial Episcopate."

The Daily American today carried a very strong editorial on the subject of ecumenism. It was emphasized that the Catholic Church in its schema on ecumenism has gone as far as it can in preparing the way for unity. It is now the time for the Protestants to do something about removing obstacles. If the Protestants don't act now they should remain silent. He practically said: "Put up or shut up." Actually this editorial is quite superficial. The implication that we have now removed all obstacles, is of course, wide of the mark.

Rumors regarding the closing date of the Council flew around fast and furious today. The Daily American ran a story of the meeting in Cicognani's apartment last night of the Presidency and the Moderators and the General Secretary. It was a three hour meeting. The story implied that they tentatively decided to have a short session next March to complete the work. Cardinal Koenig feels this rumor is unfounded. These same people are to be received in audience by the Holy Father tonight, at which time some decision could be made. We might get some sort of an announcement tomorrow. There are so many rumors afloat that it would be well if this matter were settled now by making a definite and official statement.

It is practically being taken for granted that the Holy Father will go to Bombay for the Congress in November.

OCTOBER 9: 98th General Assembly; Suenens presiding; present 2070

The entire session today was devoted to the De Apostolatu Laicorum with no interruptions for voting for anything but routine announcements.

Cardinal Caggiano was the first speaker; he was interrupted by Cardinal Suenens when he went beyond the allotted time. Caggiano, however, paid very little attention to this interruption, continuing his speech to the end of his manuscript, over a minute later! Suenens himself was the third speaker while Doepfner took over the chair to announce Suenens and the next speaker. Suenens spoke right up to the last second of his allotted time, giving rise to the speculation in my mind - and in the minds of many others, I am sure, as to whether Doepfner would interrupt him if he went beyond the allotted time! Fortunately the delicate situation was avoided when Suenens said "dixi" right on the second!

Caggiano asked to retain the definition of Pius XI and XII for the Lay Apostolate, name "the collaboration of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy." This is one of the critical points in the whole debate. The position taken by Caggiano is considered the nub of the argument about clericalism in this document. The vast majority want it made crystal clear that the lay apostolate involves the Apostolate of the CHURCH as such. The position of the laity is not merely to assist in the work of the hierarchy as mere errand boys without responsibility, recognized position of their own in the church, or right of initiative and proper responsibility.

All through this whole debate the question of Catholic Action has come up, in this schema and also in the section of the laity in De Populo Dei in the schema on the Church. The English particularly have taken a strong position against Catholic Action, as proposed by the Italian hierarchy, viz. as the essence of the lay apostolate. This involves in a very special way the attitude of the Italians towards Catholic Action. Here in Italy Catholic Action to a very large extent represents the arm of the hierarchy reaching into the Christian Democratic party. Their primary concern was to keep the Christian Democratic party in a strong position insofar as government is concerned but perfectly subservient insofar as the hierarchy is concerned. It has been said that the clash between Mussolini and the Church shortly after the signing of the concordat in the twenties was quite inevitable. Like all totalitarian regimes, Fascism could not tolerate political activity of any kind; and certainly not in an institution as important as the Church in Italy. Hence Mussolini did not hesitate to take drastic steps to stop political activity under the guise of Catholic Action.

Bishop Blomjous made the remark that the present crisis in the Italian government is no more and no less than a power struggle within the party in which the older element which is under the influence of the Holy Office is trying to retain control and is being challenged by the new

and younger element which is in favor of the "opening to the left". The latter tactic, which many feel is absolutely necessary if the party is to survive and if the eventual take-over by communism is to be avoided, is pure poison to Ottaviani and the conservative Bishops generally. That is why there was so much opposition to John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris*. The viewpoints expressed by John XXIII were the last thing the Italian conservatives in Curia and Hierarchy wanted at that time.

A year ago I heard the story that Ottaviani was told to stop talking politics during John's pontificate, when he was speaking frequently and almost hysterically about dangers involved in the "opening to the left." The conservative papers in Italy, no doubt prompted by the conservatives, made much of the increase in communist votes in the last election and indicated that this was due solely to John's having "gone soft on communism."

In the debate today Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie really tore the whole schema apart. He was particularly hard on the point of its clericalism; he said "it is absurd that this commission was composed solely of clerics!" He spoke out even more bluntly than Bishop DeRoo of Victoria yesterday.

Cardinal Suenens took a different attitude from the English; he did not insist on throwing out the term Catholic Action because of the connotations it has acquired since the days of Pius XI; but he did want to give it a generic meaning which would include all forms of activity in the Lay Apostolate. The term arose before a real theology of the lay apostolate had been developed.

If the commission does a good job in reflecting the mind of the council fathers when this schema is processed, we should get a good document. I only hope and pray that this document is not buried in the rush of trying to finish the Council this year. On this latter point there have been no new rumors during the last 48 hours.

A very strange piece of intrigue took place the other day. Someone whom we have not been able to identify called here at the hospital desk in the lobby and left duplicated copies of Cardinal Bea's intervention on the Chapter, *De Beata Maria Virgine* along with a supply of sheets containing two interventions, one asking for the elimination of the word "mediatricis" and the other the title "mater ecclesiae" from this chapter in the schema "*De Ecclesia*." The document is all ready and would require only the date and the signature of a council father. There is absolutely no indication of the origin of this document or of the names of the people responsible.

I am quite certain that Cardinal Bea had nothing to do with this. I have no evidence to back up that statement; I merely feel that Cardinal Bea would not stoop to such tactics. Furthermore it is quite obvious that the copy of the Bea's intervention was not made with the same typewriter or duplicating machine; his intervention is very neatly done on a photo-offset type of machine, whereas the copies of the proposed intervention asking for the elimination of those two expressions were made on a poor mimeograph machine and in general has a crude, sloppy appearance.

It is not clear how widely these two documents were distributed. Bishop Blomjous, who ordinarily seems to know everything that is going on, had heard nothing of this and was eager to get a copy, which I gave him.

As a matter of fact, I am very much in sympathy with the idea of eliminating those expressions from the Chapter on *De Beata*; but I certainly do not like the tactics used. These people had a

chance to submit a iuxta modum ballot and secure consideration in that way. Such sneaky tactics are out of place.

This evening I was a dinner guest of Dr. and Mrs. Cushman at the Sitea. Besides the host and hostess, the following were present: Dr. and Mrs. Horton, Dr. Outler, Father Yzermans, Father McCool, Bishop Bartholome, Bishop Waters, Bishop Hoch and myself. It was a really delightful evening. I had met all of them previously with the exception of Dr. Outler, who is from Southern Methodist University. Father Godfrey Diekmann was also there. Dr. Horton claimed the same distinction that I claim: we have not missed a single General Assembly since the opening of the first session, which will be three years on Sunday!

Dr. Outler impressed me very much. He really is taking the Council very seriously and very obviously is studying every document introduced in the Council and also follows the debates carefully. I must confess that he seems to have a much more accurate grasp of what is happening in the Council than I have. In his conversation devoted exclusively to the Council, he indicated that he was very happy with the schema on ecumenism, and even more favorably impressed by the developments so far in the project of "De Ecclesia."

Dr. Cushman is leaving this next Thursday; he is too busy to come over for dinner early in the week. He and Father Godfrey have to give a series of some foundation lecture (I forgot the name of the series). He will give two lectures and Father Godfrey will give three.

I did not have a chance to visit with Father Godfrey, so I did not get any of the details. Sidelights of the day: Felici continued his little game of providing a variation to the formula of dismissing the people after Mass. Today he said "Egrediantur universi qui in concilio partem non habent; et id cum omni festinatione!"

Bishop Soares of Beira in Mozambique solved the problem of acknowledging so many different people when starting to speak by simply saying: "Venerabiles Fratres and Reliqui Omnes!"

Today was the first time that the attendance fell below the 2100 mark during this session.

OCTOBER 10 & 11: The wear and tear of the regular schedule is telling more and more each week so that the Saturday and Sunday break is becoming more welcome. I am sure that the number of bishops in Rome will dwindle appreciably as some of the older men go home because they can't take it anymore. Up to the present the number in attendance has held up fairly well.

Bishop Hoch entertained a group at the PASETTO, one of the more ritzy (and very expensive eating places in Rome. The party started with the idea of having Msgr. Gilligan and Msgr. Ligutti; then Bishop Hoch added me to the list; then Father Lessard when he heard that Ray was a student of Msgr. Gilligan's; and finally Msgr. Gremellion. It was a grand party. Naturally most of the conversation revolved around the Council, but there wasn't much that was new. Msgr. Gilligan did contribute one story: A cardinal died and went to purgatory. Much to his surprise he found John XXIII there. "Why, Your Holiness, what are you doing here." I have been condemned to remain for the duration of the Council."

On Sunday I did not leave the building except when going to the chapel for Mass. I spent much of the day writing letters and then joined Bishop Hoch as he entertained the Henry Billions of Sioux Falls at dinner here in the private dining room.

Received a call from Archbishop Cousins to say that Msgr. Finucan phoned to announce the death of Bishop Tracy at 11:00 AM Rome time today (October 11). This had been expected momentarily for a week.

OCTOBER 12: 99th General Assembly; Card. Agagianian presiding; present 2070
The death of Bishop Tracy of LaCrosse was announced. The Moderators requested that remarks be confined to the Introduction and Chapter I. About noon they asked for a standing vote on Cloture of De Apostolatu Laicorum. The vote near unanimous.

There were a total of 17 speakers today - five more had been announced but did not get a chance to talk.

Archbishop Heenan as usual had some barbs in his speech and also some cynicism. He objected to the common concept of a layman as a "non-cleric," which is practically the definition given in the present code of Canon Law. He also called attention to the fact that in French the same words describe a learned man and a cleric; whereas in Italian the word "idiot" is used for a fool or a layman. Heenan very boldly made reference to the fact that Catholic action is also political action, though he did not mention Italy specifically. He merely said that "in some parts of the world" the term Catholic Action has taken on a political connotation. For that reason he wants the term "apostolate" to be used as the generic word instead of Catholic Action.

On the whole, the debate today followed pretty much the same lines as on previous days. There was one very funny interlude, however. Bishop Gomez of Lerida in Spain began by going all over the field on the subject of the Lay Apostolate, contrary to the request of the Moderators that speakers confine themselves to the Introduction and the First Chapter. Agagianian promptly called him to task and asked Gomez to confine himself to the proper points. But he kept right on going along the same line, when Agagianian interrupted him again and read back to him the points in the summary of his speech that he had submitted in advance. But Gomez still kept on, when Agagianian interrupted him once more. Gomez then replied to Agagianian that when a man has a prepared manuscript he must follow it because it is impossible to improvise when the time comes to speak. Again he continued his manuscript when Agagianian with some show of temper interrupted again. Again he refused and Agagianian simply cut him off and called the next speaker! Gomez is in the section directly opposite mine; when he returned to his seat he still was arguing, this time with the usher who came to pick up his manuscript. This was democracy in action! Bishop Blomjous made the comment that "this man must be a holy terror in his own diocese."

Felici is continuing his game of new phrases instead of the original "Exeant omnes." Today it was: "Exeant cuncti sed sine cunctatione."

Today not only St. Peter's but all of Rome is buzzing. It seems that somebody got to the Holy Father and frightened him about the statements on religious liberty and the Jews. The story is that Felici, at the direction of the Holy Father (he said) wrote two letters to Cardinal Bea as head of the Church Unity Secretariat telling him that these two declarations are to be reduced to mere paragraphs which are to be inserted into "De Ecclesia". To do this the word was that the Holy Father appointed a new and special commission consisting of Cardinal Browne, Alonzo Fernandez, Superior General of the Dominicans, Archbishop Colombo, Archbishop of Milan, and Marcel Lefebvre, retired, former member of the diplomatic service of the church.

Cardinal Frings heard about these plans and knew that the appointment of this commission and its task was to be made by Felici this morning during the General Assembly. Frings

rounded up all the Cardinals at the Anima whom he could reach. They prepared a letter which Frings made sure was delivered last night. In the letter they impressed on the Holy Father the terrible loss of face he and the Church would suffer if he forced the council to back down in this way. The letter also pointed out that his action was in direct violation of the "Regolamenta" under which the council was operating.

Many people knew all about this at the time when the session opened this morning; they waited anxiously for Felici's announcement. But none was made in reference to this matter. Now the question is; did the Holy Father read the letter last night or this morning before 9:00 and was it for that reason that he did not go through with this plan? or did someone else get to him? It is certain that Cardinal Bea also wrote to the Holy Father. Did his letter have the effect of heading off this tragedy? In any case, nothing happened today; we do not know what to expect tomorrow.

Maybe I shouldn't say that nothing happened today; there was buzzing and speculation all over Rome.

One thing still looks suspicious, besides the major question about what will finally be done about the two declarations, and that is the Chapter on the Church in the modern world. It seems that they are gunning for that. It really should follow the schema on the Lay Apostolate which will be completed tomorrow. But Felici announced that a layman would speak at the close of the matter on the Lay Apostolate, after which the Relator might have something to say. But Chapter 13 can not be taken up then because the relations are not ready, so in the meantime the propositions on the priesthood would be discussed and voted on in order not to lose time. Then will come the proposition on the Oriental Church and then only Chapter 13. The way things are going one wonders whether they want to bury Chapter 13 entirely!

At the regular meeting of the US Bishops Jim Norris spoke on the question of poverty all over the world. He certainly handles himself well. He proposed a demonstration on this subject in the aula some day fairly soon. His scheme is to have the Holy Father celebrate a Mass, then Mazie Ward address the Council on World Poverty, and then have some Council Fathers speak on the subject. We voted to go along with other episcopal conferences to petition the Holy Father for this demonstration.

Bishop Mark McGrath of Santiago Veraguas in Panama gave us an excellent run down on the whole Chapter 13 on the Church in the Modern World. He is a member of the commission that prepared this schema and also served on two very important subcommissions on this. He told the story of the development of this schema - and what a story it was. I hadn't realized that some bishops had to put so much time outside of the sessions and do so much traveling because of the commissions.

We voted to petition the Moderators, along with most other English speaking hierarchies, to permit only written interventions and no debate in the aula on the subject of birth control, which will be covered in Chapter 13.

It was announced by Archbishop Boyle that the regular meeting of the US Bishops will be held at the North American College.

One last bit: Bishop Clevin said that the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung a few days made an attack on Cardinal Doepfner. They accused him of buckling under the pressure of the conservatives and is pushing pell-mell for permanent adjournment of the Council even though

some important things will suffer. Cardinal Koenig denies this; He said that last year Doepfner thought that we could finish in '64, but has given up all such ideas now.

OCTOBER 13: 100th General Assembly; Agagianian presiding: present
Felici announced with great gusto that this is the 100th Gen. Assembly. At the same time they had the Vicar Apostolic of Sundan celebrate the Mass, the vicar Apostolic of Iceland enthrone the Gospel and Agagianian presiding. Felici began by saying "Festinetis exire." Bishop Blomjous leaned over and said: "Someone ought to grab the microphone from him and shout "Exeat Felici!"

He then went on to say "Congregatio Generalis centesima! Centenarium est concilium, sed non senuit". Someone might have added that we could well complete Felici's sentence by saying: "quia iam mortuum est" if the intrigue of the conservatives works out and the Council is shut off in this session and the things that have been accomplished are toned down according to plan.

I find that one suspicion which I expressed to the effect that the conservatives are postponing consideration of the 13th Chapter in the hope of eventually killing it, is not justified. Bishop Blomjous told me today that the relations for this chapter are all ready; but they are holding them back in order to give the bishops time to study the same and submit their interventions in writing before the general debate begins. This will be helpful in case debate is cut off early. Bishop Blomjous should know what he is talking about because he is an influential man on that commission. Incidentally, he told me that Bishop McGrath of Panama who spoke to us yesterday is probably the ablest man on the commission. Bishop Holmes-Seidle had told me pretty much the same thing about Blomjous himself.

There were three fathers who spoke on De Apostolatu Laicorum: Guerry, Quadri (A bishop-elect, not yet consecrated), and Abp. Zoghby of India. Quadri was one of the periti on the commission which prepared this schema. Bishop Blomjous said he was very clever, as seemed evident from the manner in which he spoke.

There was a really dramatic and historical moment in the Assembly this morning, aside from the fact that it was number 100; this was when Pat Keegan of England spoke on behalf of the lay auditors, men and women. For once a layman was speaking to the Church and not vice versa. He did so frankly, respectfully, without any suggestion of obsequiousness. His theme was that the document on the Lay Apostolate as well as those on the Liturgy, the Church and Unity were documents of fulfillment of dreams and also documents marking the beginning of a new era in the church. He stressed the fact that there is a necessary distinction between the hierarchy and the laity; but that need and should not be a cause of division.

Bishop Hengsbach wrapped up the whole matter of the Lay Apostolate in an excellent manner. What he said really added up to a plea for a fourth session in order to provide an opportunity for completing the work of the Council in a thorough manner.

Abp. Mart of Rheims read the relatio for the schema De Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali. And Cardinal Meyer immediately proceeded to tear it to pieces. The propositions in themselves are good enough, but they certainly do not add up to anything that is worthy of being a conciliar pronouncement on something as vital to the life of the Church as the priesthood. My own personal feeling is that it would be considered second rate even if it came from an average bishop in a small diocese in the form of a brief pastoral letter. Cardinal Meyer proposed that a

much more thorough treatment of the subject be prepared and adequately debated in the Council.

The Archbishop of Peru, Abp. Rodriguez, made some good suggestions concerning the priests from other countries to help make up for the shortage of priests, but he certainly betrayed a complete lack of any ecumenical spirit. In talking about the problems they face he enumerated them in this manner: "Protestantism, communism, etc." I hope that no alert reporter for a secular paper picked this up: what a story he could build around that!

There were fourteen speakers today, including our friend Bishop James Komba and also Bishop Donovan, Auxiliary of Detroit. The subject under discussion is of a nature to invite prolonged discussion, but I imagine they will invoke cloture rather soon.

There was little discussion of the great crisis in the Council which was precipitated by the threat to the declarations on Jews and Religious Liberty; it seems that they also were trying to whittle down the matter of collegiality. Actually there was little more to talk about since the whole story in all its details appeared in the secular press this morning. The Press Bureau for the Latin American hierarchy released the complete story. This may be unfortunate for us since it looks very much like a power play by trying to exert pressure through public opinion. Rome always reacts adversely to such tactics. This certainly had not been intended by Frings and the other cardinals involved; they had insisted on complete secrecy, but it seemed that the news was leaked by this bureau immediately.

Bishop Blomjous, however, did give a new twist about the situation. One of the Polish bishops told him last night: "We are used to things like this. This is exactly the manner in which the Communist Party rules our country. Felici is a perfect counterpart of the General Secretary of the Communist Party."

Bishop Cleven told me this evening that Cardinal Frings has received a reply from the Holy Father, but did not disclose the contents.

Bishop Hoch and I went to the Casa for 6:15 this evening to hear Cardinal Suenens speak on the subject of the seminary of tomorrow. It is symptomatic of the times that everybody expected something revolutionary and sensational on this subject from the Cardinal. I must confess that I entertained some such feeling. Just what we expected him to say on the subject is hard to define: perhaps a seminary without rules or regular class schedule!? In any case, he said nothing sensational but what he did say was excellent even though he was speaking of a seminary pretty much along the lines of what we have now insofar as curriculum and buildings is concerned. He said that before beginning the planning of the new major seminary now being constructed in connection with Louvain, he released ten priests full time for three months to make a survey. (He used the word "inquest"; though on the whole his English was good.) Through this survey he discovered that present day seminarians, priests and lay people feel that the conventional seminaries after the pattern of Trent leave the student and later the priest too isolated: from God, from fellow priests, from the people whom they are supposed to serve and from the world. The plan he outlined differed from the conventional seminary of today is simply that he wants it to be a seminary and not a monastery: his students are to become involved in the work of the apostolate while students. E.g. he wants students to be members of an actual functioning Legion of Mary for a few months taking part in all its activities. The same is to be done with other forms of the apostolate, so that the priest will by training and experience be equipped to enter into the apostolate and direct people in the

lay apostolate. In the same way, the spiritual training, intellectual training and pastoral training are to be as far as possible a process of learning by doing.

supplementary page

Roma, 6. X. 1964.
Eccellenza Rev. ma,

Un gruppo di Padri de diverse nazioni si riunisce ogni martedì alle ore 17, Via del Sant'Uffizio, 25, alla Curia Generalizia dell "Ordine di Sant'Agostino.

Scopo di tali adunanze e lo studio comune, con il concorso di teologi, degli Schemi sottomessi alla discussione dei Padri, nella luce della dottrina tradizionale della Chiesa, secondo l'insegnamento dei Sommi Pontefici.

Questi studi si fanno secondo lo spirito degli interventi fatti in Aula Conciliare dalle LL. EE. RR. me i Signore Cardinali Ruffini, Siri, Santos, Browne ed altri.

La prossima Conferenza sara fatta da S.E. Rev.ma
il Cardinale Ernesto RUFFINI

sul 13o Schema: "De Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis", martedì, 13 Ottobre, nell'indirizzo e all'ora sopra indicati.

La presente umile lettera vorrebbe essere anche un invito a V. Ecc., che voglia onorare le nostre adunanze colla Sua ambita presenza.

Dev. mo nel Signore
Geraldo de Proenca Sigaud
Arciv. di Diamantina (Brasile)
Segretario del Gruppo

Un rappresentante del Segretariato sara a disposizione di chi lo desideri, per eventuali informazioni e documentazioni complementari, ogni lunedì, mercoledì, giovedìe venerdì, Piazza del Sant'Uffizio, 6, ore 17 a 18, 30.

OCTOBER 14; 101st General Assembly: Agagianian presiding: present 2119
A pamphlet listing the Conciliar Commissions and periti brought up to date as of October 4 was distributed.

Also a revised version of the propositions on the Training of Priests was distributed.

The voting on the propositions on Priests, originally planned to begin tomorrow has been postponed because of the large number still wishing to speak on this subject. The Moderators will determine a later date as soon as possible. Felici did give us a list of the ballots to be cast on those propositions - a total of eight.

It is interesting to note that originally there was supposed to be no discussion of these propositions at all; merely a vote. Then they indicated a schedule of voting which made it seem that they acceded to many requests for debate to the extent of allowing one day's discussion; now they postponed the voting again to allow more of those to speak who had asked for a spot on the program. Are they giving up on the idea of forcing the Council to a close this session?

The Commission on De Institutione Sacerdotali also will present a message to the priests of the world, which, however, will not be debated since the council fathers submitted their observations last year.

Felici asked those council fathers who were making written interventions to get these in immediately so as not to delay the work of the commissions.

Discussions on "De Ecclesia Orientali" will begin tomorrow. This schema will be followed by "De Ecclesia in Mundo Moderno" on Friday or Monday.

Mentioning the debate on the famous Chapter 13 is also a favorable omen. One of the objectives of the conservatives in their last ditch maneuverings over the weekend was to throw out the whole schema on the Church in the Modern World.

Nineteen spoke on De Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali today. There was nothing particularly sensational in any of the speeches; they all added up to a demand for something more thorough hammered out through more prolonged debate. It is the same theme that was and is dominant in the discussion of the different sets of propositions which were handed to us with the word that there would be no debate. It is very obvious that the Council Fathers almost unanimously, aside from the hard core of conservatives who never wanted a Council in the first place, want another session in order to have time to do an adequate job on the important matters that still require study and debate.

Bishop Nowicki of Poland closed his speech with the suggestion that a phrase be added to Article II authorizing the bishop, after having heard the consultors, to establish a definite amount of income in order to prevent having this proposition become a dead letter or remain purely theoretical. Actually he seemed more interested in putting some kind of ceiling on the income of a priest in order to prevent inequalities. He did not elaborate on what he means by "income". I am sure it would be extremely difficult to determine anything like a maximum income because circumstances are so different in different parishes in the same diocese.

All papers carried a story today that would indicate a near collapse of the campaign begun by the conservatives this weekend. The report is that the Holy Father granted interviews last night to Frings, Alfrink and Bea at which time the Holy Father assured Bea that his secretariat would be allowed to complete processing the declarations. Koenig said that there was this proviso, namely that the committee set up ad hoc would be allowed to review the documents.

ad pagiam 44 am

MGR. ROMEO ET VATICAN II

(Le Monde)

Rome, 13 octobre. -- "Sinistre comedie de trois mille bons a rien qui, avec leurs croix en or sur la poitrine ne croint meme pas, pour certains d'entre eux, a la Trinite ou a la Vierge!" Cette definition assez particuliere du concile a ete formulee devant plusieurs personnes par Mgr. Romeo de la Sacree Congregation des seminaires et des universitesm bien connu notamment pour ses pamphlets contre les exegetes de l'Institut biblique pontifical aujourd'hui rehabilites par Paul VI. Ce prelat am on s'en souvient, fait beaucoup parler e lui pendant la premiere session.

L'outrance mise a partm cette maniere de voir les choses n'est pas si rare dans certains milieux romains ou l'on pene le plus serieusement du monde que la "minute de folie" -- comme on le dit parfois -- de Jean XXIII decidable de convoquer Vatican II se paie tres cher... Il est vrai que le concile sonne le glas d'un certain nombre de positions dites bien a tort traditionnelles et que les integristes romains se rendent compte qu'ils ont perdu la partie: certains, comme Mgr. Romeo, se montrent mauvais joueurs. D'autres, heuresuement plus nombreux cherchent a s'adapter. C'est sans aucun doute une des vertus du concile que de faire evoluer peu a peu les ecclesiastiques les moins portes a accepter le moindre changement dans leurs habitudes mentales.

Paul VI qui connait bien les milieux de la Curie pour les avoir longtemps pratiques avant d'etre archeveque de Milan, avait d'avance repondu aux detracteurs du concile en declarant le 14 avril dernier: "Quelleque doive etre l'issue du concile, nous devons le considerer comme une 'heure de Dieu', 'un passage du Seigneur' dans la vie de l'Eglise et dans l'histoire du monde."

Note: A similar story was found in the "Giornale d'Italia" the following day.

OCTOBER 15. 102nd General Assembly; Agagianian presiding: present 2130
Felici started out: Exeant omnes. Patres ornatissimi et patientissimi! The Lord knows he has given us adequate opportunities to practice patience during these three sessions. He went on to say that there are so many requests to have people attend the Council Mass that soon the entire basilica would not be big enough to accommodate the crowd that wants to enter. In this connection is witnessed an interesting performance as I was entering the Porta St. Martha. A nun was there with a ticket of admission to the Mass. The attendant was arguing with her because her ticket specified "two persons" and there were six nuns insisting on getting in on that ticket. I didn't remain to see the outcome; but if they were true to form, I am sure that in the end all six nuns did get in.

Felici also spoke of the many requests to have laymen admitted to the entire General Assembly. He pleaded for use of restraint in making such requests because the secretariate was overworked (this didn't elicit much sympathy because the office of the General Secretariat isn't working overtime). I am sure that council fathers will be influenced by this as much as they are influenced by requests to be brief in their speeches and not to repeat anything that has already been said.

At 10:45 AM Agagianian asked all council fathers to remain in their places because at 11:00 the Moderators would have an important matter to announce. Everybody thought of the possibility of having some announcement concerning the question of the closing of the Council or possibly the matter of the declarations. As a consequence, mirabile dictu, hardly anybody left his seat to go to the coffee bar. When the next speaker had finished, Agagianian asked for a standing vote to indicate their willingness to accept cloture on the subject of De Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali. As usual that was carried just about unanimously.

Cardinal Lefebvre of Bourges spoke on this topic on the petition of 70 fathers. Archbishop Marty of Rheims gave the final touch to the schema on the priesthood as relator.

Then Cardinal Lercaro took over the meeting and Cardinal Cicognani introduced the schema on De Ecclesiis Orientalibus. He is the chairman of that commission. He did much better in

his introduction than I expected. I had expected that he might get confused here and there, but he managed to follow the text very well.

Then Bishop Bukatko gave the lengthy relatio. He did a marvelous job. With his flowing white beard he makes a very venerable figure, looking older than he really is; at the same time he has a beautiful voice which made his delivery very effective.

There were three speeches on the new schema: Cardinal Koenig, Patriarch and Maximos IV Saigh.

The Cardinal had the usual precise, orderly and complete presentation of his points. The interesting thing was that the two Patriarchs took almost exactly opposite positions on the various points in the schema. I have never been able to figure out just why these two should oppose each other's viewpoint in just about every question pertaining to the Oriental Churches that comes up for discussion. Maximos spoke in French; but contrary to his usual style, he was very restrained in his remarks, which were the first he made in the third session.

We were the guests of Archbishop Binz at dinner in the Scoglio di Frisio on Via Merulana. The Council really was hashed over!

Along with the diary I am filing a copy of a news story in the Paris LeMonde giving Msgr. Romeo's opinion on the Council. It is the most scandalous bit in connection with the Council I have come across. It is so scurrilous that I find it hard to give it any credence.

OCTOBER 16: 103rd Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Agagianian presiding, present 2092

Distributed today:

- a) Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy
- b) Relatio on Chapter 13 - Church in the Modern World.
- c) Emended text of Chapter VI of de Ecclesia

Felici announced (and then the same announcement was repeated by each of the sub secretaries in respective languages at different points during today's General Assembly) that according to the decision of the Coordinating Commission a preliminary vote will be taken on each of the schemas that had been reduced to brief propositions. The vote will be taken after a brief debate on each schema to decide whether the council fathers wish to have the schema returned immediately on the individual proposition or whether they wish to have the schema returned to the competent commission to be rewritten according to the emendations proposed by the council fathers. An absolute majority will be sufficient to decide either one way or the other in these ballots. On Monday the first of these preliminary ballots will be cast in connection with the schema, "de Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali."

Felici also announced the method of procedure and the vestments to be worn at the canonization of the Uganda martyrs on Sunday.

Finally it was announced that there would be no General Assemblies on November 2 and 3. On the latter date there is to be a cappella papalis. This will make it possible for me to remain one day longer in Germany.

There were ten who spoke on the schema "de Ecclesiis Orientalibus". Of these seven were Orientals or closely connected with them. The debate illustrates one of the major problems connected with the Oriental Churches, namely their conflict among themselves. If they could unite on a common policy I am sure they would receive much better treatment at the hands of

the Oriental Congregation. As matters now stand it is impossible, even with the best of will on the part of the members of the Oriental Congregation, which often has not been present - to formulate and implement policies affecting the Oriental Churches which would be satisfactory to them: when one group is pleased the others complain, and vice versa. Bishop Doumith of Sarba in Lebanon was particularly outspoken. He said that the Oriental Churches had built up great hope for what the council could do for them. "Spec nostra fere totaliter evanescit!" That pretty well sums up the opinion of the group that opposes the schema.

I am sure that many spent little time listening to speeches, as I did, and devoted themselves almost completely to a study of the Instructions on the Liturgy prepared by the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. The first note of frustration entered the picture before even opening the pamphlet. Right across the top of the front cover in a most prominent position appeared the words: SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM. The reaction was: what have they to do with this matter?! It appeared, as one read the text, that they must have had considerable influence on a few points.

From the closing paragraph of the document it would appear that the text was prepared by the Commission and presented to the Holy Father for Approval by Cardinal Lercaro. Then the Holy Father studied the matter with the aid of the commission and the Congregation of Rites, after which he returned it to Cardinal Lercaro the Prefect of the Congregation of Rites. The document was dated September 26, 1964 and was signed by both Lercaro and Larraona and countersigned by Danta.

The Holy Father approved the text and stated that it is to become public law to be obeyed by all to whom it pertains beginning with the First Sunday of Lent, March 7, 1965. There was no word said concerning the intervening period, either allowing us to follow the Instruction immediately where feasible or prohibiting us from following it before March 7. In the case of the Motu Proprio, "Sacram Liturgiam" it was specifically stated that no one may use any of the privileges mentioned prior to the effective date; significantly no such reference was made. Canonists immediately pointed out that in legislation of this kind, with such wording, is optional immediately upon publication and becomes mandatory on the effective date mentioned. Hence I am sure that many will begin tomorrow to omit Psalm 42 and the last gospel at Mass tomorrow! Canonists have a way of making "words mean what they ain't!"

There are some points about which there is considerable complaint. The one occurs in #89. "Breviariapraeter interpretationem vernaculum, textum etiam latinum contineant oportet." In the original draft of this article the word "debet" was used instead of "oportet". This was done because some of the members of the commission objected vigorously to the requirement that both Latin and English versions of the breviary be printed in each edition. The most that could be gotten from the curial elements in the commission and SRC was to tone the word down from debet to oportet. Admittedly the latter expression is very weak and I am sure that little attention will be paid to it.

Some reference was made to the practice of concelebration in the Instruction, but the whole thing was deferred until the proper ceremonial is published. I understand that this ceremonial has been ready since the month of June, but the delaying tactics are still used. I have been told that the requirements for concelebration are such that it will have little value for us. We need concelebration at the retreats more than any other occasion. But the way ceremonial has been drafted (requiring the concelebrated priests to be around the altar, that they all wear the full sacerdotal Mass vestments, etc.) will be utterly impractical for our retreats. We probably can use a limited number of priests at concelebration on Holy Thursday, and probably

occasionally when priests observe their silver jubilee; but aside from that it seems that we will have little use for it.

Of course, there are many things in the Instruction that are wonderful and represent real progress. They also give us some idea of what the Mass of the future will be when the full reform of the liturgical books has been accomplished. For that we are grateful. It will help a great deal in bringing the liturgical renewal into the pastoral field and thus greatly influence the lives of clergy and laity.

Things are quiet on the Curial front; we don't know how far we have won or lost the battle, or what attacks to expect next. But so much is certain; it will be a long struggle to achieve the aggiornamento of Pope John. A whole new generation will have to grow up in the curia before the job is completed.

On the lighter side, a limerick on Cardinal Cushing
Cardinal Cushing of Boston avows
He, freedom to all men allows
though he's no Latin scholar
he knows how to holler
At the Council he brought down the house.

OCTOBER 17 and 18: The New York Herald Tribune (European edition) carried a lengthy story on Chapter 13, The Church in the Modern World. It seems that the papers are determined to force the debate on the issue of birth control into the open. The schema contains only an indirect reference to the subject. At the same time some effort is being made to prevent debate on this subject in the aula; but to confine the debate on the subject entirely to written interventions.

For one thing, the Holy Father last spring already announced that a committee is working on this subject in relationship to the "pill" and asked that in the meantime the subject be kept out of public debate. That may have the effect of having all council fathers agree not to bring the subject into the open in the aula.

Furthermore, if the subject is treated formally in the aula it inevitably will be discussed in every daily paper and periodical in the world. No matter what would be said, journalists would twist it and create hopeless confusion. Any effort at preventing its getting into the papers would be futile.

Did a lot of paper work over the weekend. Had David Butler of Fargo here for dinner Sunday noon. The weather was fine, but not fine enough to tempt me out today. I wanted to get caught up and I did.

OCTOBER 19: 104th General Assembly; Lercaro presiding; present 2135
Distributed today:

- a) Notificatio: a printed sheet outlining the rules for the vote on the various schemata reduced to "propositiones".
- b) Relation on the schema - declaratio on "De Christiana Educationis"
- c) Relation on schema "De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis".

We immediately proceeded to vote on the first of the schema propositiones on De Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali. I expected this vote to be rather close with either side having a good

change to squeak by with a very small majority. Actually, the vote was strongly in favor of rejecting the schema as it stood as a basis for emendation. The Vote was Placet 905; Non-Placet 1199. That means the voting stood very close to 4 to 3 against the schema. This had the effect of returning the rejected schema to the competent commission so that it can be reworked and returned to the floor for acceptance. On the basis of past experience we can feel sure that the result of this action will be that we get a much more mature statement, more worthy of a conciliar pronouncement. Felici sounded just a bit dejected when he announced the result of the vote.

While the vote was not nearly so overwhelming in favor of the more liberal viewpoint, it nevertheless was very significant. It is the first of the votes taken on a schema-proposition and as such was a test vote. These propositions had been devised in order to hasten the work the work of the Council to a point where no fourth session would be held. The Curia wants us to get out of town, and that fast! The vote today indicates that the council fathers as a whole have no intention of going home with such a large part of the work done in an inadequate manner. The vote means that these propositions which were to be voted on originally without debate, now will receive thorough discussion with adequate treatment by the commissions. They will not be plainly shoved down our throats. As a consequence the move to quit the work of the Council in such a hurried manner. Not all propositions will be treated in this manner because some are related to less important matters and may be allowed to go through with the summary treatment.

During the progress of the General Assembly we also voted on the four Articles of Chapter VII on "De Ecclesia". These articles were all acted on favorably with only 20 negative votes on the first Article and 8 negative votes against each of the other three. Tomorrow we are to cast the vote on Chapter VII as a whole, which will complete action on this Chapter except for the final ballot to be cast eventually on the entire Constitution De Ecclesia. Cardinal Koenig indicated at dinner this noon that several of the other Chapters on De Ecclesia are just about ready, so there should be rather rapid action on that Constitution during the next two weeks.

There were fourteen speeches on "De Ecclesiis Orientalibus" today. The same lack of unity among the Orientals themselves was in evidence today as was apparent yesterday. Archbishop Edelby made what was probably the best speech of the day. He said schema "non est optimum; sed honum - simpliciter bonum." But he went on to say that under the present circumstances it is the best that can be expected. Therefore he pleaded that the schema be adopted and then amended by the competent commission to correct insofar as circumstances will allow the shortcomings which are so obvious.

At 12:25 Lercaro called for a standing vote on the question whether debate should be terminated on De Ecclesiis Orientalibus. As usual, the vote was practically unanimous.

Tomorrow, after those who have received endorsement of 70 council fathers have spoken, the debate on the Church in the Modern World will begin.

There will also be the vote on the schema of De Ecclesiis Orientalibus as a whole. There will be a chance to vote iuxta modum. I will submit the modus suggested by Bishop McDevitt which provides that the converts to an Oriental Catholic Church from an Orthodox Church may choose the rite to which he is to belong. This is important in countries such as ours where the members of the different rites are so widely scattered and where they get little or no service from their own clergy.

We had a meeting of the US Episcopal Conference in order to take action on matters pertaining to the liturgy which require action by the national body. We voted definitely to make the first Sunday of Advent the effective date of using the vernacular in the Mass. We also voted to petition the Commission on the Implementation of the Liturgy for permission to make the provisions of the Instruction we received yesterday effective as of the same date. This action was prompted by the desire to cause less confusion than would be the case if we started the vernacular in the Mass on the First Sunday of Advent and the provisions of the Instruction on the First Sunday of Lent.

Archbishop Dearden, Chairman of the Liturgical Commission of the US simply made the statement that the provisions of this Instruction are not permissive prior to the date they become public law according to the document. He relied on the opinion of only one canonist connected with the post-conciliar commission. Actually there are other canonists who hold the opposite opinion. But Dearden allowed no discussion of that point.

Cardinal Spellman made this first appearance at the General Assembly for this session today. He also presided at our meeting tonight. He does not look very well. He submitted to surgery in September.

OCTOBER 20: 105th General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; present 2191
The question of the schema on *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* was first disposed of. Abp. Hakim, Abp. Baudoux and Abp. Athaide of Agra in India spoke on this schema to wind up the formal discussion. Abp. Hakim had a forceful speech, though not as carefully prepared as Edelby's yesterday. The archbishop from India made some proposals to avoid reduplication of hierarchies in the same territory because of the presence of various rites; but his proposals did not strike me as being very realistic.

The vote on the Oriental Churches showed a top-heavy majority in favor of accepting the schema for revision and emendation by the commission on the basis of the suggestions already made in writing or on the floor as well as the *modi* that will be submitted during the ballots on the details of the schema. The vote on accepting the schema showed 1911 voting *placet* and 265 voting *non placet*. Cardinal Koenig is convinced that Abp. Hakim's speech this morning is largely responsible for this favorable vote. It was announced that the detailed vote on the schema will take place tomorrow with a ballot being cast for each item as follows:

1. Proemium, Art #1
2. *De Ecclesiis Particularibus* Art # 2 & 4
3. *De Spirituali Ecclesiarum Orientalium patrimonio scrvando*. Art #5 & 6
4. *De Patriarchis Orientalibus*. Art # 7 to 11
5. *De Disciplina Sacramentorum* Art # 12 to 18
6. *De Cultu Divino* Art # 19 to 23
7. *De conversatione ecclesiastica cum Fratribus Separatis* # 24 to 29

I should add that Archbishop Bukatko gave an excellent summation of the whole question before the ballot was taken. He pointed to the fact that many conflicting and contradictory suggestions were made and very probably contradictory *modi* would be received. Obviously not everybody's suggestions could be adopted. But he did appeal for a sympathetic understanding of the problems involved. He ended by saying: Do not treat your brethren in the Oriental churches worse than you treated the Jews! He was appealing for an acceptance of the schema.

After Abp. Hakim had finished speaking Bishop Blomjous remarked that he is a strange character. I told him that I hear Hakim was quite "an operator". Blomjous answered: He is a Syrian merchant!

I should have mentioned above that the final vote of Chapter VII on "De Ecclesia" was taken before the matter of the Oriental Churches was treated. There were only 29 voting non-placet, but 233 voted iuxta modum.

We then went over to a consideration of the all-important Chapter 13, The Church in the Modern World. This is a very wide subject and Felici announced the arrangement which had been planned by the Moderators in order to treat this subject in an orderly manner.

Today we began the discussion of General principles of the schema. When that is completed a vote will be taken on the question of accepting the schema for discussion in detail. If accepted the schema will be treated in units as follows: a) Prologue and Chapter I: b) Chapter II & III as a unit. Chapter IV actually contains six separate and distinct topics, each of which will be dealt with separately. No wonder Cardinal Koenig does not expect that this schema will be discussed in full before the end of the first week in November.

Cardinal Cento took the floor on behalf of Ottaviani, president of the dogmatic commission, to provide the introduction to the schema on the Church in the Modern World. He attracted attention principally because he rolled the r's unnaturally. He was most dramatic in his delivery, speaking extremely loud and trying to achieve dramatic effect. Bishop Blomjous, who was a prominent member of the commission that dealt with this schema said that he heard all of this from Cento because Cento delivered the speech to the final meeting of the plenary commission and in a relatively small room spoke just as loud and just as dramatically. He said the windows rattled.

Bishop Guano was the regular relator. Bishop Blomjous said that during their first meetings Guano had been one of the periti for that commission and then was appointed Bishop of Leghorn in Italy less than two years ago. He was the second peritus to be named bishop and then become a member of the commission!

There were ten Cardinals who were announced by Felici as seeking a chance to speak on this topic. Ruffini as usual was on the list, though Lienart and Spellman were ahead of him on the list. (Incidentally this was Spellman's first speech for this year, because he came to Rome only last Sunday.) Ruffini went into many minute details on the schema and I was wondering how long it would take for Doepfner to interrupt him. He finally did and promptly Ruffini said that he did not know that discussion would be confined to the schema in general and had prepared his speech for discussion of details. He finished his speech as prepared! I suppose that when we get to the discussion of the various details he will speak again on each!

Lercaro's speech was excellent. He stressed the need of full, frank and leisurely discussion without haste. His talk was greeted with general applause. Cardinal Meyer gave a rather scholarly talk on the scriptural basis, especially in St. Paul, for this subject.

Another point made by Lercaro was that it takes time really to mature a subject; more so in this topic than in any other. He intimated that if the final action would be taken only a year from now in a fourth session it would not be delaying too much. He seemed to intimate that the criticism of secular press and lay experts would be most helpful because they would not feel the inhibitions we may have in criticizing a schema. On some of the subjects to be discussed many lay people are much better informed than we are.

Bishop Hoch just dropped by as he returned from dinner with Bishop Van Lierde this evening. Van Lierde attended a meeting of the Italian Episcopal Conference recently. The meeting opened with a speech of Siri in which he covered seven or eight points; then Ruffini got up and talked equally as long. When he was through he closed the meeting with prayer, and that was that. Some of the young bishops protested to Van Lierde that they wouldn't take this kind of treatment forever. In this connection it will be interesting to see what will be done in Italy in the aftermath of the new instruction released the other day. Up to the present the sum and substance of the liturgical reform has been that two years ago they were allowed to say the Leonine prayers in the vernacular. What they will do now that the Leonine prayers have been suppressed, remains to be seen.

OCTOBER 21: 106th General Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; present 2176

The Relatio on the missionary activity of the Church was distributed this morning.

During the first part of the Assembly we voted five times on the Oriental Church. Aside from the second ballot the votes were placet by a wide margin with no more than 265 votes iuxta modum in any ballot. The situation is quite different with regard to the second ballot which covered propositions #2, 3 & 4. I believe that proposition 4 is the crux of the disagreement between many of the groups and certainly the point on which the Latins disagree with the Orientals. This proposition requires that converts to the Catholic Church (from Orthodox churches) must remain in the same rite which corresponds with the rite of the Orthodox church which they are leaving. I suspect that most of the 719 modi submitted with this ballot refer to this point. In the Canon Law of the Oriental Churches which was promulgated as recently as 1958 converts to the Church were given the privilege of choosing the rite to which they wished to belong. In the schema as drafted they no longer had this option, but had to apply to the Holy See if they wished to belong to the Latin rite or a different Oriental rite. Many western bishops objected to this because it caused no end of difficulty in cases where isolated families of Oriental Catholics had no opportunity ever or only rarely to be served by Oriental priests and as a consequence attended church and received the sacraments in the Latin rite. They sometimes were entirely out of touch with their own rite. This proposition, of course, applies directly to Orthodox in that situation who are entering the Catholic Church. The point at issue here is to continue allowing them to choose their rite when entering the Church. This is the first instance where there were so many votes iuxta modum that there was no clear cut 2/3 majority of simple placet votes. As a consequence the commission will have to examine all modi and then return the proposition to the aula for another vote.

There are two more ballots on the Oriental churches which must be taken care of tomorrow.

There was a total of 12 speakers on the program for today, of whom three (Landazuri-Ricketts, Suenens and Bea) were cardinals. Suenens had some very definite opinions about this schema, which is understandable because he is responsible for the introduction of this whole subject more than anybody else. He wants to make sure that the document will be drafted so as to show up the Church in her proper field, i.e., that she respects the legitimate autonomy of the world in its own realm.

Bea recommended the restudy of the whole matter in such a manner as to make sure of a proper scriptural basis. He followed somewhat the same line as Cardinal Meyer did, though Meyer quoted mostly from St. Paul. Bishop Vairo of Gravinn & Irsina in Italy spoke so loud that

when Doepfner tried to stop him because he was running overtime, he did not hear Doepfner at all but kept right on going to the bitter end of his manuscript.

Abp. Conway of Armagh had some very penetrating criticisms to offer. He did so in a very constructive spirit and his suggestions will do much to strengthen the document.

Abp. Zoghby, Patriarchal Vicar of Antioch for the Melkites was interrupted twice by Doepfner for going into great detail rather than concentrating on the general schema. At one point he stopped to ask the usher in an undertone whether he had any time left; but this all went out over the loudspeaker; he didn't realize how sensitive these microphones are!

In conversation during the session today as we received the relatio on the Church and the Missions, Bishop Blomjous told a story about the origin of the schema on the missions. I had heard Bishop Fulton Sheen, who is on the commission dealing with the missions, say that the first draft on this topic had been prepared by Agagianian and submitted to the Preparatory Commission (on which Sheen also served) on a "take it or leave it" basis. Basically that draft got by the original Central Commission and was being prepared for the Council pretty much in its original form representing Agagianian's thinking. Somewhere along the line Doepfner, who was well aware of the development of this document, told Agagianian that unless the members of the commission were given an opportunity to debate and improve this schema in the commission meetings, he (Doepfner) would personally tell the whole story in the aula when this schema came on the floor. Agagianian agreed and the schema was improved - at least somewhat. It will get a good going over when we finally get a chance at it.

This morning at breakfast Cardinal Koenig (He had told me the evening before that he would have an audience this morning.) told us that his audience with the Holy Father proved to be rather long. The primary reason for the audience was the demonstration on the subject of poverty in the world which Jim Norris is trying to promote. Jim's original idea was to invite the Holy Father to attend a regular working session and celebrate the Mass, after which Barbara Ward would speak on the subject of world poverty. This is an ambitious program - as I told Jim Norris in conversation. I thought that the idea of having a woman talk in a working session of the Council would be simply too much for the ultra-conservatives. Jim said: "Well, at least we can try!" He is trying very hard. He has lined up a very large number of Episcopal Conferences, including that of the US, behind the plan. He asked Cardinal Koenig to go to the Holy Father directly with the plan in order to by-pass the Presidency and the General Secretariat. The Cardinal apparently was not free to discuss the details because he volunteered no information concerning details. Though I have a chance almost daily, when the Cardinal is in town, to speak to him alone at breakfast and receive much information from him, I usually do not raise any questions which involve information he gets in audiences with the Holy Father.

I was, however, surprised when he made the remark that much of the audience was given over to a discussion of the progress of the Council. The general tone was that the Holy Father was going to allow the Council to steer its own course almost completely. The real surprise came when the Cardinal volunteered the information to Bishop Hoch (who was still there at breakfast) and me that the Holy Father spoke in earnest about a reform of the traditional ideas of clerical garb and vestments; he asked Koenig at the proper time to make an intervention on the Council floor!!! This information, he added, is of course top secret. Hence no reference may ever be made to it on the basis of this entry into the Diary until after the final session of the Council and after the Proceedings of the Council become public record. In connection with the above, I should mention that there is a strong rumor afloat to the effect that the Mass

planned by Jim Norris is to be celebrated on November 21 , the feast of the Presentation, after the solemn close of this session. I do hope that this is not true because the demonstration would lose its value unless it is a part of a regular working session showing that it is the official concern of all council fathers. If tagged onto the regular calendar after completion of the session when most of the council fathers have left.

Three pages containing an address by Archbishop of Westminster page 1 of 3

THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD TO-DAY

ADDRESS OF THE MOST REVEREND JOHN CARMEL HEENAN ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

It would be most ungracious if we were not to praise the efforts of the Commission which has produced the document we are now considering, There can be no doubt that the Council Fathers concerned and their advisers have worked hard and have done their best. It is nevertheless quite obvious that the document they have presented to us is unworthy of a General Council of the Church.

If we are to speak at all about the Church in the world of today we must do so in clear unmistakable and down-to-earth terms. For some years not only the faithful but non-Catholics and even unbelievers have been awaiting from this Council wise advice on many grave problems. The Holy See itself has suggested that the Second Vatican Council will make some attempt to solve the complex social problems of our day. The document now before us will therefore be studied with eager hope.

What sort of judgment, Venerable Brothers, do you think the world will pass on this treatise? On some questions, as we know, it is better to say too little than too much. On the subject of world problems, however, it would have been much better to say nothing than produce a set of platitudes. I would like you to call to mind the number of sittings we had when the question of the sources of revelation was so fiercely debated. The theologians, of course, rightly regarded this as a highly important topic. But to the citizens of the wide world, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, a debate of this kind seems like wasting time and beating the air. Having spent such a long time on theological niceties this Council will become a laughing-stock in the eyes of the world if it now rushes breathlessly through a debate on world hunger, nuclear war and family life. People will ask ironically and with good reason what do we really mean when we call this a pastoral Council?

I must speak plainly. This document is going to dash the hopes of everyone who has been awaiting it. Its authors do not seem to realize even to whom the message should be directed. Here is an example of their way of writing: "Christians" they say "are ready to engage in a dialogue with all men of good will". But surely this is a pointless thing to say. Christians should be ready to conduct a dialogue with anyone whether or not he is a man of good will. The whole treatise reads more like a sermon than a document of a Council.

- 2 -

We have been given the schema itself together with certain supplements. The fact is that the schema even read with the supplements remains obscure and misleading; read on its own it is dangerous and could prove harmful. I would like the Fathers of the Council to consider this question very seriously. We have been told to debate the schema and to pass

over the rest without comment. But if we fail to scrutinize both documents with great care the mind of the Council will have to be interpreted to the world by the specialists who helped the Fathers of the Commission to draw up the documents. God forbid that this should happen! I fear specialists when they are left to explain what the bishops meant.

Between sessions of this Council the Church of God has suffered a great deal from the writings and speeches of some of the specialists. They are few in number but their sound has gone forth to the ends of the earth. These few specialists care nothing for the ordinary teaching authority of the bishops - nor, I regret to say, for that of the Pope. It is idle to show them a papal encyclical in which a point of Catholic doctrine is clearly laid down. They will immediately reply that a Pope is not infallible when writing an encyclical. It really does not seem worthwhile for the Pope to write any more encyclical letters since they can apparently no longer be quoted in support of the Faith.

We must protect the authority of the Teaching Church. It is of no avail to talk about a College of Bishops if specialists in articles, books and speeches contradict and pour scorn on what a body of bishops teaches. Until now it has not been a doctrine of the Church that the theologians admitted to the Council are infallible. The theories of one or two must not be mistaken for a general agreement among theologians which has, of course, special authority.

Perhaps the Commission responsible for this document had no chance of success from the outset. They were, in fact, denied the help of experts who really knew their subjects. When you are dealing with the problems of social life you need to consult those who know and live in the world. Now let me ask how many parish priests, how many of the faithful, how many husbands and wives, how many doctors, economists, scientists (especially experts in big-chemistry and nuclear physics) were at work on this Commission? It is useless in these matters to seek advice only from those who since their youth have spent their lives in monasteries, seminaries or universities. These eminent men may hardly know the world as it really is. The world can be unpleasant and cruel. These scholars often have a childlike trust in the opinions of men in the world. Certainly they are simple as doves but they are not always wise as serpents.

- 3 -

If you are looking for examples of all this you need only study the section on matrimony. Everyone knows that doctors all over the world are busily trying to produce a satisfactory contraceptive pill. This special kind of pill is to be a panacea to solve all sexual problems between husbands and wives. Neither the treatise itself nor the supplements hesitate to prophesy that such a pill is just round the corner. Meanwhile, it is said, married couples and they alone must decide what is right and wrong. Everyone must be his own judge. But, the document adds, the couple must act according to the teaching of the Church. But this is precisely what married people want to be told - what is now the teaching of the Church? To this question, our document gives no reply. For that very reason it could provide an argument from our silence to theologians after the Council who wish to attack sound doctrine.

The document thus blandly addresses husbands and wives: "Some practical solutions have made their appearance and there are more to come". This is no way for a document of the Church to be composed. When our children ask us for bread we should not give them a stone.

I strongly appeal for this document to be given to a new Commission. The treatise itself says that learned men and married couples must work out with theologians ways of understanding more thoroughly the mysteries of nature. But this should be done before and not after a conciliar document is drawn up.

I therefore propose that without delay a new Commission be set up composed of specialists from the laity and priests with long pastoral experience. Then after three or four years let the fourth and final session of the Council be convened to discuss all these social problems. It is true that some of us in this Episcopal College will have gone to our reward. But perhaps we shall then be able to help the Council more by our prayers than we do now by our speeches. One thing is quite certain. It would be a scandal to rush this debate now that we have at last come to really pastoral problems.

OCTOBER 22: 107th General Assembly; Doepfner presiding: present 2157

At the beginning of the Assembly Felici announced that at about 11:00 the official medal of the Third Session of the Council will be distributed. They made a big fuss about the fact that the medal would be given today only to the council fathers who were present and occupying their seats. Periti would receive their medal only if they go to Santa Maria (inside the Vatican on Saturday morning or next week on any day between 5:00 and 7:00.)

The two final ballots on the Oriental Churches were cast this morning. In the one ballot there were only 22 unfavorable votes and 27 modi; and in the other there were 111 unfavorable votes with 195 iuxta modum.

There were fifteen speeches today on the Church in the Modern World. Archbishop Heenan set the tone in the first speech; most of the others followed suit, though no one else was so scathing in his criticism. Apparently Heenan simply has no time for the periti, because his worst barbs were directed towards that group. Fortunately the NCWC office provided us with a complete text of the English version of the address. It is being filed with this Diary because it is a classic example of the frankness and freedom with which the council fathers speak up at times. It must be said however, that very few speeches in the past have been as sharp as this one.

The other speakers without exception, admitted that the schema merits consideration; but they also agreed that it will require prolonged debate and much hard work between the sessions. Some spoke of allowing as much as four years to pass by before having the fourth session in order to allow for enough time to prepare an adequate document. It seems to me that up to this time the greatest difficulty arises from the fact that the commission was asked to draft the document before there was any clearly developed idea of just what message we are to get across to the world. It isn't possible to do a satisfactory job without first determining the nature of the job. Another difficulty is that the document was composed before the schemata on the Church and the Lay Apostolate have been fully developed. This schema on the Church in the Modern World, it seems to me, should tie together the things we have been trying to develop during the course of the Council: the worship of the Church, the Nature and Mission of the Church; the laity in the Church, etc. And then all of this must be put together in a concrete program through which we can speak to the world and bring some help to the world in meeting its problems. I don't think we can offer the concrete solutions to every problem; for one thing the situation is so fluid that before we can get down to practical cases, the problems have changed radically and we are obsolete. We can not do more than provide direct answers in terms of principles to guide our people in their daily living; and to provide for the world a basis

of practical action. The real difficulty arises when we try to develop these principles in terms which are intelligible and acceptable to the modern world.- And so the debate goes on.

I had expected that we would close discussion on the schema in general and pass on to the detailed discussion of the Introduction and First Chapter. But apparently they want a prolonged discussion. At the present rate it will take another two weeks at least.

Archbishop Roberts spoke yesterday afternoon (probably some of Heenan's sharp words were directed at him! I lost my respect for Roberts when he deceived his audience by saying that he heard speakers were cut off in the debate those last days as soon as they stopped talking about generalities and took up some of the problems in detail. He said it in such a manner as to imply that there is no freedom on the Council floor to meet the real problems head-on; he implied that he would take the liberty to speak freely of the real problems! Archbishop Roberts is an intelligent man and he certainly should have learned the rules of procedure which are followed in all major schemata: When a new schema is taken up, there first is a discussion on the "schema in genere", the purpose of which is to determine whether the draft proposal is acceptable to the Council as a basis for detailed discussion. We are now in the process of that general discussion; and it is true that Doepfner called a few speakers, including Ruffini, who started going into details. Soon this discussion of the schema as a whole will be terminated and a vote taken on the question of whether it should be accepted as a basis for detailed discussion. If it is accepted by an absolute majority, then we begin debate in detail according to a schedule already announced in the aula. If Archbishop Roberts has paid any attention to what is going on in the Council during these three sessions and especially during the General Assemblies this week, he would know that he created an utterly false impression when he intimated that there would be no free discussion of problems facing the Church or that there has been no such freedom during the 107 General Assemblies which have already been held.

In this connection a conversation at table this evening is interesting. Two pastors from the Archdiocese of Cologne who are official Auditors in the Council were telling of their surprise over the freedom with which the council fathers speak on the floor! Maybe they should visit with Abp. Roberts for a while.

OCTOBER 23: 108th General Congregation; Cardinal Doepfner presiding 2079 present. The propositions concerning religious were distributed; along with them we received an Appendix to these propositions. Felici made it clear that the appendix would not be debated.

Felici announced that the Holy Father has set November 21 as the closing date of the third session. His Holiness will concelebrate Mass with 24 council fathers who have major Marian shrines in their jurisdiction. In the afternoon the Pope will also appear at St. Mary Major for a solemn function, the nature of which has not been disclosed. It appears that the Holy Father wishes to make a great demonstration in honor of Our Lady. I would not be surprised if he took the occasion of the Feast of the Presentation of Our Lady to dedicate the Council or the World to her. I am sure that the Presentation Sisters at Valley City and Fargo will be more than pleased that this function is on their patronal feast.

The hope was expressed that the commissions and the "periti" will labor diligently so as to have several final texts ready to present to the Holy Father yet during this session for solemn promulgation. There was a long round of applause when Felici referred to the many "hard working periti." I am sure it made Archbishop Heenan quite uncomfortable - a sensation which, I am sure, he experienced many times during the course of today's General Assembly.

The question of a fourth session was also definitely settled today when Felici announced that another session will be held when the Holy Father decides to call one. I suspect that Pope Paul will call the fourth session as quickly as is feasible consistent with doing a thorough job on what will remain of the agenda. I am sure that he will be anxious to have this over with at the earliest possible date in order to rid himself of the burden of the many pressures that are brought to bear on him during these sessions.

The pastors who are official auditors at the Council were invited by Felici to Santa Martha to be his guests at an informal gathering.

There is a very strong rumor that Felici had been on the point of resigning his position as General Secretary. I have no positive evidence; but Abp. Jachim among others have reported that this is generally accepted as fact. It seems that he feels he was made the scapegoat by the Secretariat of State in their efforts to soften down the declaration on religious liberty and for practical purposes to scuttle the declaration on the Jews. He was lead to believe that the word to that effect which was passed on to him came directly from the Holy Father. He wrote the famous letters on these two declarations to Bea on that assumption. Then when the going got rough the rug was pulled out from under him. If there is real truth to this story it would be interesting to know who was responsible for this bit of intrigue. I am sure it was not Amleto Cicognani because his mental state is such that he would hardly know what the score is.

There were seven speeches on the schema on the Church in the Modern World insofar as general principles are concerned. While the major portion of all speeches were pretty much along the lines of what we have been hearing since last Tuesday on the general principles of this schema, there were several very tart replies to Archbishop Heenan. The first jab came from Abbot Benedict Reetz, O.S.B., head of the Beuronese Congregation of the Benedictines. His reference was really sizzling. He started in a sarcastic vein by saying that he feared speaking to the Council since he was one of those who spent his whole lifetime in a monastery and therefore is not supposed to know anything about the world. He even referred to the forty monks who were once sent to "make angels of the English people!" In any other place and circumstances this could all have been very amusing; but to me it did not seem quite proper for Abbot Benedict to make use of the sounding board of the aula to make a personal attack on Heenan. He certainly did not confine his remarks to the general principles of the schema under discussion; rather he took the occasion to defend the religious life. All of this drew a round of applause from the far end of the aula, which in turn drew a sharp reproof from Doepfner; "...ne fiant plausus."

There were two insistent demands from Bishop Yu Pin and Bollatti that a strong statement on communism as the militant form of atheism that constitutes the principal threat to the church and world.

We had another amusing instance of speakers being interrupted by the Moderator and then refusing to stop. Bishop Von Streng of Basel was first called for going beyond general principles into details of Chapter 4. He went right on without any pause until he had gone beyond the allotted ten minutes when he was called twice by Doepfner; still he went on to the bitter end! He was not quite as bad as the last speaker yesterday who was last on the program for the day. He was called for going overtime, but refused to listen - it looked more as though he simply did not hear because he was talking very loud. Doepfner interrupted three times to no avail. So he simply had the mike turned off and then announced the session for today! That really drew a laugh and applause from the crowd.

At 11:00 am after seven had spoken the Moderators called for a standing vote on the question of cloture on the discussion of the general principles of this schema. The vote carried. Then another amusing incident occurred when the relator who was supposed to sum up the whole argument couldn't be found! It took some minute before he got there to make his report.

As soon as the relator finished, a ballot was taken on the acceptability of this schema for further discussion. Of the 1876 votes cast 1579 were placet; 296 non placet and one invalid. For once there was no vote marked placet iuxta modum. After the vote was taken and before the ballots were counted there was a dull intermission filled for awhile by some feeble attempts at humor on the part of Felici, though in the light of the rumor concerning Felici's offer to resign, his remarks had an interesting connotation. He referred to the fact that today we observe the feast of St. Anthony Maria Claret, who was a council father in Vatican I. He went on to say that when the next ecumenical council comes up he will not be canonized but very probably will still be in purgatory because of his shortcomings and sins in connection with this Council!

At first the Moderators apparently were going to wait for the announcement of the count on the ballots before proceeding with the announcement of the speakers on the Introduction and Chapter I. Then they decided to go ahead, and two or three speeches were given before we knew the result of the ballot.

At this point I imagine that Archbishop Heenan wishes he had never heard the word "pill". The London SUN carried a most sensational story about his reference to the pill in the Council yesterday. The SUN is a most sensational type of paper. It used the top six inches of the front page to build up a headline. It starts out with: THE PILL, under which in two lines they quote Heenan's remark: "When our children ask for bread we must give them a stone." Then in a double headlines: HEENAN DEMANDS VATICAN VERDICT. Obviously the newspaper story was utterly unfair to Heenan. His references to birth control were rather limited and certainly had not accounted for the major tone of his speech. But it is a good illustration of what will happen if the question of birth control is discussed in the open on the aula floor. So long as anybody says anything on the floor, no matter whether we are in executive session or not, the papers will sensationalize it. Statements for or against will receive the same treatment.

There is one beneficial effect this sort of thing has had: the fact that Heenan's speech captured the headlines served to keep Abp. Roberts off the front page. I don't know of any news reference to his speech.

Right next to the story on Heenan there is a picture and a story of an Englishwoman. It reads like this in the headlines: Next Week in the Sun: THE WOMAN WHO BECAME AN OUTCAST. Then the story goes on to tell of one Dr. Anne Biezanek, a Catholic and a mother who threw the Church over in order to advise and write about birth control. The story announces that her book will appear in the SUN serially beginning next Monday.

The story of the Day: Archbishop Heenan was taken to the hospital of the Blue Nuns today suffering from "peritinitis."!

another one: There are three kinds of council Fathers:

- a) STATIC - never leaves their places during the sessions
- b) ECSTATIC - leave their seats to go to the bar or walk around
- c) PROSTA (TE)TIC

During the third session of the Council the Holy Father signs his documents as follows:

PAULUS VI

Felici-ter regnante

OCTOBER 24 & 25

Teresa E. Muench and her friend, a Mrs. Plein of Oshkosh, Wis. came to Rome Friday noon and plan to be in town until next Wednesday forenoon. They called to see Father Lessard and myself on Friday afternoon. On Saturday evening we took them to dinner at LaTaverna Guelpha on Via Florentina. On Sunday they came here to the hospital for Mass which I celebrated in the hospital chapel at 8:15. They remained here for breakfast and then visited a few hours with the sisters. At 11:00 Father Lessard took us over to St. Bernardo's (Cardinal Muench's titular church) to see the shrine which was renovated with the aid of a gift of \$5000 which the Cardinal had promised them, but which was paid from his estate after his death. While we were in St. Bernardo's a downpour of rain came. It kept on raining all the way back to the hospital, which meant fighting terribly disorganized traffic. It seemed that every bus in the city was on the street which turned off Viale Trastevere as we tried to get up the hill to Monte Verde!

We had dinner with the visitors and Father Cormac, after which they returned to the hotel to prepare for going to the beautification ceremony this afternoon. Fortunately the rain held off during most of the afternoon until after :00 pm. Father Lessard had arranged for a car to take them to the beautification and back to the hotel after the same. They are to be present at the Mass at the opening of the General Assembly tomorrow morning.

This was Terry's first visit back to Rome since the time when she, Mary and Dorothy spent those hectic days here at the time of Cardinal Muench's death. I was greatly relieved that she was not overcome emotionally when revisiting the scene of that very trying experience 2 1/2 years ago. She very obviously enjoyed seeing the Sisters whom she had met here in 1962. Unfortunately Mother General and Mother Monica were away on a visitation; but they are expected back before Terry leaves on Wednesday. In that case Terry will come back to see them.

OCTOBER 26: 109th General Assembly; Cardinal Suenens presiding: present 2007

On October 28 is the anniversary of the election of Pope John. Mass will be concelebrated by twelve pastor-auditors at the Council. On October 29 is the 25th anniversary of the ordination of Cardinal Doepfner. He will concelebrate with a group of bishops who are observing anniversaries of their episcopal consecration.

Nine speakers were announced for discussion of the Introduction and Chapter I of the Church in the Modern World. Eleven speakers were announced for discussion of Chapter II & III of the schema. But only nine were present to take their turn. This brought an announcement from Suenens to the effect that council Fathers who requested opportunities to speak should make sure to be present when their turn comes.

Auxiliary Bishop Guerra of Madrid did probably the best job today. He asked for a thorough treatment of communism - something which others had done; but he made a thorough analysis of the manner in which the subject should be treated. He talked too long and was called by Suenens for going overtime. Nevertheless he received a good round of applause.

Both Bishop De Roo (of Victoria originally from St. Boniface who was consecrated a year ago) and Bishop Hacault (also of St. Boniface consecrated on September 8, 1964) spoke today - This was De Roo's second appearance.

The session was ended by 12:05 for lack of anymore speakers!!! Mirabili dicti! But since three failed to show there simply weren't enough to go around and fill the time.

OCTOBER 27: 110th General Assembly; Cardinal Suenens; presiding: present
Tomorrow we begin debate on Chapter IV.

The revised text and relatio on De Beata was distributed today; on Thursday one single ballot will be cast on the document as it is. Placet iuxta modum votes will be accepted; the modi must be turned in with the ballot.

There were 17 speakers today on Chapters II & III. For the first time that I can remember the Moderator did not follow the order in which the speakers had been listed by Felici at the beginning of the General Assembly when calling the speakers to the microphone. It made for a bit of confusion at times, though most of the speakers were waiting when their names were called to speak.

Cardinal Frings was the first speaker. He arose at his place at the table of the presidency and announced that since he can no longer see, he had obtained authorization from the Moderators to have his secretary read his manuscript for him. At the end he thanked the Moderators, Council Fathers and also his secretary.

Two phases of the subject received the greatest attention today: evangelical poverty and the poverty of the underprivileged on the one hand and the relationship of the Church to scientific research on the other. In both matters there was some pretty direct and hard hitting speeches. Bishop Cleven of Cologne made his first appearance at the microphone today. He pointed out the fact that in many areas the number of people engaged in scientific and historical research and in scientific pursuits is way below the percentage of Catholics in the area. He spoke very bluntly about the fact that even in our scientific age the Church still seems to fear science and historical research and restricts freedom in these fields as much as they can. He appealed for a positive program on the part of the Church in support of research in any field that will help uncover the truth.

When the Assembly adjourned Suenens announced that tomorrow we would begin debate on Chapter IV.

There was a very amusing scene enacted in the first row of our section directly below us. The first and second seats in the row are occupied by two Council fathers who are simply huge. They seem to have lost their battle with girth control. The man in the second seat is more huge than the one in the first. The latter wanted to leave his place before the end of the Assembly. The first one found it too inconvenient to step into the aisle, so he simply leaned back and his companion tried to get by. He just could not make it and found himself stuck tight and he had quite a time executing the maneuver before he reached the aisle. This navel engagement ended in a draw!!

Suenen's version of. lines from Livy:
Quidquid id est timeo peritos
et adnexa ferentes.

He had been particularly critical of what the periti had written in the ADNEXA to the schema on the Church in the Modern World. The latest story on the Council: Pope John became curious about the progress of his Council. He approached God the Father who answered: "I really don't know; I would suggest that you ask my Son." Here John got the answer: "You will get more accurate information from the Holy Spirit; I haven't been following the proceedings very closely." The Holy Spirit said: "I must confess I don't know. Whenever Felici says Exeant onmes!, I leave."

Today I left my seat during the Assembly for the first time in this session. Bishop Hoch took me on a conducted tour. I visited Bar-abbas and then Bar-Jonah; I was told there is also a Bar-nun for the accommodation of the auditrices, but we didn't find it. We took a look into the first aid room. (Bishop was the very first person to use the first aid room on the opening day of the Council in October of 1962.

The coffee was terrible, but I found the recording equipment which takes down every word spoken in the Council very interesting. I also found that leaving the seat makes the Assembly seem alot shorter, but I am not much inclined to repeat the experience very frequently.

OCTOBER 28: 111th General Assembly; Agagianian presiding; present 2007

This morning Felici concelebrated the Council Mass with 12 pastor-auditors. In the Mass they followed the new instructions insofar as parts omitted. It was a bit surprising to notice Felici fumble the prayers at the foot of the altar! The Holy Father had done the same when he celebrated the Council Mass on one occasion last year. At the Mass this morning we commemorated the anniversary of the election of Pope John; Felici also commemorated the anniversary of both his ordination and consecration.

Tomorrow Doepfner will concelebrate the Council Mass with a group of bishops.

Announcements: tomorrow we vote on Chapter VIII of "De Ecclesia" dealing with de Beata. It will allow the votes iuxta modum, which means that "modi" must be submitted with the ballot. Along with the other mail today we received a whole batch of modi suggested by the "Servants of the Blessed Virgin Mary". There was also a suggested modus delivered to us along with the Council Digest which would provide for dropping the word "mediatrix" entirely from the schema, even though in the revision of the schema this term had been watered down considerably. I am voting iuxta modum and using this particular Modus because I feel that any official recognition of that title, even indirectly, would be very harmful to progress in the ecumenical field. We also received a report on Chapter I of the De Ecclesia in which is indicated the manner in which the "modi" submitted on Chapter I of De Ecclesia were disposed of. This vote will simply be placet or non-placet, since the chapter as a whole has been voted on and adopted already.

Before proceeding with the debate on Chapter IV of the Church in the Modern World, Agagianian pointed out the importance of the matter contained in this chapter. Some points are not to be discussed publicly in the aula because of the difficulties involved in premature discussion in the press of the matter; but all observations submitted in writing by Council Fathers will receive the same consideration as if it has been spoken in open meeting.

Bishop Wright was the Relator introducing the matter of Chapter IV. In his presentation of the material he indirectly answered Archbishop Heenan by making reference to the work of competent periti who have worked and will continue to work on this material.

Today was quite a USA day in the Council; besides Wright, we had speeches from Cardinal Ritter, Bishop Grutka and Abp O'Boyle. Ritter spoke on Article 20 and pointed out some weaknesses insofar as the content is concerned. Grutka and O'Boyle spoke up very strongly on the matter of segregation and discrimination. These statements will certainly leave no doubt in the minds of anybody where we stand. It will be very effective among African bishops who in some instances felt that the Church had done little or nothing in this field.

Today I attended the public audience granted by Pope Paul. I had arranged to meet Mr. & Mrs. Ward Mahowald of Grand Forks, along with Mrs. Mahowald's nephew, Father Pat Logan, student-priest at the Casa. In typical Roman fashion the place of the audience was switched from St. Peter's to the Hall of Benedictions without notice to anybody. I got there at 4:05 all dressed up in house cassock and ferriola but there was no sign of an audience. After waiting around for twenty minutes one of the attendants finally thought of explaining that the audience has been changed. Along with a group of Canadian bishops, among them Archbishop Lemieux and Bishop Nelligan, we made our way over to the Hall of Benedictines. I was to meet the Mahowald's after the audience; I had arranged with the driver here to take me to the audience, wait for us at the Porta St. Martha and then take them to their hotel and bring me back here. It took some running around after the audience to get Georgio at the Porta, St. Martha and drive over to the Porta Bronza on time to catch the Mahowald's before they came out from the audience. Since I was among the first to get out and the Swiss Guard was kind enough to let me go through St. Peter's I managed to find the driver and get back to the Porta Bronza. In fact I waited for ten minutes because the Mahowald's had been pretty far to the front and were among the last to get out.

The Holy Father looked better than at any time I saw him since his election as Pope. He acknowledged the various special groups who were there, including the rather large number of bishops. He spoke briefly on the theme of the communion of the Saints in relation to the feast next Sunday. He stressed the importance of Communion with the Holy See, union with Christ and communion of all the saints. He spoke in Italian, French, English, German and Spanish. There was quite a variety of special groups of tourists from different parts of the world.

After the audience the Holy Father personally greeted about 30 special lay guests, the pastors who are auditors at the Council and, of course the bishops. When I told him that I was Bishop of Fargo he said a few words in high praise of the work the Cardinal had done in Germany.

OCTOBER 29: 112th General Assembly; Card Agagianian presiding;
The Mass this morning was celebrated by Cardinal Doepfner to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination. He concelebrated with a group of other bishops, all of whom were observing some anniversary or ordination or consecration. The fact that Doepfner has been a bishop and cardinal so long already in spite of the fact that he is only twenty-five years ordained points up his rather meteoric career as a seminary professor, bishop, Cardinal and influential council father. As a Moderator, along with three others he exercises tremendous influence on the workings of the Council. I recall my first meeting with Doepfner. It took place on my first trip to Germany in 1949 when I accompanied Bishop Muench on a trip to Regensburg for the centennial of the "Sr. Bonifatius Verein" (the German equivalent of our Catholic Church Extension Society). Bishop Muench celebrated the Mass, Cardinal Frings preached and in the afternoon Bishop Doepfner officiated at a vespers service. He had a magnificent voice. He had been appointed bishop of Wuerzburg shortly after the end of the second world war, when he was only in his middle thirties.

The Mass this morning was very impressive though it lasted a bit longer than the concelebrated Mass celebrated by Felici and some priest-auditors yesterday. The difference came in the fact that the choir from the Germanicum sang hymns, most parts of the common of the Mass which caused some delay several times.

The report on the "Modi" relative to Chapter II of de Ecclesia was distributed. We will vote on them tomorrow at the same time when we vote on modi of Chapter I.

Cardinal Feltin and three other council fathers spoke on Article 20 of Chapter IV, The Church in the Modern World.

Twenty speakers were announced to speak on Article 21, of whom eight got a chance to speak.

Archbishop Roy of Quebec made the relatio on Chapter VIII of de Ecclesia (de Beata). At 10:20 the vote was taken on this chapter, which was adopted by the following vote: Placet 1559, non placet 10, 521 placet iuxta modum and one invalid. There was a good round of applause when it was announced that the chapter had been adopted absolutely. It will be pretty much up to the commission to act on the "modi."

Before beginning the debate on Article 21 Archbishop Deardon read the relatio. He did a good job. The relatio itself might be accused by some people as straddling the very practical issue of "birth control" by whatever name one wishes to designate it. He refers to the fact that in the schema it is asserted that for sufficiently grave reasons married people can themselves form their conscience with regard to the number of their children in the light of true marital love and the norms of Christian prudence. But immediately he added that from this it in no way follows that they can use any means of regulating family size; nothing can be permitted which is opposed to the natural orientation of the marital act or which destroys the conjugal act's expressiveness of personal and marital love. The people who demand action by the Council on birth control are looking precisely for a means of regulating the size of their families. They are not so much concerned about the theory of when they may decide to limit their families, but how they can accomplish this with a good conscience. I am sure that point will come up for detailed discussion when we come to page 15, lines 25 to 41. In fact Ruffini the first speaker on this Article (21) raised that very issue right off. He just would not trust the consciences of individuals, but asks how they can foster love if they don't want children. Leger followed Ruffini and in some points answered the questions of Ruffini.

Leger discussed the ends of marriage, stressing that we should not regard procreation as the primary end and mutual love a secondary end. His exposition of this point is good.

Just after Leger started talking Bishop Petit walked by my seat and asked the question: "On what side of the fence will he land?" When he returned Suenens had spoken; Petit returned to his place. I said to him "if you had any doubts about what side of the fence Leger landed, there can be no such doubt in the case of Suenens." His only comment was "'Vive l'amour!' The Frenchman can't resist it."

Cardinal Suenens in a well ordered speech, delivered with more feeling and emotion than I ever heard from him before, insisted that the whole question of marriage in all its phases must be studied thoroughly by a combination of the commission appointed by Pope Paul (or to be appointed; I don't know whether he has already acted on the statement he made earlier in the year). This joint group must make a complete study. And he insisted that the names of all

members of the commission be published. Presumably that point would insure the selection of a more impartial committee, and not one which would be selected on the basis of what they would be expected to say rather than on their competence in the field as doctors of medicine, social science, economics, moral theology, etc. In a dig at Ruffini, who made much of a quotation from Augustine, he said that we have learned something since Aristotle and Augustine. There was a loud round of applause at the conclusion of the speech.

If the papers give this speech the full treatment, I am sure it will cause a sensation. As Dr. Quanbeck mentioned this evening after a dinner put on by Bishop Hoch, "This may prove to be one of the historic General Assemblies of the Council!" I am sure that Dr. Quanbeck is right. Everybody who spoke today asked for a clear and forthright statement. But what they considered as being forthright ranged from the very decisive "NO" of which Ruffini spoke to an insistent demand for a thorough study of the subject all across the board as suggested by Suenens. I am quite sure that the desire of most council fathers to keep the question of birth control out of the public debate in the aula went out of the window already when Dearden made the relatio. It is proving to be true that you simply cannot provide an intelligent discussion of the sacrament of matrimony today while at the same time leaving the one element which more than anything else makes marriage the crucial issue in connection with the moral law that faces us as theologians and pastors. At this point we certainly need prayer more than at any other point in the whole Council so far!

As mentioned above Bishop Hoch arranged for a dinner this evening. Bishop Van Lierde, Bishop Hengsbach, Dr. Quanbeck, Abbot Gilbert, Bishop Hoch and myself were present. Bishop Mendez of Cuernavaca was supposed to come also, but didn't show up. The question of today's session did not come up till only Dr. Quanbeck was here, and then only briefly with the remark quoted above.

Abbot Gilbert told of a letter which Archbishop Heenan wrote to Abbot Reetz after the latter had given such a stern answer to the former on the question of the periti and those who never lived outside of a seminary or monastery. The Archbishop wrote most politely and invited the Abbot to dinner at his convenience. Abbot Gilbert said that the dinner will be tomorrow.

Bishop Van Lierde spoke at length, in answer to some of our questions, about the significance of the power play in the Kremlin which finds Krushev on the sidelines and two other leaders at the helm. His theory is that this is all pure strategy. Krushev had brought communism as far along as possible with his policies; he now is temporarily standing aside, primarily to effect a union between Russia and China, something which he couldn't accomplish. Sooner or later he will be back on top again, after the various spheres of influence desired by the communists have been achieved. This all will effect the situation in Italy. There will be a real fight between the Church and communism here, and the outcome is not too clear.

Van Lierde was very convincing in his statements, but it seems to me that his theory has some holes. It looks too much like a play for keeps in Russia - even if, as Van Lierde said, Krushev himself presided at the meeting during which he was deposed.

Am leaving for Germany tomorrow afternoon for a visit at Frankfurt and Godesberg. I will check on the work Sister Olga is doing on the material which Father Coleman picked up on tape last year in connection with the biography of the cardinal.

Here is another story on Abp Heenan, a variation of the one that said he was taken to the hospital with "peritonitis." His peritonitis was caused by having swallowed a Haering

pronounced herring). Heenan's attack on the periti was prompted largely by his objection to the "new moral theology" largely propagated by the Rev. Bernard Haering, CSR, of the Alphonsianum here in Rome.

OCTOBER 30: 113th General Assembly, Cardinal Agagianian presiding, present 1929. It was announced that because of the holidays on November 2 and 3 there will be a General Assembly on Saturday, November 7. The amended text of the schema on De Pastoralis Episcoporum Munere in Ecclesia was distributed. This schema will be voted on next week Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, with six ballots on Wednesday, eight on Thursday and seven on Friday.

During the meeting we voted on the question of approving the manner in which the commission processed the "modi" which had been submitted on chapters I and II of de Ecclesia. Each report was approved with only 17 and 19 negative votes on the respective chapters.

Cardinal Alfrink was the first speaker on the list this morning. I am sure he considered that speech a "major policy address" on the subject of birth control. He pointed out that every priest in pastoral work is faced with the anxieties and difficulties of many good and faithful Catholics who personally wish to fulfill all moral obligations of their state. Yet they experience difficulties which in only too many cases alienate them from the Church. Or, the spiritual struggle may become such as to cause great harm to other human values, including marital fidelity. But, Alfrink did not in any way suggest that we compromise the divine law, even if extremely grave difficulties arise. At the same time he insisted that sociological studies of these difficulties can not be accepted as substitutes for moral theology when it comes to the question of determining what is right and wrong. We do not accept "situation ethics" in the sense that an absolute moral value loses its validity in given circumstances. He went on to analyze conjugal love and also the possible conflict between procreation and the adequate education of the children. He stated very bluntly that where there is any intention of placing the conjugal act in a manner that positively excludes the possibility of offspring through means that are intrinsically evil, the Church can not approve. But he did ask that the whole matter be reviewed in the light of new knowledge of human nature in relation to sex. The problem involved is much too important to be decided hurriedly and without the help of every possible bit of knowledge bearing on the subject gathered and studied by people competent in the field.

The secular press, including the London Times and the NY Herald Tribune wrote as though Alfrink were trying to advocate "birth control" in the sense in which people outside the Catholic sphere use the term. This is another illustration of the reasons why every effort is being made to restrict open discussion on this subject in the aula, insofar as that can be done. We are not anxious to help the journalists provide a Roman holiday for their readers.

Ottaviani and Browne spoke after Alfrink. Both of them indulged in exactly the type of discussing this subject which Alfrink and others had condemned i.e., looking only into the conventional manuals of moral theology, without paying any attention to other factors that enter into the picture. Ottaviani gave a pious ferverino based in part on the fact that he is the eleventh of twelve children, born of poor parents in the laboring class; I could have gone him one better by saying that I am the last of thirteen born of poor farmers. His convincing argument was that we have discussed the inerrancy of the pope and bishops of the Church; but now we cast doubt on that teaching!

Cardinal Browne gave a typical lecture on the end of marriage without changing a word or citation that had not already appeared in the manuals centuries ago. He is living in a world which completely ignores the passage of time and the changes that have taken place, or the progress that has been made in medicines, etc.

NOVEMBER 4: 114th Gen. Assembly; Card Lercaro presiding; present 2011

The Mass this morning was according to the Ambrosian rite because of the feast of St. Charles Borromeo, the fourth centenary of the coming of St. Charles to Milan and the tenth anniversary of the promotion of Pope Paul to Milan.

Before the Mass the council fathers were asked to remember the Pan*Orthodox Conference at Rhodes.

At the request of the Moderators Felici assured the Council Fathers that the final redaction of the schema on the Pastoral Office of Bishops will be in full conformity with the definitive text of the Constitution on the Church. There is a long story behind this announcement! As mentioned on October 30, we received the revised schema on the Pastoral Office of the Bishops last Friday, just before I left for Germany. I did not have a chance to look at this document very carefully. I turned it over to Bishop Hoch, who was in bed with a cold and could not attend last Friday, telling him to study the changes that were made in connection with the emendation of the text to bring it into conformity with the mind of the council fathers as expressed during the debate in the aura.

When the Council Fathers got a good look at the emended text, there was another crisis similar to the one created some weeks ago in the famous case of the declarations on the Jews and Religious Liberty. At that time it had been rumored that not only were these declarations watered down, but that the schema "de Ecclesia" had received similar treatment. This proved to be a well-founded rumor. As an illustration of this process of watering down, the very first paragraph (#4) following the Proemium was changed. The commission had been instructed to bring the doctrinal statements in this schema on the pastoral responsibility of bishops into exact conformity with the definitive statement of the doctrine on the church in "de Ecclesia". In the relatio it was stated that this had been done "ad verbum." The trouble is that they looked for texts which were not the basic statement of doctrine in order to find something that weakened the idea of collegiality. The old text of #4 started with the words: "Supremam ac plenam potestatem..." The "emended" version is "Suprema in universam Ecclesiam potestas..." There were a few other texts which received similar treatment. The whole effect was simply to weaken the statement on collegiality which had been clearly and definitely formulated in "de Ecclesia" by using weaker expressions in this schema on pastoral duties. The result would have been that in the future theologians would interpret the statement in "de Ecclesia" in conjunction with that in this schema and end up with a confused or at least weakened statement on collegiality.

While the majority of bishops had left Rome on Friday and many did not return till yesterday afternoon, many of the leaders of the various episcopal conferences got together and prepared modi to be presented which would correct the false impression created by the emended texts. Copies of these modi, four in number, were widely circulated. Cardinal Meyer sent copies of these modi with a brief letter of explanation to all American bishops. The same was done by a number of other conferences, including the African group headed by Bishop Blomjous (my neighbor in the aula).

After all that had happened, the announcement by Felici just before we started voting on Chapter one of the schema on pastoral responsibility seemed a little ironical. The announcement was obviously intended to reassure the council fathers with a vague promise that the skullduggery would be corrected and that we need not bother to vote *iuxta modum*. Bishop Blomjous turned to me with the remark: "I don't trust them; I will submit the *modi* nevertheless." Apparently there were other council fathers who were concerned by the obvious effort to change the picture with regard to collegiality. This is evident from the manner in which the votes were cast. The difficulty was mostly with Art 4, Chapter II. There were 226 negative votes on the individual article; but when we came to vote on the entire Chapter 1, there were 852 votes *iuxta modum*. This meant that the chapter was not accepted as it now stands, but was sent back to the commission so that they can give effect to these *modi*, after which it will be returned to the aula for another vote.

We were not the only ones to promote *modi*. The story has made the rounds that the conservative group, under the leadership of Ottaviani and Ruffini, with Staffa doing the leg work, also promoted some *modi* which were calculated to weaken the document even more than the commission had done. It is hardly likely that their efforts accounted for very many of the *modi* submitted, but we will have to wait till the document comes back for a vote before we know the exact answer.

Abp Veuillot of Paris read the *relatio* on the emended text of the amended schema on the pastoral responsibilities of bishops and Bishop Gargitter presented the special report on Chapter I. He made the statement that the texts referring to collegiality were to be coordinated with parallel texts in "de Ecclesia" and that the commission tried to do so. How far that was from an exact statement is shown above. There was a rather amusing interlude in Gargitter's *relatio*; i.e. it would be amusing if it were not a symptom of things happening much too frequently. He said that some council fathers had inquired why the words "... qua legitimi Apostolorum successores..." in Article 6 line 1 of the original text were omitted in the amended text. He laughed and said that this apparently was a printing mistake made by those who set the type; the matter had never been discussed in the commission and the members of the commission had no knowledge of what happened! In this instance the omission was quite harmless; but it is a known fact that copies of documents, especially those prepared by the Holy Father are subject to such editing. It happened in case of Mater et Magistra, Pope John's address at the opening of the first session and Paul's address at the opening of the second Session. Probably the most notable case is the alteration of the text of Sacram Liturgiam, the *motu proprio* of Paul VI in connection with the liturgy.

Cardinal Lercaro opened the discussion of Art 22, on the Church and culture. He called attention to the fact that the article does not go deeply enough into the question, being satisfied with a few platitudes about how much the Church has contributed to culture in the past. We must make good our claim that we are not dependent upon the culture of any one age but can adapt to changing cultures. This is not the case now; a condition which must be corrected by being alive to what is going on and making our own distinct contribution. He stressed the need of having laymen study and teach theology, as had been done in the early ages. Lercaro was interrupted by Doepfner when he had gone overtime. If I remember rightly that is the second time this has happened, between the two.

The action during this section was unexciting in so far as the debate is concerned, but the vote on the first chapter of the pastoral responsibilities of the bishop caused some excitement and kept most council fathers at their places till after 11:00. It was quite a sight when the ushers collected the ballots after the vote on the chapter as a whole; they, almost without exception,

had a whole bundle of "modi" because of the large number of votes iuxta modum - the largest we have had at any time during the council.

NOVEMBER 5: 115th Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Lercaro presiding; present 2063.

It was announced that the Holy Father will grant special audiences to the various national and language groups, beginning with the French speaking bishops from Africa. Secretaries of the various groups should inform the Maestro di camera of the number that can be expected in each group so that proper arrangements can be made.

Tomorrow the Holy Father will appear in person at the General Assembly. He will occupy a seat at the table of the Presidency and will inaugurate the discussion on the question of the missionary endeavors of the Church. The regular program of debate and balloting as announced for tomorrow will be carried on. Felici announced the names of seven speakers for today, to which were added four names who had the endorsement of 70 council fathers. Before asking the first speaker to come up, Lercaro announced that the Moderators had proposed that the seven regular speakers be not invited to appear, but that we hear only the four who were in the second group. This was a bit confusing because Lercaro's announcement was not too clear; so, he asked the fathers to be seated until he could repeat the announcement. By standing vote, the proposal was adopted, but it did not have the usual near-unanimous consent when cloture is invoked. As Bishop Blomjous summarized it, "I believe in free speech!" Apparently many others did not like such fancy foot-work in disposing of the speakers. The whole procedure looked just a bit too arbitrary.

Before going to the discussion of Art 24 on the Church in the Modern World, Bishop Carli of Segni and Bishop Jubany of Gerona gave the relatio on Chapter II of the pastoral responsibilities of bishops on which we voted today. We certainly could do without the long relationes which go into the minutest details. All of this material is given to us in printed form and can be studied at leisure at home. Usually the relators read the text so fast that you can not follow even with the aid of the printed copy. Certainly the relationes today added nothing to our understanding of what we were voting on. Added to the relations was the reading of the various texts that were voted on, though in most of the articles Felici had the good sense of reading only the beginning and end. I might add here that the reading of relationes is completely frustrating when the relator is Spanish or French!

There were so many preliminaries today that we did not get down to business on the regular program until 10:30. There was a pleasant and historic variation with regard to the relatio today (just to be different from what I complained about above). Fr. James Norris read the relatio for Article 29 of the Church in the Modern World. The text was in Latin and it came as a very agreeable surprise to hear Jim do so well with the Latin. The whole speech referred to the poverty of the people in every part of the world and in its close there was an eloquent appeal to the Church to take cognizance of this problem in an organized systematic manner.

Jim Norris made a fine impression, though I was disappointed that he was not allowed to speak in English. Yet, the occasion was a bit disappointing. Jim started with a very ambitious project in mind. He contemplated having the Holy Father celebrate a special Mass for the impoverished people of the world. The Mass was to be the regular Council Mass at 9:00 AM. After the Mass, as an introduction to this article 24 dealing with poverty Barbara Ward was to make a speech on the subject. Jim told me about these ambitious plans about three weeks ago; at the time I told him he would be fortunate if the Holy Father came to celebrate the Mass. But a woman talking to a regular session of an Ecumenical Council in St. Peter's??? NO!! That would just be too much for staid old Romans. Jim replied; Well I can try! A year ago

there would have been excitement enough if a layman had made a formal relatio in the regular program of a General Assembly. Things have been moving so fast that this year it seemed much less impressive because we had expected so much more. It is unfortunate that this came the day before beginning discussion on the missions; Paul VI considers the missions of supreme importance; and I presume he is correct.

But the whole situation changed with the singing of the processional hymn during the enthronization of the Gospel after the Mass. This music consisted of little more than rhythm, though it was considerably more melodic than the music during the Mass. Along with the chant drums were used and at points of emphasis there was a clapping of hands. Bishop Blomjous of Tanganyiki explained to me that the music during the Mass is oriental in origin while the music after the Mass was based on very old tribal music; he added that the original spirituals sung by our own Negroes in the US were also based on this African tribal music as found in Eastern Africa. The particular processional sung today is the characteristic Royal Salute of the East African tribes used to welcome their chief to their villages. It has been adopted as a salute to Our Lord in the Eucharist at the time of benediction with the Blessed Sacrament and Eucharistic processions. This music very obviously impressed the council fathers very favorably, whereas the music during the Mass left us cold.

Before the enthronization of the Gospel the Holy Father had left the *pridieu* before the altar and occupied a chair in the center of the table of the presidents. He emphasized that he was taking part in a "working" session by leaving the throne unoccupied and using a simple chair at the table with the members of the presidency. Felici made the usual announcements and called the names of the speakers along with the preliminaries to the balloting.

The Holy Father spoke on the Missions, thus opening the discussion of this topic which he very obviously considers of supreme importance. The address was very brief, but was a beautiful homily on the commission which pope, bishops and the church as a whole received to preach the gospel to every creature. But, he did use one sentence which may be a bit embarrassing to the missionary bishops. He said: "We hope that, although you may decide upon some improvements in parts it (the schema) will receive your approval." The missionaries had promoted the idea of rejecting the schema as we did the one on the priesthood in the hope that it would receive a fuller treatment from the commission. It will be interesting to see what will happen, This is a good demonstration of the wisdom in not having the Holy Father preside regularly at working sessions.

The Holy Father remained while Cardinal Agagianian read the relatio which served as an introduction to the consideration of the propositions concerning the missions. The relatio was much too long and Agagianian insisted on reading every word of it. I hope the Holy Father gets the idea of hinting to the powers that be to shorten the relations.

Five Cardinals spoke on the schema, followed by one bishop. The preliminaries connected with the Mass and the Holy Father's appearance took so much time that there was no chance to hear more speakers. Discussion on the missions will continue through tomorrow.

The voting on Chapter two as a unit and on all of chapter three was completed, though we did not get all of the results because balloting continued until after 12:00. The ballot on Chapter II as a unit failed of complete approval because there were 889 votes *iuxta modum* and 1219 placets. This means that consideration of the *modi* will be mandatory. This makes it quite evident that this schema will not be finished in this session. There are many parts of Chapter III

which are controversial and I would not be surprised if there were as many modi for that chapter. We will find out tomorrow when the results of the last three ballots are announced.

We had a most interesting conversation at table this noon. Bishop Biskup stated that he had seen a statement in the Daily American and Herald Tribune to the effect that Cardinal Koenig was to call on Cardinal Mindzenty at the American Embassy in Yugoslavia in January. He asked the Cardinal whether that is true. The Cardinal in his usual suave manner smiled and said: "If it were true I would not be allowed to tell you." But then he went on to say that he did call to see Mindzenty a little less than three years ago. He had been instructed to keep his visit as quiet as possible so that the public press would not create problems that might prevent the interview. He went to the Embassy incognito and told the attendant who admitted him that he wished to see the American Ambassador.

"Who shall I say is calling?" "I am not free to tell you!" Just then the first secretary of the Embassy came along. He recognized the Cardinal (Koenig) immediately. He said "You are very fortunate; the Ambassador is in and can see you immediately. The Cardinal explained that the status of Cardinal Mindzenty was not considered in the recent agreement between the Holy See and Yugoslavia. The reason is that Mindzenty will not consent to leave the Embassy unless the Yugoslav government will treat him in an honorable fashion by reinstating him to the position he had occupied prior to his arrest, trial and sentence to prison. In other words, he wants to be completely rehabilitated, whereas the government absolutely refuses to do that, even though Mindzenty would be very willing to leave Yugoslavia without any thought of returning. That Tito will not permit; the most he would allow is to treat Mindzenty as a criminal against the state who was given amnesty and permitted to leave the country. That Mindzenty will never do, though the way is always open for him to leave - on Tito's conditions.

There was considerable discussion of Mindzenty's status at the Embassy. Cardinal Koenig explained that no one is allowed to visit Mindzenty aside from Embassy staff members. From the outside one Yugoslav priest is allowed to go once a week to hear the Cardinal's confession. This permission was granted by President Eisenhower when this situation first developed. The permission was renewed by President Kennedy. Said Koenig "That is the first time in history that the President of the United States granted faculties for confession.

NOVEMBER 7: 117th Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding: present
Felici announced that an audience would be granted by the Holy Father next Monday evening to the English speaking bishops from Africa.

He then continued to say that he had received an inquiry from a few council fathers why no recognition has ever been given to the ushers! He then paid them a splendid tribute and added that this had not been done previously because the ushers are a part of the staff of the General Secretariats of the Council and that they did not want to blow their own horn. I have always admired the quiet, efficient work of the ushers. With few exceptions they are very alert, patient and most gracious. At times I feel sorry for them when council fathers make rather unreasonable requests of them as though they were mere errand boys. This happens at times when a series of ballots is being taken during a regular working assembly. For every ballot, they have to distribute the card, pick them up again after the council fathers have marked them and take them to the "machine room" where the automatic equipment processes them. This involves more work than would first appear because it involves going up and down the steps dividing the sections of the seats in the aula. For one or two ballots this is not bad, but when there are eight ballots taken between 9:30 and 11:00 as sometimes happens, I am sure these boys know that they have had a workout.

Last summer the coach of the Green Bay Packers insisted that Paul Hornung run up and down the bleachers in the stadium to get in shape after a year's layoff. I think he would have gotten just as good training as an usher in the aula!

It is a bit annoying to see council fathers asking ushers to carry messages, parcels, etc., to the end of the aula during the time when such balloting is in progress. The other day the chief usher finally couldn't take it any longer: he went along and told all the ushers that they were to do nothing but take care of the ballots until the voting was completed that morning. When you consider that it takes ten minutes to process a complete ballot, it is obvious that there is no time left for running errands.

Speaking of the chief usher recalls the fact that this young priest has functioned in that capacity during all three Sessions so far. He is a Polish who speaks Italian fluently as well as French. He is very handsome, energetic and most efficient. I am sure that the smooth functioning of the process of voting is due in no small degree to his work. Besides supervising the other ushers he personally distributes the pack of cards that goes to each section. This alone involves walking; at least a quarter of a mile for each ballot!

Felici announced the results of the last three ballots taken yesterday. There were only 11 and 15 negatives votes respectively in the last two ballots. But in the vote on the chapter III as a unit there were 469 votes iuxta modum and 15 non placet. This means that the chapter was approved as a unit. What is done with the modi will depend on the mood of the commission since the total number of placets is enough to give full approval. Consideration of the modi will be optional.

There were 17 speakers on the subject of the missions today. The program of speeches started off most impressively with Frings, Alfrink and Suenens. The other council fathers who spoke were mostly missionary bishops while almost every one, including the three Cardinals announced that they were speaking on behalf of the African bishops. There were enough of these who spoke for themselves, so they really got a good hearing today.

Cardinal Frings is truly amazing. He spoke again today without help from anybody; he had been allowed to have his secretary read his talk last week. His speech was short but very precise and orderly. He started out by saying that the subject of the missions is of such tremendous importance that the Council simply can not do justice to it in a few lines. There was a tremendous round of applause. Frings in relatively few words outlined a practical program for improving our mission program, including fixed annual contributions by all dioceses.

Suenens took the occasion to refute some of the false interpretations made by the public press of his speech on matrimonial ethics. He vigorously denied having suggested that any change is to be made in anything that the Church has definitively and authentically taught. I am not surprised at this reaction because Suenens was definitely misquoted. Which again demonstrates the wisdom of not having indiscriminate public debates on this subject.

There were some fireworks in a number of the speeches this morning. Bishop Lamont of Umtali in Southern Rhodesia (a White Father) was one. He had a well prepared manuscript and also a well rehearsed bag of oratorical tricks. His delivery would have been a good example for a teacher in elocution to use as a demonstration for his class!

When Lamont sat down there was a loud round of applause (his performance was good entertainment) but the aula became very quiet after Doepfner said: "Enixe rogatur ne fiant orationes rhetoricae!"

Msgr. Grotti, (Prelate Nullius at Acre e Purus, Brazil) made the sharpest speech of the day in criticism of the schema - it was really scathing! He said that it is absurd to find no definition of what missionary activity really is in this schema. He suggested that the periti who proposed this schema be sent to the missions in order to learn this definition! There probably was much more of a sting in this last remark than appeared on the surface. The story is told that Agagianian wrote the original schema for this topic and presented it to the preparatory commission on a "take it or leave it" basis, without giving anybody a chance to improve or amend it. The gossip continues that Doepfner, who had learned of this procedure, threatened Agagianian with exposure of his part in this on the Council floor!

I am wondering what the Holy Father thought of the performance in the aula this morning just one day after he had appeared personally and allied for approval of the schema. There was no speaker this morning who had much of a good word to say about the schema. Beginning with Frings right down the line almost every speaker asked that the schema be either radically done over or rejected entirely.

I felt uncomfortable as speaker after speaker contradicted what the Holy Father had said yesterday. I am sure that many others felt the same, even though it is very obvious that most of the objections against the schema were valid. There was, of course, no excuse for such performances as were put on by Bishop Lamont and Msgr. Grotti.

This does not excuse those who arranged for the appearance of the Holy Father and prepared his script. Obviously he does not have time to study this document in detail, let alone study the schema as a basis for his remarks on the subject. It looks as though this may have been planned by those who wish to prevent the missionary bishops any voice in making the plans and executing the same for a practical program of mission endeavor that has a realistic approach to the problem in our day. In any case, this experience should make it plain that the Holy Father should not appear at a working session and make a speech on a subject which everybody knew would be hotly debated. If the arrangement was made to head off such debate, it is all the more reprehensible.

The debate on the missions will be concluded next Monday, after which debate on the Church in the modern world will be resumed.

NOVEMBER 9: 18th Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; present 1964.

This morning there was terrible downpour of rain just as we left here and got worse as we reached St. Peter's. It was like a regular tropical. Even Felici remarked about the rain as not being very charitable to the cause of attendance at the Council. Very many fathers were late, and more than usual stayed away.

The death of the Archbishop of New Orleans was announced.

Discussion on the schema covering the missionary activity of the church was completed as seven speakers appeared. Next to the last speaker was Bishop Fulton Sheen. His speech was a peculiar mixture of practical ideas with the type of "microphone elocution" for which Sheen is famous. He almost matched Bishop Lamont in the performance he put on. His preaching tone and artificial rhetoric and elocution would have been quite in place for a TV

audience; but it showed poor judgment on his part to give that type of speech on the aula floor of an ecumenical council. He was talking to his peers as superiors, which is something entirely different and requiring an entirely different approach from that used before a popular audience.

I visited for a few minutes with Abp. Pocock just after Sheen talked. He mentioned that the burly colored archbishop sitting just across the aisle from him was very obviously annoyed by the manner in which Sheen delivered his speech because he grimaced and grunted almost continuously while Sheen had the floor. Pocock then leaned over and asked him how he liked the speech. He let out a prolonged "A-a-c-h-h-h" in a tone of contempt and then said: "I don't like his whispers and he talks as though he were on a radio program in New York."

Much as Sheen's elocution was out of place, the fact still remains that he undoubtedly is very popular. Few speakers of any rank have commanded the breathless silence that he did this morning. Everybody listened intently and the usual buzz of conversation and coming and going was absent. Only the ushers were moving silently as they delivered their messages or letters. And when he was through there was a round of vigorous applause. Felici rose at the podium to make some announcements which he prefaced with the remark: "Plausus non secumfert effectum iuridicum."

After the speakers on this schema were all given their opportunity to speak, a vote was taken on the schema covering the missions. When voting on propositions in the past we were simply asked to say placet or non-placet on our ballots, meaning that the propositions were either accepted or rejected with instructions that the commission was to rewrite or rework the whole thing. This time in his announcement Felici indicated that the terminology was twisted: i.e., Placet meant that the schema was to be returned to the commission and non-placet that it would be accepted. In other words if you meant yes you had to vote no and vice versa. Just what the reason was for this change is not clear: Felici offered no explanation, but there was a great deal of speculation, if the schema was to be rejected and returned for complete reworking we had to vote placet. That meant it would take a 2/3 vote to get the schema returned and a 1/3 majority to accept, which is contrary to usual voting procedure. Maybe this was done out of consideration to the feelings of the Holy Father who had endorsed this schema yesterday. It was obvious after the speeches that schema would be rejected; no speaker liked it. But if the rejection came by way of a strong placet vote it would sound a bit better than if the announcement and the record carried so many non placets for a schema endorsed by the Holy Father on the only occasion when either John or he appeared for a working session. Whatever the object was, the result was that the schema was rejected by a vote of 1601 to 311. Now they are free to produce a completely new schema for the missions.

There were four speeches on Article 24 of the Church in the modern world and four on article 25. There is no indication exactly when the discussion of this schema will be terminated; I presume tomorrow.

It was announced that as soon as this schema was completed the propositions on Religious, Seminary education, Catholic education and matrimony as a sacrament would follow in that order.

This evening Bishop Hoch entertained the following at dinner: Dr. & Mrs. Horton, Dr. & Mrs. Quanbeck, Dr. Butler, Abbot Gilbert, Father Godfrey, Father Sheerin, Father Lynch of the Vatican radio besides myself. It was a very delightful evening. It was interesting to note than no one present had a good word to say for the elocution employed by Fulton Sheen in his delivery of his speech, though it was admitted that some of his ideas were good.

The striking thing about the dinner was not so much anything specific that was said (the conversation was in a lighter vein) but rather the spirit of the gathering. Five years ago we always felt ill at ease in the presence of a mixed group of clergymen. This evening the atmosphere could not have been more cordial. It also was clear that the Observers have learned much about the Church and like what they learned.

NOVEMBER 10: 119th Gen. Assembly: Cardinal Suenens presiding; Present 2119.

I saw Fr. Heston on the way into St. Peter's this morning and visited with him briefly. It was his opinion that the schema on the Church will be completed and promulgated during this session. Also, all the debate on the remaining propositions will be completed. Obviously, if *de Ecclesia* is to be promulgated as a completed document, the document on religious liberty and the Jews can not be made a part of *de Ecclesia*. Father Heston indicated that we will get an opportunity to cast the first round of ballots on both the declaration on Religious Liberty and on the Jews which will give us an opportunity to commit the Council to a text of these declarations even though the finishing touches can not be put to the document until another session. It was in this connection Fr. Heston had an interesting story. Some Arabs who are friendly to the Holy See and are not involved in politics are advising the Holy Father not to buckle under the pressure which is being exerted by the politicians among the Arab nations. This pressure is merely a form of intimidation for political reasons. If the Holy See gives ground now it will create a very dangerous precedent which will invite continuous pressure amounting to virtual blackmail in the future if we give in this time.

Felici announced that during the course of the meeting the *relatio* on Matrimony as a Sacrament is to be distributed this morning as well as the report on the disposition of the *modi* concerning Chapter II of *de Ecumenismo*. We are to vote on the disposition of the *modi* on Chapter I this morning and on Chapter II tomorrow morning. In a humorous vein Felici indicated that he had two more announcements to make of which one is of a joyful character and the other less joyful. A book giving the history and description of the book of the gospels used in the enthronization every morning, illustrated in full color is to be distributed to each Council Father. Each Father will receive a copy in which the text is in his own mother tongue. Actually, the book is beautifully done and is really a collector's item.

The other announcement was received with less enthusiasm: there is to be a regular general assembly on Saturday morning.

There were three regular speakers on Article 24 of the Church in the Modern World, and seven who had gained the right to speak by securing 70 signatures on their petition.

In the discussion of Art 24 the principal point of interest was nuclear warfare. There were some very positive opinions expressed on both sides, though no really hot debate developed.

The schema on religious was introduced by Bishop McShea of Allentown. He read every line of the lengthy *relatio*, which became rather boring because of the many details covered.

Cardinal Spellman was the only one of the six Cardinals who were announced as speakers on the schema *de Religiosis*. Spellman spoke better and had a better text than on any previous appearance. He praised the schema for what it said and for the restraint exercised in not repeating pertinent statements which already were parts of other schemata. But his characteristic conservatism became evident in the manner in which he cautioned against going too far in carrying out the renewal which has been promoted so vigorously. He insisted that if

some things were adopted by the religious which had been recommended by some, even prelates, it would destroy rather than renew the spirit of the religious life. He was utterly opposed to having religious trained and experienced in teaching and nursing work take on other tasks like home visitation, etc. Such things are to be undertaken by those communities founded for that purpose or new ones should be founded; but no nuns should be given tasks for which they are not suited or trained.

I would not be surprised if Spellman was consciously taking a dig at Suenens' book: "The Nun in the World." This book has been a thorn in the side of some religious superiors whose subjects had read it; or a thorn in the side of some religious whose superiors had read it and tried to put it into practice!

At the conclusion of the discussion of Article 24 Professor Juan Vasquez, a lay auditor from Argentina spoke on behalf of the laity. Since he spoke in Spanish I could not follow his speech.

Bishop Blomjous said that we will receive three or more propositions summarizing the principal trends of thought in the Schema 13 on the Church in the Modern World. These are to be voted on in order to give the commission some idea of what the mind of the Council Fathers is in order to guide them in reworking the schema on the basis of the speeches that were made. This is a device which was used last year in connection with the question of collegiality and the permanent diaconate. That technique precipitated a real controversy between the Moderators and the Presidency which took a long time to resolve before the vote was taken on October 30, 1963. But when we did the final voting on Chapter II de Ecclesia this year it was very evident that the "straw vote" the year before was a very accurate index. That index was followed and vote this year was even more in favor of collegiality than a year ago. If Blomjous story is correct, the commission should get a good idea of what the real trend of thought is among the council fathers on the points covered in schema 13.

We had our first session of the regular meeting of the bishops of the United States. Last year those meetings were held in the Cavlieri Hilton; this year at the North American College. Our arrangement this year is much better. The agenda on the meeting was pretty much routine. The only question that precipitated any debate was the point covered in Pastoral Munus in which each Episcopal Conference is to establish for its area, subject to approval of the Holy See, the amount of money that can be borrowed before the permission of the Holy See is required. We got exactly nowhere, simply because no one has ever defined clearly just exactly what is meant by "alienation of property" as the term is used in Canon Law.

NOVEMBER 11: 120th Gen. Assembly: Suenens presiding; present 2109.

The discussion on de Religiosis will be completed tomorrow. A preliminary vote will be taken as usual to determine whether the propositions will be accepted or whether the entire schema is to be returned to be reworked again. If accepted, then we will vote on individual propositions.

All are invited to see the exhibit of conciliar documents prepared by the Vatican archives. The exhibit will be open from 4:00 - 7:00 daily except Sundays and holidays. The entrance is from the Cortile Belvedere.

The vote on the disposition of the modi in Chapter II on de ecumenismo was taken this morning. There were only 85 negative votes out of 2109.

Eight Cardinals spoke this morning on the schema de Religiosis. The lines were pretty well drawn; the speakers generally of the conservative mentality were afraid of any adaptation of religious communities to the needs and temper of the times, while the progressive element went all out for change. There were extremes on both sides. Ruffini for instance said that only one norm was valid for accommodating the spirit of a community to modern needs, namely the will of the Holy See. In effect that means, some congregation in Rome. If changes in constitutions were left entirely up to the curia, I am afraid there would be precious little aggiornamento in Religious Life! Of all the speakers today Doepfner was probably the best. He did not object to the fact that the schema was reduced to propositions, but he did say that it did not face the basic difficulties. He then elaborated on spiritual renewal (not mere different forms of pious exercises but a return to real spirituality uncements: Tomorrow no regular General Assembly; in its place there will be capella papalis. Patriarch Maximos IV will celebrate a solemn pontifical Mass according to the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom at 9:30 AM. After the Mass the Holy Father will bless the new images of SS Cyril and Methodius.

We received the report on the "modi" connected with Chapter III de Ecumenismo. There will be a vote on these modi next Saturday. During the same general assembly on Saturday there will be nine ballots cast on the propositions which make up the schema on religious. The debate on de Religiosis was terminated at 11:20 when cloture was invoked by standing vote. This schema received 1155 placets and 882 non-placets in a ballot that was cast after Bishop McShea summed up the whole question following the invocation of cloture. Since the schema received more than an absolute majority of the votes, it means that the propositions will be retained basically as they are, subject to "modi" accompanying votes iuxta modum. The vote on de religiosis will follow the vote on Chapter III of ecumenism on Saturday.

There were eight speakers on De religiosis today besides the summation of the schema by Bishop McShea. One of the points brought out in the speeches today (especially in that of Huyghe of Arras in France) is the fact that the schema on Religiosis was apparently prepared without any reference to the updated ecclesiology as exemplified in the schemata on the church and the pastoral responsibility of bishops, and also the schema on the Church in the modern world. This is understandable since these other schemata took form only after most of the work on de religiosis had already been done. I am sure there will be many "modi" proposed during the voting on de Religiosis which begins on Saturday to bring the general tone of these propositions into harmony with the other schemata.

The schema on seminary education was taken up. The relatio was endless and the text was read in a droning voice which made it beyond comprehension, especially since I had failed to bring the copy of the schema.

Cardinal Bueno Monreal started off the debate on the seminaries. I do not recall that he spoke at any time during the present session. He scarred the schema on the lack of a proper concept of the nature of a vocation, and insufficient emphasis on the necessity of a vigorous program of promoting vocations.

Cardinal Meyer did a masterful job with his interventions. I am reminded of Cardinal Koenig's remarks after Cardinal had interviened in connection with the schema De Vita et Ministerio Sacerdotali: "Cardinal Meyer's appearance with an intervention is always elegant." That can be said particularly of this intervention. It is very evident that he did not fail to profit a great deal from his experience as professor and rector in St. Francis Seminary of Milwaukee.

The intervention by Abp. Colombo of Milan was particularly significant, not so much because most people seem to think that he is constantly expressing ideas prompted by the Holy Father but because of the ideas themselves (whether they are his own or those of the Holy Father). He scored current seminary education because it is not unified and lacks coordination in the various subjects that are taught; and these subjects do not present the student with any sense of his mission. Then there is also a lack of "human" formation which sends the young priest into the pastoral world without having had contact with or acquired knowledge of the society in which he is to work. There is no really responsible attitude towards his work or his superiors. Abp Colombo impressed the council fathers deeply in spite of the fact that he was called up to speak at 12:20 when ordinarily the assembly is brought to a close. He commanded complete attention and almost absolute silence, which is quite an achievement for anybody who is the last speaker for the day.

Probably the feature of this morning's assembly was the fact that Cardinal Meyer was called for going overtime! That is something that never had happened before; the Cardinal was always very meticulous in having his speech carefully timed to the allotted ten minutes. Calling him for going overtime came as a surprise to everybody, including, or I should say, especially Cardinal Meyer. He became flustered just for a second, and then calmly brought his intervention to an orderly end.

The third and final meeting of the US bishops was held at The North American College this afternoon and evening. We had expected a very short meeting, thus allowing ample time for attendance at Mass for Archbishop Rummel in the College chapel before the supper at 7:00. But it seemed that one delay after another occurred in the various matters that came up for consideration so that we were not finished at 6:15. Cardinal Meyer, who took over when Cardinal Spellman had to leave, adjourned the meeting till after supper. We come back to the auditorium at the College by 8:00 PM and then got bogged down again in various matters which delayed the final adjournment until 9:30 PM. Our experience in the meetings of the bishops this year more than at any time previously point up to the need for establishing a tradition of more orderly procedure. The manner in which Cardinal Spellman badgered one or the other bishop who was making a report certainly does not encourage anybody to take one of the various committee jobs which are essential to the work of the organization. Owing to the fact that we have to adopt new statutes in order to set up an Episcopal Conference in line with the mandate given in *de Ecclesia* and *de Pastoralis Episcoporum Munere in Ecclesia* will give us a good opportunity to eliminate some of the very unpleasant features of our procedure in the past, both in the election of the board members and the conduct of the meetings. I am glad that Cardinal Meyer was designated as chairman of the committee to make a draft of proposed statutes. From conversation with him just before supper I gather that he has some very definite and excellent ideas on the subject.

NOVEMBER 13: From the standpoint of pageantry the cappella papalis this morning was a magnificent demonstration. The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is most impressive and the music, which continued almost without interruption through the two hour ceremony was excellent. But I simply can not see why we should continue such elaborate displays, even in St. Peter's. Aside from the large group of choristers, theological students, priests and prelates of the Oriental Church who had a part in the ceremonies, there was the usual entourage accompanying the Holy Father. The latter did walk in, which took away some of the feudal character of the proceedings. But I still think that the simple entry made a week earlier when the Holy Father participated in the general assembly, would have been more edifying if not quite so overwhelming. When witnessing these spectacles, one wants to shake himself loose and wake up in the modern generation. I just can not see that such grand displays are really

inspiring for clergy or faithful; a certain amount of thrill may move one emotionally, yes; but real edification and inspiration, no!

The Mass itself was also very elaborate. There was a surprising mixture of languages: Greek, Latin, Arabic, Old Slavonic, while the copy we received had the complete text in Italian in a column parallel to that giving the Greek text.

At the end Felici announced that as a gesture of poverty the Holy Father would offer his tiara for sale, the proceeds to be used for the poor. He carried it personally to the altar. This all came as a complete surprise. No further explanation was offered.

NOVEMBER 14: 122nd Gen. Assembly; Card Agagianian presiding; present 1963.
Today we were really overwhelmed with paper: they gave us printed reports in five pamphlets covering the disposition made of the "modi" submitted on Chapter III, IV, V, VI, VII and VIII. We will be voting on all of these "modi" next Tuesday and Wednesday. This makes it seem definitely possible to be ready for the formal promulgation of the Constitution on the Church at the solemn session which is to be held next Saturday.

Felici made a very solemn announcement of the fourth public session which is to be held at 9:00 AM on Saturday, November 21. He went into great detail concerning what each group of prelates (Cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, Major Superiors of religious congregations, etc.) are to wear! They haven't caught the spirit of poverty as yet in connection with the ceremonial of the council. It no doubt will take a mayor project instituted by the Holy Father personally and imposed by solemn orders to achieve any major revision of solemn ceremonies in St. Peter's.

Felici was most emphatic in his announcements concerning the attendance at this public Session. He repeated the word omnes, o-m-n-e-s, O*M*N*E*S, three times with increasing emphasis. In spite of this, I am sure that many Council Fathers will be leaving Saturday morning. It had originally been announced that the closing public session would be held on November 20 and practically everybody had made arrangements for their departure from Rome on Saturday. Since all planes out of Rome are crowded those days immediately following the close of the third session, there were many who simply could not get space on Sunday evening if they were inclined to do so. The American charter flights have been put off till Sunday, but some other charter flights will leave on Saturday as originally arranged.

There was some confusion in the announcement concerning the audience for US and Canadian bishops; originally we were told it would be at 6:30 PM, November 15; today Felici announced it would be at 5:00 PM and then he finally said it would be at 6:00 PM.

It was announced that we very probably will have to hold an afternoon general assembly on some of the days next week. The complete calendar for the remainder of the session will be announced on Tuesday. One could hear some grumbling over this announcement, but that was only scattered. Obviously, the council fathers are very willing to put in a few grueling days in order to make sure that we will not have to go home empty-handed after this session. As of now we can confidently expect to have the Constitution on the Church and the Decree on Ecumenism promulgated. At the same time there is a good chance of getting almost all of the other schemata into shape for more or less final action by the respective commissions during the interval between the third and fourth sessions. There will be some debating left for the fourth session, but not very much.

Bishop Blomjous gave me some interesting inside history. He said that after the action of the Coordinating Commission requiring some of the commissions to reduce their schemata to brief propositions, most of the commissions followed suit immediately even though it cut some very important items down to a point where they were quite meaningless as conciliar pronouncements. But the commission on the Lay Apostolate simply refused because this subject simply could not be treated intelligently in this manner. The commission sent a letter signed by every single member to the Coordinating Commission explaining the situation and telling them that they simply would not and could not carry out the instruction. As a consequence we very probably will have a very good decree on the Lay Apostolate.

In connection with Religious Liberty, we may feel quite confident to end up with a rather strong statement on the subject, much stronger than we thought possible as recently as a week ago. This declaration has finally cleared the Theological Commission, after being held up there for some time. The impasse was finally resolved in a manner which will enable the ultraconservatives in the Theological Commission to save face. The great majority of the Theological Commission voted to clear the declaration of any theological error and ruled that it was orthodox in every respect. But this commission will officially go no further. It has returned the declaration to the Secretariat for Unity, the certification of orthodoxy; but then practically said to the Secretariat that this declaration is "their baby" and that they (Theological Commission) will assume no responsibility for it! This seems to be a happy solution, because I feel that the less the Holy Office and the theological Commission concern themselves about this particular subject the better it will be. In any case we now can feel confident that this declaration, and probably that on the Jews, will come back to the floor for a preliminary vote which will commit the Council to a specific text. That will be of tremendous importance even though there will very probably be some modifications made in the aula during the fourth session. At least we will have a basic statement to work with now that has been accepted by the Council provisionally.

In the Constitution De Ecclesia some notes have been added by the Commission which will provide a more or less official declaration of the mind of the legislators in the interpretation of the text of the Constitution which will be adopted. Those notes will be printed along with the official text, I understand, and are designed to curb any speculative theologians in the future who might be inclined to use this Constitution as a basis for efforts to whittle down or to extend the doctrines promulgated in the same. This constitution is not a formal definition and therefore will be subjected to intensive study in the future. The commission wants to make the meaning of this Constitution as clear as possible so that there will be no grounds for future theologians going off at a tangent in their speculations.

Abp Staffa of the Congregation of Seminaries and University Studies has been feverishly active during recent sessions button-holing council fathers in the aula and at the bars in an effort to secure a large number of signatures from representative council fathers on a petition to be addressed to the Holy Father. The petition would ask His Holiness simply to withdraw the Third Chapter of De Ecclesia from the Constitution, thus simply throwing the whole concept of collegiality right out of the window. From what I can gather, he is meeting with very limited success. It seems a bit ridiculous that such an effort should be made at this late date, long after the Council Fathers had voted in favor of this concept by better than a 90% vote. But Staffa did get some signatures among Italian bishops (probably 150 or more). This is an indication of the control the curia people have over the Italian bishops. He got more signatures than the total number of negative votes on some of the propositions involved; which means that on the surface some of the bishops- buckled under to the pressure exerted by Staffa but

had voted for collegiality when the ballots were taken. There is a great deal of that attitude among Italian bishops; they are looking for emancipation from the Curia.

During the session today the vote on Chapter III on Ecumenism was taken. It got only 82 negative votes. We also cast six ballots on the introduction and the first 14 articles on Religious. For the first time in the 244 ballots cast during the three sessions there were more "modi" than straight placet votes on any proposition. This happened in the vote on the Preface and articles 1 to 3 on Religious. A group of prelates led by Doepfner and Suenens had circulated a series of "modi" relative to the proemium and first 13 articles on de Religiosis. At the same time an even large number of "modi" were circulated by the ultra conservative groups which have often mailed things to us. I noticed that the bishops in the seat ahead of me (Italians) were using these "modi". But apparently our set of "modi" were used much more. This was apparent from the fact that our "modi" pertained only to the first 13 articles. All ballots on those articles had from 845 to 1105 votes iuxta modum; but in the sixth ballot which pertained to Art 14 for which we had no modi there were only 103 votes iuxta modum! This would indicate that Ruffini's group has a very small following. Bishop Blomjous, who was connected with the effort to distribute these "modi", though he did not sign the accompanying letter, said that 1600 copies of our "modi" were distributed to as many council fathers. These figures are not final since there is time to submit the "modi" on Monday and Tuesday.

There were thirteen speakers on Seminary Education today, of whom five were cardinals. While Suenens spoke Bishop Blomjous made some interesting observations after I had asked him if I was correct in my impression that Suenens had lost considerable stature during this third session and slipped far from the influence he exerted at the beginning of the second session. He said that basically, Suenens is quite shallow. He has an uncanny sense of detecting what the general public is thinking or wants. He is very clever at using expressions that are akin to "SLOGANS" which capture the public fancy. Blomjous used the example of the original title of Schema #13. That title originated with Suenens; in fact in the beginning he stood almost alone in fighting for a schema on "THE PRESENCE OF THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD". Actually little progress was made on this schema, which has had a hectic history, until after the commission to which it was referred really got down to work. Suenens personally made little contribution to the development of this schema in the commissions, though he did make some hard hitting speeches; but these again were strictly in line with what the people were interested in and wanted. I said to Blomjous: "Your description of Suenens makes one believe that he is a demagogue in a dignified sort of way." He replied: "That is what he is!"

Ruffini harped on "obedience to the bishop". He could not see how discipline would survive if the seminarians were allowed to have any contact with apostolic works involving laymen. He hasn't changed a single idea about seminaries and quoted nothing more recent than the Council of Trent.

The other Cardinals had some excellent things to say about updating the plan of seminary organization, operation and curriculum.

Staffa was the first to speak after the Cardinals. I may be prejudiced, but this man seems to me to be most overbearing when he rises to speak, which fortunately is not very often. The story is told that Staffa was a great rival of Felici's in so far as the position of General Secretary is concerned. It is almost frightening to think of what we would have had to put up with if Staffa had been the General Secretary and we would have had to put up with his overbearing manner day after day in the aula!

Staffa insisted that "progress" does not make already detected truth the subject of any further inquiry! That is characteristic of the attitude which rejects any possibility of our growing in the knowledge and understanding of a given truth. It is just that attitude on the part of those who wrote our theology manuals and histories during the last 400 years which makes the aggiornamento of Pope John so desperately necessary.

I was at Santa Maria del Lago, Chicago house of studies for priests for a dinner honoring Cardinal Meyer on the eve of his feast day. It was a delightful occasion and there was a great deal of conversation about the Council, as might be expected.

NOVEMBER 16: 123rd Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Agagianian presiding; present 2122.

Felici started off the day this morning with some important announcements to use his own description: (maximi ponderis)

1) Unless announced otherwise later, there will be no afternoon sessions during this week.

There was a vigorous round of applause which greeted this announcement. But Felici immediately added that this will give them time to study the schemata on which voting will be done during the remaining days of the session.

2) It seems that some protests were lodged with "higher authorities" to the effect that the "Ordo" governing the procedure in the aula was not followed in discussing and voting on Chapter III of de Ecclesia. A careful study of the acts during the assemblies when this subject was debated and voted shows that the prescriptions of the "Ordo" were carefully observed. Some also expressed doubts about the orthodoxy of the doctrine expounded in this same Chapter III. These doubts were submitted to the Theological Commission. This commission had passed on these matters before the Chapter was submitted to a final vote by the council fathers.

3) A question has been raised about the theological notes explanatory of Chapter III. Felici referred us to the Theological Commission's explanation on page 8, number 10 of the "modi" submitted on that Chapter.

4) Then Felici stated that he is to read the Nota Explicativa which is a sort of introduction to the treatment of the "modi" that were submitted. This is being done at the direction of Higher Authority. The reaction to this Notes is varied. Some object to them most vigorously on the grounds that it amounts to a whittling down the doctrine on collegiality which was adopted by the council by huge majorities. Others, however, take the view that the Notes not only are accurate, but that their introduction was wise because it will act as "a curb" on future speculative theologians who may be tempted to go to extremes either by trying to explain away collegiality or on the other hand by trying to take this Chapter III as a basis for developing a theory of "conciliarism" or developing a spirit of Gallicanism. I am sure that this point will be argued pro and con for a long time. I am inclined to accept the Notes on their face value. I understand that without such a set of explanations and clarifications this Chapter III would not have gotten out of the theological Commission.

5) Many council fathers have indicated a desire to follow the example of the Holy Father in the symbolical gift of his tiara for the benefit of the poor. The suggestion was made that it would be more practical and accomplish more if the different council fathers who are so inclined may send a cash gift directly to the Secretariat of State. In connection with the Holy Father's Tiara I overheard Bishop Hannon of Washington tell Archbishop O'Boyle about the telephone call he received from a man in Washington who has been very active in raising funds for medical and hospital work in one of the Spanish speaking countries. He proposed to acquire this tiara and then place it at auction with a great deal of "hoop-la" and thus probably make a very large profit which would increase the amount of money going to the poor as a result of the Holy

Father's action! The good man, in his enthusiasm, apparently does not realize that this would be a rather dignified procedure.

Today the voting on religious was completed. It was surprising to note that as many as 2122 ballots were cast. I expected that by this time many of the council fathers would have headed for home. Actually the number present today was not too much below the number which were here for the beginning of this session.

In the voting on religious there was a hard core of 50 to 75 votes cast against the whole thing. The number of votes iuxta modum was very much smaller than on the first six ballots.

Just after 12:00 a standing vote was taken on the question of invoking cloture on the schema covering seminary education. This was done by practically a unanimous vote. Felici announced that tomorrow we would take a preliminary vote on this schema. If it is adopted by an absolute majority vote, we would begin the voting on the individual propositions during tomorrow's session. He indicated that there will be seven ballots cast on these propositions.

There were twelve speakers today on seminary education. Cardinal Bacci revealed his ultraconservative attitude on this subject as on every other subject. He was "disturbed" by some of the speeches made last Saturday (he named no names). He seemed to think that these council fathers want to throw St. Thomas right out of the window because they advocate a study of contemporary philosophy with a view to qualifying themselves to combat materialism and secularism. He insists that the schema go out of its way to insist that Thomistic philosophy must have a position of supremacy in the seminary curriculum. He seemed to overlook that one of the propositions emphasizes the importance of the philosophia perennia.

I am confident that the interventions which have been made will be a great help in making something really worthwhile of the propositions on seminary education. The text itself as it now stands provides the basis for a proper revision of the seminary curriculum. What is most important is the fact that the control of the seminaries will very largely be in the hands of episcopal conferences. At the same time I am sure that the Congregation on Seminaries will make a desperate effort to check any efforts to achieve real control by the episcopal conferences.

This evening at 7:00 we had an audience with the Holy Father. The US and the Canadian hierarchies were received at the same time. The pattern of this audience was different from such audiences in previous years. We were distributed in small groups through the whole series of ante-chambers leading to the library where private audiences are usually held. The Holy Father then began going from one ante-chamber to another greeting each bishop individually. Then we gathered in the Aula Clementina where speeches were made by Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Leger. I was very much disappointed in Spellman's speech. It sounded too much like bragging about how much we have accomplished. Not a word was said about the fact that we were joined with the Canadians for this audience. Leger, on the other hand began by speaking English and expressing pleasure at being admitted to the presence of the Holy Father in the company of their brothers in the US.

The Holy Father spoke briefly in English and French. He read the English manuscript much better than I had ever heard him handle the English before. In fact, His Holiness looked more vigorous and less worried than at previous appearances.

A story for today: It was said that when Felici started making the announcement that some or many council fathers suggested that we follow the example of the Holy Father, who gave his tiara, by giving our crosses and rings. Without waiting for the remainder of Felici's announcement, one missionary bishop took off his pectoral cross and stuck it into his pocket!

NOVEMBER 17: 124th Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Lercaro presiding; present 2146.

The word is getting around concerning the personal intervention of the Holy Father in the question of Chapter III de Ecclesia. The conservative group just would not give an inch in the meetings of the dogmatic commission considering the question of collegiality. It got to the point where the deadlock was delaying action on this matter to a point where time was running out. The Holy Father was determined that de Ecclesia was to be promulgated next Saturday along with de Ecumenismo. He instructed that meetings of the dogmatic commission be held - a real closed meeting to which members of the commission only would be admitted with any periti. It seems that after the first such meeting they hit on the plan of the Nota Explicativa Praevia as a compromise. A man from the Gregorian, a friend and kindred spirit of Tromp's, made the first draft of the Nota. It seems that it took a considerable amount of haggling over the terms of the Nota before they arrived at an agreement to let Chapter III go through as it was approved so overwhelmingly quite some time ago. There are those who feel that these Nota compromise our position on collegiality. My contention is that the Nota make little practical difference. Taking the text of the Constitution as it stands and leave it without any explanation but relying only on the obvious meaning of the same, the Pope can accept collegiality in practice or go on with the curia as it is now constituted, or he can adopt the principle of collegiality in actual practice by downgrading the curia and assembling a regularly constituted "senate" or whatever you want to call it. The fact that the Nota were added and made more or less official adds nothing and detracts nothing from the practical situation; but psychologically it had the effect of satisfying the conservatives by offering them an avenue of escape from the spot they were on. This way they can save face even though the Nota in practice detract nothing from collegiality.

To me the important thing is that the text of the Chapter III and other chapters and schemata (especially De Episcoporum Munere Pastoralis Ecclesiae) provides a clear statement of the doctrine of collegiality. By outlining the theology of collegiality without solemnly defining the same we have achieved something we never had before: a statement of that doctrine based purely on scripture. If the present Holy Father or some successor in the future decides to put these theories into practice, the theology can then be tested and refined through experience and the teachings of speculative theologians to a point where it will develop fully and become ready for definition if that becomes desirable.

I think that the basic problem arose from the fact that the conservatives were looking at this matter too legalistically. They had allowed the doctrinal statement based on scripture to go onto the floor and be adopted by overwhelming vote. The word "collegium" kept sticking in their craw because it is a highly technical term in Canon Law. In law "collegium" is a moral entity or person, the members of which are equal; they elect their head. That is not the case in the collegiality of the episcopate. Here the Pope is the head by divine right; he is not the recipient of such power from the college of bishops or from any other source than the Divine Founder. Probably that is the point that bothered the conservatives; they are now satisfied that this legal point is cleared up.

When the vote on this chapter was announced (there were only 46 negative out of 2146 ballots cast) there was a thunderous applause. Apparently the council fathers as a whole did not feel that we lost ground in the compromise that was made to get this schema adopted.

We had a very busy morning with all the announcements, the distribution of material, and the balloting. They distributed a printed copy of the announcements made yesterday concerning the ceremonies at the solemn session next Saturday; the explanations made in the Nota and other decisions concerning the manner in which chapter III was processed; and finally at long last the copy of the amended version of the declaration on Religious Liberty.

The schema on Religious Liberty will be voted on next Thursday. There will be four separate ballots covering the fourteen articles. This will be followed by a vote on the whole declaration. Votes iuxta modum will be permitted only on the last ballot. It is a great relief to know that we will be able to go home with the news that some voting was done on this matter. I hope that we will get a very heavy majority in favor of the same.

Today we voted on Chapters III, IV and V of de Ecclesia, voted to accept the Propositions concerning Seminary Education, with modifications, and then cast three ballots covering the first 14 propositions on Seminary Education.

Before the above ballots were taken there were three speakers on Seminary Education. This was followed by the Relatio on the propositions concerning Catholic Education, and five speakers on the latter Propositions.

The Relator made a very promising announcement in the beginning by saying that since the printed relatio was so very long, he would confine himself to four questions covering the Propositions. And then he proceeded to take more time to answer those questions than it would have taken for him to answer the questions! You just can't win.

Actually there was too much competition for the speakers with all this voting and other activities going on. It is fortunate that all of the speeches are filed with the General Secretary and are carefully studied by the commissions; otherwise the speeches made this morning would be a dead loss. As it is the many good things which were said will not be wasted.

In his intervention Spellman tried to protect us against the charge of using the Council to pressure our government for aid to parochial schools. The object of the Propositions, he said, is to assert the rights of children and parents in matters of education, not to demand funds. Hence this should be stated more explicitly. Abp. Cody in his intervention spoke on behalf of the National Catholic Education Association.

Judging from the tone of the interventions it appears that these declarations will be adopted with modifications. The stress placed on the importance of a post conciliar commission to treat the whole field of education more thoroughly meets with much favor.

NOVEMBER 18: 125th Gen. Assembly: Cardinal Lercaro presiding; present 2131. Pope Paul assisted the Mass this morning which was celebrated by Patriarch (Armenians in Cilicia, Lebanon) Batanian. This apparently was a move to satisfy the Armenians after the Melkites had gotten such a big play when the Holy Father attended the Mass celebrated by Maximos.

There will be a barrage of ballots tomorrow and Friday as the last minute action of this session is taken care of prior to the public session on Saturday. Tomorrow debate on Catholic education will very probably be completed early enough to permit voting. Four ballots are

planned for that schema. On Friday there is to be a vote on the Declaration concerning the Jews and other non-Christian religions. Three ballots are planned for that.

Yesterday it had been announced that there would be a vote on the Declaration concerning Religious Liberty on Thursday - tomorrow. Today Felici threw a bomb-shell into the aula when he announced that "a number" of council fathers sent a letter of protest. They called attention to the fact that the Ordo regulating the procedure of the Council provided for an adequate interval between the time when copies of schemata are given to the Council Fathers and the time when such schemata are voted on. But, the schema of the Declaration on Religious Liberty which was returned to us on Tuesday to be voted on Thursday, has been almost completely rewritten since the text had been debated. Therefore, there will not be ample time, if the vote actually is taken on Thursday, for the council fathers to study the text carefully. Hence, they petitioned the Moderators and members of the Presidency to rule that the schema be tabled until the fourth session because only in that way can it receive the careful study it needs!

Felici said that the Moderators and members of the Presidency decided to submit the matter to the general assembly itself for a decision. Hence tomorrow a ballot will be taken to decide whether the Declaration is to be subjected to the preliminary note or not. If the decision is favorable, the five ballots on the schema will be taken as planned. This is, of course, a very obvious "power play" to scuttle the Declaration on Religious Liberty. If it is held in abeyance during the interval between sessions the local members of the commissions of the Council will have more opportunity to whittle away at the document as they did during the interval between the second and third sessions. On the other hand, if a preliminary vote is taken now we will at least be committed to a definite text which can not be tampered with as easily as a text on which no votes have been taken.

It will also be interesting to see tomorrow just how the proposition on which we are to vote in this matter is worded. We probably will be up against another situation where we have to vote no when we mean yes and vice versa. I have a feeling that the people who submitted this petition (I wish I could find out who signed the petition) were very much disappointed that the Moderators and the members of the Presidency did not decide this matter themselves. Judging from the whole atmosphere in the aula during the debate on this subject, it would be a stunning reversal of form if the General Assembly does not reject this move, but votes to proceed with the planned balloting. I feel that the petitioners expected the decision to come from those who control the agenda; it must have been very disappointing to them when it didn't. There must have been a sharp debate on this matter among the Moderators and members of the Presidency. From my position in the aula I can see very little of the area where the Moderators and Presidents are seated, and I can see nothing of the Secretaries' table; but Bishop Mueller who sits across from me, says there was a tremendous going back and forth in this area during the progress of the meeting. That would seem they received the letter only after the opening of the meeting or shortly before. That may also account for the action of throwing the matter into the laps of the council fathers.

Today we finished voting on the chapters of "de Ecclesia." Later in the General Assembly we received copies of the completed text of this Constitution. There will be the formality tomorrow of taking the final vote on the entire constitution before it is turned over to the Holy Father for approval and promulgation at the public session on Saturday. As a part of that ceremony there will be a "ceremonial" vote on the same Constitution as part of the procedure leading up to promulgation. I am sure there will be some negative votes, even on Saturday from the die-

hard conservatives, just as last year there were quite a few negative votes on the Decree on Communications.

All told in the General Assembly today we cast seven ballots, three on the last three chapters of de Ecclesia and four on the propositions on seminary education.

There were nine speakers today, but, as was the case yesterday, not much attention was paid to them because of the buzzing activity and excitement on the floor which accompanied the balloting. I felt sorry for Bishop Pohlschneider of Aachen. He apparently was to make a major statement on Catholic education in behalf of the German speaking Fathers. He was called to the microphone after Bishop Munos-Vega of Quito was introduced. But after the latter finished speaking at 12:20 Felici started making the announcement about the petition to delay the vote on Religious Liberty and also announced the results of several ballots. It was after 12:30 before Felici finished and Lercaro hesitated for a few seconds and then simply said that the next General Assembly will be tomorrow at nine. I hope Pohlschneider gets a chance to talk tomorrow after standing there so patiently at his microphone for over ten minutes, only to be cut off!

Cardinal Leger has high ambitions for the schema on Catholic Education. He said it could well become the Magna Charta of Catholic Education and therefore should be returned to the commission to be done over completely and adequately. He said that we did not have the time (or the energy) at this late date to do that before this session ends. He got a big hand.

I am sure that the speeches will receive more attention from the members of the commission than they received in the aula today! Many good things were said. But the whole atmosphere has taken on the air of "the last day of school" in the aula; I imagine that will be worse tomorrow and Friday.

During the General Assembly today Bishop Blomjous received a note from Father Tom Stransky who is on the Secretariat for Christian Unity. They are to meet this afternoon at 4:00. I asked the Bishop what he thought of Father Stransky in so far as his qualifications for the work he is doing. Without hesitation and with some enthusiasm he said: "Father Stransky is tops." He went on to say that last summer there was a rather important meeting on Ecumenism near Florence - Casada I believe was the name mentioned by Blomjous - at which a large number of the top people in this field participated. Father Stransky made one of the major addresses. His subject was "Ecumenism in the United States". Bishop Blomjous said that in his opinion Stransky gave the best speech of the entire conference. This is most encouraging because Father Stransky is still a very young man; he could render a tremendous service to the Church if he can continue in the field of ecumenism.

We also discussed the document on Religious Liberty. Bishop Blomjous was not present at the General Assembly yesterday and therefore did not have his copy, so he went through mine. He is quite happy with it, and gave me some of his ideas. This document is discussing religious liberty as a civil right, based on the nature of the human being. The Declaration shows the great influence which Father John Courtenay Murray had in framing it. We discussed the question of restricting religious liberty in some areas. When that must be done "for the common good" it would be better that this be considered necessary only for the preservation of "public order." The common good is much more extension than public order. And if it were held that the State has a right to interfere for reasons of all phases of the common good, it would wander into fields entirely beyond its competence. Even the teaching

of religion is a matter of the common good, but no one would therefore want to argue that the state can step in. The function of the state is described much better by the term "public order."

Bishop Blomjous is quite satisfied with the development concerning Chapter III of de Ecclesia. He feels that the Nota Explicativa Praevia do not derogate the concept of collegiality in any serious manner, but that they did provide an escape for the conservatives with a minimum amount of face saving. Congar, Danielou, etc. agreed to the Nota saying that they do not rob collegiality of any real meaning.

NOVEMBER 19: 126th Gen. Assembly; Cardinal Doepfner presiding; present 2145.

The first in the order of business this morning was the vote on the Constitution de Ecclesia as a complete unity. Felici was very careful to announce before this ballot that Council fathers should keep in mind the announcement he had made in the name of higher authority on Nov. 16 when casting their ballots today and at the public session on Saturday. This already is a tip-off of what the party line for the Curia will be in the future: whenever the question of collegiality comes up, refer to the Nota Explicativa Praevia so that everyone will understand that collegiality doesn't matter much after all! The vote carried with only 10 non placet out of a total of 2145 casting ballots. There was a loud applause when the result was announced.

Tomorrow (Friday) there will be the final vote on the decree on Ecumenism as a unit. Here another "power play" has taken place. When announcing this vote Felici read nineteen textual changes which have been introduced into this decree and are already incorporated in the copy which we will receive. Felici indicated that these changes all were approved by the Secretariat for Christian Unity. At the press panel which bishop Hoch attended this afternoon Father Tom Stransky, a member of that Secretariat, flatly denied that these changes had ever been presented for consideration at any plenary session of the Secretariat. His remark was: what we need more than ecumenism is common honesty! In fact, Felici had said that the modi came from the secretariat and are purely for purposes of clarity. Father Stransky said that some of these changes in the text result in a change of emphasis. We are now left in the position where we must vote in favor of all these changes if we want any action on ecumenism. If more than one third would vote negatively the whole decree would be rejected!

We received a copy of the "modi" on Oriental Churches and will vote on the same tomorrow: one ballot on the modi which were adopted and one since the last report and one on the action regarding all the "modi" affecting this decree.

The debate on Christian Education was completed and voting began. The ballot on whether to accept or reject the propositions was carried with 419 dissenting votes out of a total of 1879. The four ballots on the various propositions were completed at 12:35, but the result of only the first was announced. There were 157 negative votes and 140 votes iuxta modum out of a total of 1891.

In the meantime things were happening. I had come to the aula this morning, taking it for granted that after the vote on the complete text of de Ecclesia, we would proceed immediately to the vote which was announced yesterday by the Moderators and members of the Presidency, to determine whether we proceed with the vote on religious liberty or whether in response to the petition of "some" fathers, the vote be delayed to the next session. Since the mind of the council fathers on the question of religious liberty was quite clear, there was no question in anybody's mind what the outcome would be. In fact I was a bit amused by the fact that three Italian bishops directly ahead of me were feverishly busy preparing "modi" to be used when the voting on the Declaration began. Each had a fist full of at least a dozen such

"modi" which they kept arranging and signing as soon as the session opened. They also had a list indicating that they were to vote Non Placet on all ballots where votes iuxta modum were not called for.

All of a sudden it dawned on me that they were proceeding with the debate on Christian Education and called for no more balloting. Four fathers spoke, which took us up to 10:45 when cloture was voted. Then three men spoke (Fernandez among them, of course) with the support of 70 fathers so that he could speak after cloture. Fernandez was called for going over time, but he paid no attention to this and went right on to the end. This in spite of the fact that there was loud applause when Doepfner called him.

Now I knew that something was up; in fact I have a note written at this point in which I wrote: "There is something funny going on. For some reason they are not bringing the Declaration Religious Liberty to a vote. They kept droning along on Christian Education without a move to begin the balloting which had been announced yesterday."

When the time went past eleven, I was sure. Finally when they had disposed of Christian Education on the floor Tisserant was introduced by Doepfner and made the following announcement: The petition by some council fathers to have the vote on Religious liberty postponed to the next session so as to permit more time for its study had been considered. The Presidency has decided that the General Assembly is not competent to make the final decision on a procedural matter of this kind. Therefore the Presidency has decided that the petition will be granted and that the vote will not be taken until the next session. Council Fathers who wish to intervene on this subject must have their interventions in the hands of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity on or before January 27, 1965.

This was the bombshell which exploded at 11:05. Cardinal Meyer was instantly on his feet and went to Tisserant to protest this action. He reminded Tisserant that there had been no meeting of the Presidency. The reply was that Tisserant called on the individual members of the Presidency and all the others agreed, so there was no need to refer to Cardinal Meyer. The latter went into action without delay and the bishops in the aula and especially in the side nave near the coffee bar went into action immediately. By 11:30 a petition signed by more than 800 council fathers from many different countries had been gotten together. Cardinal Meyer, Leger, Ritter and I believe Alfrink went to the Vatican immediately to deliver the petition to the Holy Father. Whether they got to see the Holy Father and what, if anything he did, I do not know at this writing. But I am sure no petition ever gathered so many names in such a short time, in or out of the Council. A bit of humor developed as Msgr. Quinn of Chicago, who prepared the text and ran off the sheets for signature, used Felici's mimeograph machines.

* Cf next page for relatio by de Smedt.

I am sorry that I did not leave my seat and move around the side naves. I could have had a chance to sign the petition. I am told that there were all shades of reaction from a near state of shock to real anger. Such a blatant disregard of honor, honesty, and integrity should be simply unthinkable in connection with the work of the Council. That, entirely aside from the terrible blow this will be to the reputation of the Holy Father, repudiation of the work of John XXIII. and the discredit to the Council itself. Then the catastrophic effect on the work of ecumenism in the United States and Canada and the loss of face of catholics in these areas before their fellow citizens just cannot be imagined. It seems that the movement to circulate the first petition originated with some Spanish bishops who had reasons to fear Franco. Archbishop Naba

stated he had seen the petition. It had probably 250 signatures, mostly from Spain. Though I am sure there were some Italians also.

Bishop Hoch was at the press conference this afternoon. The whole story was told in all its details. Father John Countenay Murray, Father King, Father McManus, Father Stransky, Bishop Philip Hannan were all there. They named names and gave facts, and obviously were speaking in anger much of the time. The place was jammed and it is easy to imagine how this story will hit the papers in the morning all over the world. My own reaction was that it left one quite speechless. I didn't leave my seat till the end of the session. And I must confess that as I walked out of the Porta Santa Martha I didn't care much whether I ever got back to the Council again!

* See previous page.

It seems like a ridiculous anti climax to have Bishop de Smedt make a relatio on the schema on Religious Liberty after the announcement was made that there would be no vote on the same until the next session. In similar circumstances I do not think that I would have had the courage to speak at all. It probably would have been a very dramatic gesture of protest if he simply had announced that he would not make the relatio now that it could be no more than a hollow mockery! But it is well he did speak. De Smedt is a masterful orator and he certainly was equal to the demands of this dramatic situation. When he started in a low voice one gained the impression that he was deeply moved and on the verge of tears. His style is quite different than that of a Lamont or a Sheen; but he was much more effective than the others because his elocution was a natural development of the message he had to get across and not an artificial device. Several times during his talk he was interrupted with long applause and at the end it was like rolling thunder in the huge vaults of St. Peter's. Not even the Holy Father had received such an ovation at any of his appearances in connection with his appearances at this session.

The text of the relatio had been printed before the bombshell of this morning hit us and de Smedt did not depart from the prepared text in any way. As he gave the history of the development of the Declaration during the several revisions, study by the Secretariat and by the Theological Commission and how everyone had an opportunity to become familiar with the subject matter one felt that his speech had been prepared specifically to answer the argument on which the action in deferring the vote had been based. He stressed that the present text while greatly amplified over the original draft in order to clarify both the theology and pastoral elements, nevertheless represented no departure in any way from the content of the original drafts. Nothing was inserted into the text beyond what the council fathers had suggested in their interventions and therefore the present draft actually is familiar to all who paid any attention to the debate and represents what the Secretariat feels is the mind of the Council Fathers. It is very obvious that if the vote had been taken immediately after the completion of the relatio it would have been no less than 90% favorable to the Declaration.

NOVEMBER 20: 127th General Assembly, and the last of this session.

Cardinal Doepfner presided; present 2119.

We received a beautiful solid gold medal of the Blessed Mother as a gift to each council father from an anonymous donor.

Besides that they distributed the complete schema on Ecumenism; the amended schema on Priests and also the amended schema on Divine Revelation.

Felici made a very apologetic announcement about the rehearsal which is to be held in St. Peter's by the twenty-four who will concelebrate with the Holy Father at the Solemn closing of the third session tomorrow. He had announced this rehearsal for 5:00 PM yesterday afternoon whereas it actually will be this afternoon. He confessed that this was one of many mistakes made during this session, but that it certainly would be the last!

Before beginning the regular work of the assembly Tisserant made an announcement; there was the silence of death in the aula as he spoke. The Holy Father wished to make known to the council Fathers that the vote on the Declaration on Religious Liberty would be the very first item of the agenda in the next session of the Council. The message referred to the very large number of council fathers who had protested the postponement of this vote. He hoped that the document would be carefully evaluated by the council fathers during interim. Interventions in writing may be sent to the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity until the end of January, 1965.

It seems a little strange that there should be talk of further interventions. These had already been given in the prolonged debate of this draft-schema. According to regular procedure the draft should have been voted on in order to approve or disapprove the manner in which it reflected the mind of the council father as expressed in their intervention's spoken or written. In the process of voting there would be ample opportunity to submit modi which would then receive the required attention. The proper thing would have been to tell us that the draft would remain as it is until the next session when we vote on it. With the attitude shown in the past, it is quite evident what the conservative elements want to do to this Declaration before we ever get a chance to vote on it. They will devise some means of altering the text and then making it stick.

They tipped their hand today with regard to the technique they can employ. We had voted on all four chapters of Ecumenism and adopted all chapters by a huge majority. Normally after each chapter has been voted as a unity and the disposition of the modi approved, the vote on the whole Decree is more or a less a formality. But not this time. Yesterday we were given a list of twenty-two alterations in the text of the final printed copy, alterations which we were told were approved by the Secretariat, but which Father Stransky denies. We were told that we could vote only placet or non placet. Which means that we had to decide either to swallow our pride again and accept what they had inserted or else throw the whole thing out of the window and we would end with nothing on ecumenism. I wonder whether it wouldn't have been wiser to reject the whole Decree in order to preserve the integrity of the Council. While none of the alterations was very serious, it nevertheless introduced a change in the tone of the Decree. That in itself is not nearly as important, however, as the principle involved. If they get by with putting us into a position every time when we come to a final vote on a council document where we must approve things which we don't like in order to be left with nothing in our hands, it is quite evident that the Curia people can write our ticket for us all the way down the line, and then make us vote our approval! This doesn't leave much integrity in the whole proceedings.

Today we voted the Oriental Churches, the final ballot on Ecumenism, the Declaration on Jews and other non-Christian Religions and on Matrimony as a sacrament.

The way these were shoved through today revealed the hypocrisy behind the reasons given for delay on the vote on Religious Liberty. I mentioned the vote on Ecumenism above. Then we voted on the Jews, without anymore opportunity or any more preliminary voting than on Religious Liberty. Yet that went through and will be promulgated on Saturday - tomorrow! And we had not asked or expected that Religious Liberty would be promulgated, even though

everybody knows that could easily have been done if they hadn't dragged their feet; all we wanted was to get a chance at only the preliminary ballots in order to get ourselves committed to this text. No: they needed more time - to scuttle the text!

Then they had the nerve to bring the schema on the floor with only two days to vote and little more time to study the implications. On the very day when we are told to take the time to study the text of Religious Liberty carefully we are also asked to vote on Matrimony as a sacrament after practically no opportunity to study it! As Archbishop Conway said on the floor today, we are asked to dispose of a major pastoral problem (mixed marriages) after a minor consideration after practically no opportunity to canvas the mind of the Council. He said, "There isn't another legislative body in the world that would treat a major problem in such a summary manner. Yet here we are asked to turn this body over to the Curia (the pious statement that it would be referred to the Holy Father for his personal decision is simply dust in the eyes of anyone who knows how the Curia operates. Furthermore it was quite generally known that the matter was already decided some time before the draft of these propositions ever came to the floor, or were distributed to us!

There were thirteen speeches in all, besides the Relatio on the Jews and other non-Christian Religion. Archbishop Conway of Armagh, mentioned above gave one of the better speeches. He certainly laid it right on the line as Heenan, Morris, Kroll and others had done. Heenan thanked the periti for the work they did on this schema. As usual he had to bring in one sharp statement. He said: "Pope John XXIII wanted to renew the Church, not destroy it."

This question of mixed marriages is a good example of conflicting pastoral elements. To relax the law of clandestinely would be harmful to us: at table this evening Bishop Cleven told me that they made a study in Cologne and discovered that two thirds of all their mixed marriages are outside of the Church! Because of the penalty of excommunication many of these Catholics became Evangelicals; the ministers would go to these catholic parties of such marriages and tell them: "Your Church has throw you out; you have no other place to go except to come to us." This certainly differs from our picture - and that in the Catholic Rhineland. Bishop Cleven said that much of this is due to the influx of evangelicals as displaced persons or expellees.

There was some time left after the speaking ended as we had to ballot on Matrimony as a Sacrament and then wait until we received the count. There was a total of 2045 votes cast on that ballot with 1592 placet and 457 non placet.

Felici used the time to make various announcements. There is nothing to be done on the schema on Divine Revelation until the next session when the vote will be taken. The Schema on the Priestly Ministry is to be studied and suggestions sent in before January 31, 1965.

Suggestions for Religious Liberty must be in before January 31, 1965. He then went on to explain the ceremony for tomorrow and outlined the formalities regarding the promulgation of three documents, de Ecclesia, Oriental Churches and Ecumenism. A formal ballot will be taken on each, and he said he hoped that there would no invalid ballots or ballots iuxta modum! After all, we will be seen by all the world during that ceremony - there were TV cameras for tomorrow all over the place. Each of the documents will have to be signed. Those who are proxies can not sign at the solemn session unless they are bishops. Other proxies must go to the Secretariat later to sign.

As Felici kept rattling along obviously to kill time Doepfner interrupted and then made some speeches of gratitude to everybody who contributed to the work of the Council. Felici himself and the ushers got the biggest applause. We finally left at about 12:40 PM.

As I walked out of St. Peter's I did not experience the thrill that I had expected. Even though the Council did produce three documents, of which the Constitution on de Ecclesia and Decree on Ecumenism are of tremendous importance, the episode in the blocking of the vote on Religious Liberty leaves a bad taste in my mouth. At the same time the events of the last three days serve as a warning that there will be a determined effort on the part of the curia to prevent the great majority of the Council to carry out the obvious will of the Church as expressed by that majority. They have demonstrated that they will use every trick in the book, even if it is of questionable honesty, in order to prevent any further change. That is not a very pleasant thought to take along home!

COUNCIL DIARY

FOURTH SESSION

1965

COUNCIL DIARY 1965

September 14 This year I probably was better conditioned for the opening of a Council Session than was the case in any of the three previous sessions. I have spent a week in the Holy Land, returning to Rome on September 11. Abbot Baldwin, OSB and I came to Rome from the States on August 31, and on September 4 the two of us along with Father Lessard took off for the Holy Land. It was an unforgettable experience. The weather was hot, though not any more than normal for this time of the year. So we were subjected to some discomfort because of the heat, though never to a degree that annoyed us. We saw things that were aggravating, because of the commercialization and exploitation in many places, but the overriding impression almost everywhere was one of edification. Even though many shrines obviously were not authentic and the exact location of others probably do not correspond accurately with the sites of events in Our Lord's life, we nevertheless were inspired by what we saw at the holy places, especially in those places where we celebrated Mass. Coming as it did just before the opening of the fourth session, the visit to the Holy Land was well timed.

The atmosphere here in Rome is a bit tense, more so than usual before the opening of a session. Everybody connected with the Council realizes that a big job remains to be done. Some action will have to be taken on eleven different projects, ranging from voting only to a full scale discussion and voting. I am convinced that this material will never be processed completely if the pattern of the previous sessions is followed. To get everything done before Christmas, it will be necessary to change the procedure in some way that will hasten the process debate and the revision by the Commissions.

There are many important questions that certainly will generate controversy, but the two projects which are most frequently referred to in the precouncil conversations are those on religious liberty and the Jews.

Speaking of the declaration on the Jews recalls some conversations which I had with people from the US who are now in Jerusalem. I never referred to this problem in speaking to any of the Jews or Arabs. Every single westerner I talked to on that subject was emphatic in condemning the declaration, not for theological or historical reasons, but simply because of the reaction some said retaliation instead of reaction which certainly will be provoked among the Arabs. Some insisted that even at this late date it would in the long run be best if the Holy Father simply withdrew the whole question from the agenda of the Council with the simple statement: "The time is not opportune for making a formal statement on this subject." They claim that nothing short of this would in any way pacify the Arabs. I tried to explain what such action would do is mar the public image of the Church and of the Council particularly if the declaration on the Jews were dropped or even changed to any great extent. But the only reaction I got was that the Arabs have an absolute blind spot on this subject and no amount of explanation or assurance that the declaration has no political overtones can change their attitude. I can well understand that the westerners in Jerusalem Jordan would not dare to take any other position on this question. I never realized how fierce and bitter the attitude of two groups of people could be towards each other until I came face to face with it in the City of Jerusalem. I imagine that the situation is somewhat similar to that along the "wall" in Berlin.

This was brought home to us in Jerusalem by an experience we had with our passports. When we went through immigration at the Tel Aviv airport, they stamped Father Baldwin's and my passport. That little formality put us to no end of trouble because if we had attempted to enter Jordan with such a stamp by an official of the Israeli government, we would have been refused entry! We had to get a special document of identification from the American Consulate and then Father Patrick Coyle, OSB, who is on friendly terms on both sides and can go back and forth at will, arranged to accompany us across the fifty meters of no man's land between the two guard stations at the Mendelbaum Gates! The feeling is such that postal officials will refuse to process mail that originated on the other side of the line. There simply is no communication across the line, except by rifle or machine gun fire.

With that kind of feeling, it is easy to understand why men like Maximos IV violently denounce the declaration on the Jews. I am quite sure it will pass by a huge majority, but it will do much harm to the Church in Arab countries, though such harm will be out balanced by the good it will do in other parts of the world, especially in the States.

What we are to expect from the declaration on religious liberty is hard to say. Cardinal Koenig mentioned at table this evening that a rumor is floating around to the effect that Ruffini has drafted his own declaration on religious liberty and has secured the signatures of 50 council fathers asking that his declaration be substituted for the one which is officially on the agenda. Just how such procedure would fit into the rules, I can't quite understand. The rules, I believe, do provide that a Council Father supported by the signature of a certain number of other Fathers, can ask for the introduction of a subject not on the agenda; but I do not see that there is any twist of the rules of procedure which would make it possible to throw out a schema already on the agenda and substitute another on the same subject. Whatever is done, I am sure the small minority opposing the declaration now under consideration will not give up without a fight. There is considerable fear that the Holy Father may go along with this group up to a certain point which would greatly weaken the declaration.

At least we are sure of one thing as of this evening, the declaration on religious liberty will be considered first when the Council gets down to business in the 128th General Congregation which is to be held tomorrow!

The solemn opening of the fourth session this morning was quite impressive. The Holy Father walked in the procession, which is a step forward. But they still had the entourage of about fifty people in various types of ecclesiastical and court uniforms. The latter are taken right out of the feudal panoply of the Middle Ages. It would lend so much dignity to pontifical functions if they would shed some of those things which are absolutely meaningless in this age. Much has been accomplished in connection with the music. The simple chant tone of the "Tu es Petrus" sung by the whole congregation has more dignity than all of the efforts of the Sistine Choir and the silver trumpets.

There were at least twice as many Council Fathers present this morning as there were last night. In fact practically all seats in the nave and most of the tribunes were filled.

The Holy Father's Allocution to the Council Fathers was, in quite general terms, revolving around the theme of peace and charity. He did draw a round of applause when he announced that an episcopal senate would definitely be organized. The "penitential procession" from the Basilica of the Holy Cross to the Lateran at 5:30 this evening was announced. Because of the hopeless traffic conditions practically no one from Salvator Mundi went.

The penitential procession from the Basilica of the Holy Cross to St. John Lateran was described as magnificent. Only Archbishop Byrne and Bishop Biskup of the group living here at Salvator Mundi went. They reported that the whole demonstration was much more orderly and reverential than could be expected. They estimate that much more than one thousand bishops and other prelates participated and that the crowd which lined the street for the entire route of the procession joined in the prayers that were recited. The reason why the rest of us did not go was fear of the traffic congestion that was inevitable. Bishop Biskup said the traffic was as bad as had been expected; they did not get back here till nearly nine PM even though the procession started at 5:30 and the whole demonstration was over by seven o'clock!

I have read the complete text of Pope Paul's address to the Council Fathers at the solemn opening of the fourth session. This address impressed me as much as any address Paul VI has made, with the possible exception of the one made at the opening of the second session. Paul rededicates the Council to the objectives of John XXIII: Those objectives can be summarized in the phrase: UNITY OF FAITH AND UNIVERSALITY OF LOVE. He really preached a good retreat to the Council Fathers, reminding them of their responsibility to remain loyal to the word of God and loyal to the Church. He stressed unity within the Church and the duty to seek unity of all followers of Christ. That is the attitude with which we must approach the world of the Council. It was very easy to see that he is very much concerned about the excesses to the right and the left among some more or less irresponsible elements in various parts of the world.

Paul described the technique followed by the Council in its proceedings as a process of dialogue, prayer, reflection and discussion leading up to final agreement. In my opinion, that is the best description of the workings of the Council that I have ever heard. The word "discussion" might be amplified a bit so as to convey some idea of great variety of opinions expressed in the beginning of the debate on any given project.

The address of Paul was not the type that commanded many headlines; the average newspaperman would not appreciate the real impact such a speech would have on the Council Fathers generally. The press was more interested in the announcement the Holy Father made of his plan to organize an Episcopal Synod and to attend the UN meeting on Oct 6. He explained the reason for his failure to make any comments on specific points on the agenda by saying that he did not in any way want to put pressure on the Council Fathers, but wanted them to be entirely free in their opinions and decisions.

SEPTEMBER 15: 128th General Congregation, Agagianian presiding, Present 2265.

Archbishops John Kroll and Paul Hallinan are supervising the production and distribution of the COUNCIL DIGEST again this year, with most of the mechanical phase of the work being done at the NCWC office. They announce that the Digest would appear daily until the discussions of the schemata are completed - predictably by mid October. Thereafter it will appear periodically to report on the results of voting. There is, of course, nothing official in this announcement in so far as a commitment regarding the completion of the work of the Council. But it is interesting to note that some people are optimistic about the closing date of the Council. Completion of discussion will, of course, come long before the solemn close, because of the work that must be done by the commissions. But if the discussion is ended by mid October there is a much better chance of ending the Council by early December.

When we came to the aula this morning we were surprised to learn that the Holy Father was to attend the first part of the Congregation.

He entered informally by way of the Porta Santa Anna and occupied a priedieu during the Mass and then took the center chair at the table of the presidency. Cardinal Marella announced that the Holy Father was about to promulgate a Motu Proprio, to be known as APOSTOLIC SOLICITUDO by virtue of which he would constitute an Episcopal Synod. After this announcement by Marella, Felici read the complete text of the document. There was practically dead silence as Felici slowly and deliberately read the text. The bishops listened intently and were obviously pleased by what they heard. There will no doubt be many comments publicly and privately about this action of the Holy Father, but from what could be gathered from the reading of the text, it is quite obvious that some details of the setup will please the bishops very much, while others, as was the case with Pastoral Munus, are disappointing.

The use of the term "Synod" is a bit encouraging because it has the connotation of a legislative body rather than a mere consultative group. Yet the Holy Father yesterday referred to the function of the Synod to be "consultation and collaboration." Maybe it is silly to quibble in this way about terms: in the long run it will depend entirely upon the reigning pontiff whether the Synod is to function at all or whether it will be a mere formality or whether it will become a real instrument of effective help to the Holy Father in the government of the Church.

There is the same objection to the form of Apostolica Sollicitudo as there was to Pastoral Munus: the powers of the Episcopal Synod are strictly delegated and not declared to be inherent in the collegiate nature of the Episcopate as had been declared in de Ecclesia.

On the other hand, it is a most hopeful sign that the membership in the Episcopal Synod will be made up of about 85% to be elected by the various national conferences or ex officio members, such as metropolitan; only about 15% are to be nominated by the Holy Father. There was prolonged applause when Felici finished reading the text of the Motu Proprio. The Holy Father then left quietly by the same route he came.

Before beginning the routine work of the General Congregation, Tisserant was given the floor. He made some perfunctory announcements and expressed thanks to the members of the commission. He repeated some of the rules of procedure, especially those concerning repetition and applause. It very soon became evident that these rules would be observed no more than during past sessions. This became evident within a matter of minutes when Agagianian, who is to preside during the discussions on religious liberty, read a message of felicitation to the Council from Athenagoras. That evoked loud and prolonged applause. Agagianian then announced that during this session permission to have priests or others who are not experts or council fathers will be granted only upon request in writing coming from the person's own ordinary. This is a wise restriction; last year there were people roaming all over the place during some of the congregations, especially towards the end of the session. The matter of having non members attend had gotten out of hand.

The project on religious liberty was now formally brought to the floor. de Smedt read the relatio on behalf of the Secretariat of Christian unity. He did his usual good job. He was persuasive and effective in defending the schema. His oratory is simply magnificent. The text of his relatio was excellent. He placed special stress on the fact that the schema is not a theological exposition of the theology of freedom or the relationship between church and state; it referred only to the one point, namely that there may be no coercion by the state or by anyone else to compel or prevent religious practice. He asked that this be kept in mind when Council Fathers cast their ballot.

There were eight regular speakers who took the floor today all of them were Cardinals. Spellman was the first. His text was well prepared, but his delivery, while better than on most occasions in the past, still left much to be desired. Yet, I am sure he made a good impression.

Today we really had some big guns speaking on both sides of the question. Besides Spellman, Frings, Urbani, Cushing and Alfrink spoke in defense of the schema. Urbani represented 32 other Italian bishops. Ruffini, Siri, de Arriba y Castro spoke against.

The group which defended the schema did a good job of presenting their case in a persuasive manner. I am sure that they allayed the fears of some of the Council Fathers from countries with which the Holy See has a concordat and where the Church enjoys a privileged position. Such bishops are really afraid that their people (probably because they are not well instructed) become indifferent to religion or would consider one as good as the other if the doctrine regarding conscience and its right to freedom were promulgated.

I was particularly struck by Cardinal Frings' presentation. He spoke in simple, dignified language, handling the Latin as fluently as German. While he is not so very old (early seventies) his eyesight is gone almost completely and his general health is not good. But as one listened to him this morning, there was no evidence of his disabilities. His mind is as sharp as ever.

The three who spoke against the schema were blunt and harsh. They predicted dire consequences if the declaration is adopted. They simply state that only the Catholic Church has a right to teach the gospel and that no other religion has any right to freedom. It is obvious that they have remained completely indifferent to the things which the Council has done in the schema on ecumenism. To them the greatest calamity that could come to their countries would be to lose their present relationship to the state. They still seem to think that the so-called "privileges" which the Church enjoys in their countries are absolutely indispensable to their existence. If they would study the progress made by the Church in countries where there is complete freedom they might come to recognize the fact that those "privileges" may be the mill-stone that weighs down the Church and blocks her efforts to promote the life of the Church. de Arriba y Castro stated very bluntly that both Church and state must oppose proselytism. He went on to say that the Council must be careful not to destroy the Catholic religion in countries where everybody is Catholic.

Bishop Hoch and I went to Unitas on the Piazza Navona where the Documentation Center is conducted by the Dutch. Cardinal Alfrink spoke in French and Father John Courtenay spoke in English. Alfrink had as a principal theme a strong protest against the manner Dutch Catholics had been treated in the world press for the past month and particularly against articles appearing in the Italian press during the last few days. He described that treatment as "one-sided, negative and biased." He spoke very strongly in defense of the Dutch Catholic community. He said that they had their problems something which might be said of almost every other country; but he insisted that the criticism of the Dutch Catholics is not justified. He disagreed with the unknown individual who is supposed to have said that it is a sign of a lack of vitality in the Church because no schism has as yet occurred. He countered this with the statement that it is a sign of real vitality that the Church can go through this period of the Council without suffering any schism.

Father Murray spoke of the Development of Doctrine in connection with the schema on religious liberty. He analyzed the writings of Leo XIII on the question of civil liberty and

compared it with what has been written and said by Pius XII and John XXIII. He distinguished between the paternalistic state in which context Leo XIII was writing with the political state of which Pius XII and John XXIII were writing. He went on to explain the real development that has taken place in the teachings concerning the relationship of subject to the state in Leo's time to the relationship between the citizen and the state in our time.

SEPTEMBER 16: 129th General Congregation: Agagianian presiding, Present 2252.
The meeting opened with a request from Felici that the heads of each Episcopal Conference in the various countries, submit information concerning the name and residence in Rome of the Chairman and also the exact name of the Conference.

Felici then announced the schedule of the schemata that are to be discussed and then those to be voted on generally, and those that will be voted on only in reference to the modi already submitted. The voting will begin next Monday, September 20.

There were seventeen speakers of which five were Cardinals. That makes a total of twelve cardinals who spoke on this schema. Of the seventeen who spoke today, ten were in favor and seven opposed. Two of the Cardinals, both of oriental rites, were interrupted by the moderator. Meouchi became flustered and sat down. Slipyi just ignored the reminder that his time was up and finished reading his papers.

I am sure that not much was contributed by way of light on this subject. The speakers were all very restrained and practically none aside from Carli condemned the schema outright. If they continue debating all day tomorrow it will be another very dull General Assembly as this one was today.

It is interesting to check on the press coverage given to the General Assembly held yesterday, September 15. The big thing at that meeting was the presence of the Holy Father and the promulgation of the Motu Proprio, "Apostolica Solicitududo." That certainly was one of the more important things to happen in the Council so far because it represents a concession to the insistent demands of the Council Fathers outside of the Curia that the episcopate of the world be given at least a token share in the government of the Church in recognition of collegiality which had been treated so explicitly in *de Ecclesia*.

But a reading of the English press today would give you the impression that this was only a minor development alongside of the fact that Spellman and Cushing spoke out strongly for the schema on religious liberty. Of course, I saw only the NY Herald Tribune and the Daily American and heard only the AFN news broadcast. But the fact is that the two newspapers ran stories from the AP and UPI, which means that substantially the same story was circulated by these agencies in the States. Hence I am sure that this is the picture which the people in the States got of the first working congregation of the fourth session. Newsmen have their own scale of values. They must have known that the Motu Proprio was "hot copy" but they also know that the general public, especially in the States is interested in religious liberty; so they played up this subject to the neglect of another much more important subject.

They not only gave that story priority, but they also made it as sensational as possible, giving the impression that there was a real "battle" (this expression was used in the story and headlines) on the subject. There was real plain talk on both sides, but it was hardly a battle.

SEPTEMBER 17: 130th Gen. Congregation; Agagianian presiding; 2214 present.

The first announcement today was the sixtieth anniversary of the ordination of Maximos IV. The announcement was greeted with prolonged applause. The Sisters went all out to put on a special dinner for Maximos to which a group of Oriental Rite Bishops were invited. The dining room was rearranged banquet style and all of us joined in the special dinner and general festivities. The old patriarch was very obviously pleased by the recognition given to the event. One would not suspect at first sight that he is in the high eighties.

Today I made a discovery! In this cosmopolitan atmosphere one of the big problems, especially for the help, is the pronouncing and spelling of names. Sister Veronica, who presides over the dining room, told me that the dining room and kitchen staff have no end of trouble with my name; they simply can not pronounce it. So, they solved the problem by simply referring to me as "Excellenz Kruschuv!" I always thought that along side of some of the Arab names among the other guests, my name is somewhat simple; but I find that matters of phonetics in different languages are purely relative; what seems most simple in one language represents a "jaw breaker" in another language. There is a rather pointed moral to be drawn from this: in the debate on the Council floor we sometimes become impatient with certain Council Fathers who seem to have a closed mind to some of the ideas that seem so obvious to us. If we want to understand the ideas put forth by speakers from other parts of the world we have to keep in mind that their habits of thinking are conditioned as much by their traditions and their general milieu as their speech of accent is determined by the phonetics of their mother tongue. So, if the help here calls me Kruschuv (can't even spell the name correctly) it is not because they think I am a communist leader, but because their mother tongue had no sound like my name in its phonetics. Our minds are closed to the patterns of thought among other people just as we find it practically impossible to pronounce the names of other people or the words in their language. I will try to keep that in mind in commenting on the attitudes of people like Ottaviani, Ruffini, Carli, etc.

There were eighteen speakers on this morning's program. The entire period of the General Assembly, aside from very few very brief announcements, were devoted to the speeches. The Council Digest this evening had eight pages of copy in giving summaries of the speeches. Six of the eighteen speakers were Cardinals, of whom Ottaviani was the last. This makes a total of eighteen Cardinals who have spoken on this topic; that seems like something of a record.

Of the eighteen speakers, seven are quite definitely against the schema. Two or three others admitted that a declaration on religious liberty must be made by the Council, but their concept of what the declaration should contain is such that silence would be much better than a statement of the type they propose. The other speakers, including some Italians, e.g. Florit, were willing, or for the most part eager to have the declaration made substantially as it now is. But practically everyone suggested one or more amendments to the schema.

On the whole, the Congregation this morning was boring because there just was no break in the rapid succession of speakers, most of whom said things that had already been said over and over again. The observation made above concerning the difficulty of communication between different groups of people because of the difference in their milieu applies very well here. Men like Ottaviani have kept the mentality of the inquisition, and nothing will change their attitude.

Something new happened this morning: Bishop , Auxiliary of Louisville, spoke before his name was called. So we had the unusual situation of having a man introduced after he spoke!

Maloney also had the distinction of introducing a new idea. He used the argument so often made by the conservatives that error has no right to be heard as an *argumentum ad hominem*. He reasoned something like this: There are many contradictory statements made on this council floor. Obviously some of the Council Fathers must have propounded error, since they flatly contradicted others. If error has no right to be heard, but what right did some of the Council fathers speak? Not by the right of truth; but by the right of their being Council Fathers!

One thing struck me rather forcibly this morning. When Ottaviani rose to speak there was perfect silence in the aula, something which is most unusual. I am sure that no other speech on religious liberty was listened to as attentively as his. Of course, he became so excited over his subject, as he frequently does, that it became very difficult at times to understand his Latin. In spite of that, practically every Council Father remained at his seat while Ottaviani spoke even though it was already 10:40 when he started talking. By that time, normally many Fathers would leave the aula even though the coffee bars don't usually open till about 11:00. This can only be interpreted as recognition (grudging given in many cases) of Ottaviani's power and influence in the Council. Even though few in the Council will admire his attitude on matters of orthodoxy and his harsh and sometimes brutal methods of dealing with those whose orthodoxy he suspects and the power plays he will employ to prevent the Council from making changes which he opposes (he opposes almost all changes), yet they respect his sincerity and his position and his loyalty in the service of the Church. Immediately after Ottaviani finished speaking at least one third of the Council Fathers left their places.

Cardinal Heenan made an interesting and valid point when he called attention to the fact that tolerance between Catholics and Protestant is a comparatively new phenomenon. Until modern times, Christians were either on your side or they were heretics or schismatics. It was the custom on both sides to burn heretics! He ended his speech by saying that a few days ago the Holy Father said some strong words about intolerance in Soviet countries and defended the right of every man to follow the dictates of his own conscience. It would seem rather droll, if not hypocritical indeed, if the Council Fathers did not follow the Pope's lead.

We received a schedule today of the voting that is to take place on *De Divina Revelatione*, beginning next Monday. There are to be twenty ballots on that project, of which six will be ballots on the six individual chapters permitting of votes *iuxta modum*. There is some speculation that the discussion of Religious Liberty will be completed soon enough to begin preliminary voting on that schema as soon as the one on revelation is disposed of.

Brother! What a relief to know that tomorrow and Sunday will be free days. The 3 and a half hour General Congregations daily from Monday through Friday are rugged indeed.

SEPTEMBER 18 & 19. The two days' break certainly was welcomed. There was very little activity aside from trying to get caught up with some of the paper work. Even that did not arouse much enthusiasm to be doing something. Went downtown to buy a few odds and ends. Radio reception was excellent Saturday night which made it possible to get the Notre Dame California game. Father Lessard and I went to the North American College to see a movie. That just about sums up the activity for the two days, aside from getting a good sleep each afternoon.

SEPTEMBER 20: 131st Gen. Congregation; Agagianian presiding; present 2204. Bishop Ribeiro of Goias in Brazil sat next to me in two of the previous sessions. He has been assigned the seat next to me in this session, but for some reason or other he hasn't shown up

for a single Congregation yet this year. Bishop van den Bronk of Parakou in Africa is in the seat next to the one assigned to Bishop Ribeiro. He is a Hollander and speaks near perfect English. I asked him this morning whether he could get me a copy of the pastoral letter issued by the Dutch hierarchy during the summer. He did not know whether an English copy would be available, but felt he could get one in German or French. Cardinal Alfrink sent a copy of that pastoral to the Holy Father some weeks before the encyclical on the Eucharist appeared. Rumor has it that the Dutch pastoral had considerable influence on the development of his encyclical by the Holy Father. I am anxious to compare the pastoral with the encyclical.

Today we started voting on de Divina Revelatione. The results are a surprise just as the liturgy schema brought a great surprise in the voting. As we look back to those meetings back in November of the first session in 1962 when the deadlock developed in connection with the schema de Fontibus Revelationis one can hardly believe the results of the voting which is now taking place on the same subject. All told, there were six ballots today; three on two paragraphs of Chapter I; one on the chapter as a whole and two on the first two paragraphs of Chapter II. We covered some of the ground on which there was a deadlock in 1962. Felici announced the results of only three ballots before we adjourned this morning. Two of these showed 19 and 20 negative votes, respectively and, believe it or not, the second ballot taken this morning showed absolute unanimity! Three ballots were thrown out as invalid because of improper marking; every one of the other 2180 votes were "placets." There are fourteen more ballots to be cast on this schema, with each ballot on a chapter as a whole permitting votes iuxta modum. I am sure that a few of these votes will arouse more opposition because of the controversial nature of some of the points contained in the schema. But, on the whole, the schema should be carried by a wide margin even though we don't expect another unanimous ballot. The one this morning was the first in the 289 ballots already taken in the four sessions; we certainly don't expect another!

A total of thirteen Fathers spoke on the schema this morning. Of these nine were Cardinals. This makes a total of 27 Cardinals who have spoken on this one project. This surely must be some kind of a record. Both Cardinal Wyszynski and Cardinal Reran spoke this morning. It is only natural that they should base their remarks largely on the experience they have in their native countries. Cardinal Heran got a great hand as he rose to speak. This is the first time he was permitted to come to a session and this was his first speech. He made some significant remarks. He insisted that oppression of conscience ended to be for the good of the true faith, is morally pernicious. He contended that the Church in Czechoslovakia is now making painful expiation for the sins committed in the past against freedom of conscience in the name of the Church, such as the burning of John Hus and the forced re-Catholicizing of the majority of the Bohemian people. By these acts the civil authorities, wishing or pretending to serve the Church in reality did irreparable harm to her. It is quite plain, however, that people in the so-called solidly Catholic countries simply cannot see this lesson which history teaches. They did not experience outright persecution; and they do not realize the sad state of religion in those countries where the monopoly exists about which they are so worried about now. They consider their preferred position a great asset and fear the declaration on religious liberty will destroy that position.

One of the surprises among the speakers today was Cardinal Rossi who spoke on behalf of a group of 82 Brazilian bishops. While he had some criticism to offer and proposed some amendments, he and the group represented went pretty right down the line with the schema. Rossi even asked for strengthening the schema on the point of the rights of parents and children.

Cardinal Cardijn in his maiden speech made a strong, appeal for real apostolic activity by the Church everywhere based strictly on an evangelical appeal. He saw relationships of religious liberty with the ecumenical movement, education, etc., which had not been mentioned by others. The effectiveness of his speech, however, was greatly reduced by the fact that he talked much too long. This was aggravated by the fact that he simply did not seem to understand what Agagianian meant by interrupting him; he kept right on going until Agagianian interrupted him for the third time!

Everybody could appreciate Bishop Gran's position as Bishop in Oslo in Norway. He stressed the fact that religious liberty by no means threatens the missionary zeal of the Church nor does it lead to relativism in dogma or disregard for truth. Those evils threaten more in places where the Church enjoys a preferential position which becomes the occasion of neglecting the teaching of religion. There is no substitute that can be found for a vigorous ministry of the word.

At the beginning of this General Assembly, Felici read a letter to the Holy Father which Cardinal Tisserant, dean, proposes to send to the Holy Father in thanks for the Motu Proprio, Apostolic Sollicitudo, the encyclical Mysterium Fidei and his proposed visit to the UN.

SEPTEMBER 21 : 132nd Gen. Congregation; Agagianian presiding; present 2257. The business of the Congregation began innocuously enough: Felici announced that the following have been invited by the Holy Father to make the trip to New York when he appears before the UN, with him: Cicognani, Tisserant, Agagianian, Gilroy, Spellman, Caggiano, Doi and Rugawbwa. Felici offered an explanation of the obvious; these Cardinals were selected in order to provide a delegation that represents all the geographical areas where the Church now is active. We were also told, that tomorrow copies of Schema 13 would be available in the principal languages. Felici also announced the results of the fourth through the tenth ballots taken yesterday on Divine Revelation. These figures followed exactly the same pattern as the voting yesterday. Felici also promised that the voting outline to be followed in connection to the Lay Apostolate is to be distributed to us tomorrow. The voting on this schema is to follow immediately after all ballots on Divine Revelation have been cast.

In this General Assembly there were four speakers on the schema de Libertate Religiosa. Cardinal Dante was the first to speak. It is evident that the Red Hat or anything that went with it did not improve the quality of his speaking voice. He had the same frog in his throat after the first sentence which always seemed to bother him in the days when, as official master of ceremonies and secretary of the SRC he had to read the long decrees during the formal proceedings of beatification and canonization! In so far as his speech is concerned he followed the regular party (curial) line. He named Slypyi by name to disagree with him because the remarks reminded him of the liberal doctrine of de Lamennais.

Dante was followed by Cardinal Journet of Switzerland who spoke in an effort to clear up the diversities of opinions on specific points which are numerous in spite of the agreement of the great majority on the basic doctrinal statement.

The bishop from east-central Africa with the unpronounceable name (Kozlowiecki) endorsed the statement of Cardinal Urbani. Bishop Munoz Vega objected that the schema confines itself to man's natural right to religious freedom in the juridical-social order to a point where theological considerations are excluded and rights and duties based on the supernatural order are neglected.

At 10:40 no one was surprised when Agagianian asked for closure, which was adopted by the usual large majority. I said, "No one was surprised because there was a strong rumor current yesterday to the effect that debate on religious liberty would be terminated today. Bishop de Smedt gave the summation of the project and assured the Fathers that due consideration would be given after careful study of the various interventions that were made. He promised particularly that certain terms would be more clearly and accurately defined.

When asking for termination of the debate Agagianian mentioned the fact that sixty-two speeches were made in the aula on religious liberty. Including the two cardinals who spoke today, a total of 29 cardinals appeared. This is almost fifty percent of all the speakers! I don't know whether this is something to complain about or not because it is not important whether or not this fact did or did not have any effect on the ultimate result. But I do know that Pope John would not be pleased. He insisted on complete freedom of speech and an opportunity to speak for everybody in the aula. That is why the discussions during the first session dragged on and on so interminably; still John was very reluctant to approve the change in procedure which allowed termination of debate upon vote by a two thirds majority. It was He who insisted on giving a chance to those who were supported by five other Council Fathers (increased last year to seventy) to speak after cloture had been voted. The point I want to make here is that an unusually large number of cardinals spoke on this project; if that continues on the various phases of the debate on Schema 13, I am sure there will be some grumbling.

After action on cloture we settled back to steel ourselves for the days and days of boring debate which quite certainly will be given over to Schema 13. Then Felici began to make an announcement in a tone of voice that boded trouble; or at least always did in the past. Immediately I recalled the headlines in the papers this morning. The Daily American had this headline: "Report Pope Petitioned by Conservatives" and the NY Herald Tribune was positively sensational: "Vatican Council Near Crisis Over Religious Liberty Issue." These papers had expected a vote yesterday already on religious liberty, which actually did not seem to us to be in the cards, so I had dismissed the rumor. But from past experience I knew that headlines such as were carried this morning always had enough foundation in fact to bode trouble. But even at that I hadn't given too much thought to the news story in the Daily American which I saw at breakfast.

But when Felici began his announcement in the tone of voice he always uses when trouble is brewing, a chill ran down my spine. Most of the others must have felt the same because there was dead silence. This became positively weird when Felici went on to say that he had an important announcement which we had better take down in writing. He then proceeded to dictate the following: "Utrum textus reemendatus de Libertate Religiosa placeat Patribus tamquam basis definitivae Declarationis ulterius perficiendae iuxta doctrinam Catholicam de vera religione et emendationes a Patribus in disceptatione propositas et approbandas ad normam Ordinis Concilii." There was a great sigh of relief, because the last time we heard Felici use that solemn tone of voice, he introduced Tisserant who made the now famous announcement that there would be no vote on religious liberty in the 3rd session.

Whatever other skullduggery was in the works (at that time I did not know how much skullduggery there had been the night before and how close we came to being deprived once again of the opportunity to vote) we at least were going to get the chance to vote this time. Unlike the time when we had been given the same assurance last year, they wasted no time in taking the ballot. Last year the promised ballot was two days off, which allowed enough time for the conservatives to maneuver us out of it. We were voting on Revelation at the time. The

Moderators interrupted that series of ballots to provide for an immediate vote on religious liberty. Felici wasted no time in announcing the result, though he sounded quite woe-be-gone while giving us the following figures: Present and voting, 2222, voting placet 1997, non_placet 224, invalid vote 1. Everybody was flabbergasted by the size of the majority. The press related that the conservatives expected a minimum of 500 negative votes; it was a great shock to them that they did not get even half that many.

The papers this morning (I am told that all Italian papers, communist liberal or conservative gave the whole story, not only of the vote but what led up to it) gave front page headlines and the Daily American also ran the longest editorial I have seen on their editorial page since Kennedy's death. The news stories in the Daily American and NY Herald Tribune gave us details which revealed to us how close we came to a repetition of last year's debacle during the last week of the session. It seems that the Central Coordinating Commission, which normally decides what goes onto the floor and what doesn't, had an emergency meeting last night and voted 19 to 9 against allowing a vote on the project. What that would have done to the Council and to the Image of the Church in our generation, I shudder to contemplate.

The seats of the presidency and the moderators are so far away so that few Council Fathers noticed that Tisserant, Agagianian and Felici slipped off during Mass and returned only in time to begin the working session. Who else had gotten to the Holy Father first is not yet known. But the fact is that the Holy Father issued orders that the ballot was to be taken today. (Probably people would be less prone from now on to say that Paul can not make up his mind or take decisive action on anything. In any case another last ditch maneuver of the conservatives was foiled (to use the language of westerns) and as a result of what happened today, we can afford to be a little more optimistic about the future of the council.

I mentioned above that 62 had been given the floor to speak on this project and that 29 of them were cardinals. Calculating percentages throws light on another interest fact: 224 out of 2222 Council Fathers voted negative. That represents only a hair's breadth more than 10% of the Council Fathers in the conservative camp on this issue. But when you check back over the speeches that were made almost 50% of the speeches of this project took a negative attitude, i.e. were among that 10%. It seems to me that it is expecting a little too much of chance to say that this was not deliberately planned. Maybe I am guilty of rash judgment, but it certainly looks to me that the conservatives made sure that enough opposing speeches would be made during the debate. Maybe there were proportionately fewer Council Fathers who favored the schema who asked to speak. But in my opinion that would not explain why a group representing only 10% of the whole got a chance to make almost 50% of the speeches on this hotly contested topic. Frankly I think that conservatives were deliberately pushed up among the earlier speakers because it was obvious that not everybody who asked would get a chance to speak. From the manner in which this schema has been kicked around, it is clear that the curia crowd will do anything to kill it.

Another point that stands out in this voting is the question of the attitude at the Spanish and Italian hierarchies. I haven't taken time to count the total number of bishops in Italy, Spain, and South America (the latter are often lumped with the Italians and Spanish on this question, and some of them did speak against it), but when you stop to think that only 224 voted against religious liberty it is evident that these hierarchies in large part have to be aligned. The total negative votes is only about half of the number of bishops in Italy and in the Curia. (These are always lumped together when talking about the Italian Hierarchy.) Only a fraction of the so-called ultra-conservative bishops of the hierarchies in the Italian and Spanish speaking countries voted against religious liberty. Even if their group had succeeded in rounding up 500

negative votes, it still would have been far less than the total number of bishops in those countries.

The speeches made by the five Cardinals who started off the discussion of Schema 13 came as a considerable let down after the drama of the vote on religious liberty. Spellman did very well in his speech. The whole subject lends itself to oratory more than most of the topics and the different speakers take advantage of that fact. Cardinal Bea was the last to speak. As usual he took quite long, which did not help his popularity among the Council Fathers; this Congregation was going beyond the usual time. That is not very agreeable to the men who have sat there over three hours already. Bea took some pot shots at the Latin that was used in Schema 13. He insisted that classical Latin simply does not lend itself to modern ideas and insistence on using classical terms only makes the Latin unintelligible and unworthy of the Council. This is particularly harmful because it will give rise to endless discussions later on its meaning and the doctrinal authority of the document will suffer by reason of the uncertainty of the text.

I probably should have added to the comments on the religious liberty vote the thought that the conservatives have not yet given up in their efforts to prevent a strong statement on religious liberty. Since it is hardly likely that they can prevent any declaration being promulgated, something which they have been trying to do up to today. They will no doubt use every tactic at their disposal to water down the whole document by inserting ideas which contradict the main thesis of the document. They succeeded in inserting into the quaesitum on which we voted the clause "...iuxta doctrinam Catholicam de vera religione..." which they will no doubt use as a pretext to tack on phrases that will neutralize the basic ideas of the declaration.

SEPTEMBER 22: 133rd General Congregation; Lercaro presiding; present 2260.

Felici started with the announcement that Cardinal Cicognani will observe the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination tomorrow; he will be celebrant at the Council Mass. There were four speakers who had secured 70 signatures on their petition and therefore were allowed to speak on the schema, de Libertate Religiosa. Bishop Ancel who spoke in the name of over 100 Council Fathers had something significant to say; the others were repetitious.

Bishop McVinney was one of the twelve who spoke on Schema 13 in general. Lercaro called him for not keeping to his subject. McVinney replied: "Loquor de schema in genere." That was probably true; he spoke in such generalities that he almost missed the basic subject entirely! It is quite obvious already that Schema 13 is not going to be the important document that was expected! No one seems to be satisfied with it except the over-all objective, which is to establish dialogue with the world. But no one seems to agree with the details selected for discussion nor with the manner in which they are discussed. I am afraid that as they take up the different chapters and paragraphs in particular, this will be more and more the case. I still feel that we should confine ourselves to principles and leave the application of those principles to documents like pastoral letters where the problems are local and to encyclicals where the problems are universal. We can expect that a Council can write a "Mater et Magistra" or a "Pacem in Terris." Those encyclicals were to the point; the first encyclical of Paul VI was ineffective because it tried to cover too much ground. The topics covered in Schema 13 are enough to cover a dozen encyclicals.

Cardinal Koenig made his first speech of the session today. As always, he was very precise and to the point. He is not too happy with the form and content of this Schema. He expressed himself at different times on this subject and feels that they are trying to cover too much ground.

Today's papers gave quite a play to Spellman's remarks about conscription or compulsory military training and also about conscientious objectors. Father Lessard said that all secular papers gave big headlines to Spellman's speech. It seems that none of the European countries permits any exemption for conscientious objectors. There is quite a campaign on at this time to secure such legislation, which is naturally opposed by governments. Hence they gave big play to Spellman's remarks.

We got a great deal of work done today. There were sixteen speeches altogether; four on religious liberty and twelve on Schema 13. Along with that we cast nine ballots to complete the voting on de Divina Revelatione. That is a good day's work. Some of us did not get a copy of the schedule of ballots to begin tomorrow on de Apostolatu Laicorum. I haven't studied this very much as yet, but I understated that it is a very disappointing document. It seems certain that this statement will not get much praise from the "new breed" whether clerical or lay. Before saying anymore I will wait until the matter is reviewed as we cast the different ballots.

SEPTEMBER 23: 134th General Congregation: Lercaro presiding: present 2229
The Mass was celebrated this morning by Cardinal Cicognani to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination. When he marched in during the Introit procession he looked very feeble, but as he celebrated Mass his voice was clear and strong.

Felici announced that the seat assignments would be revised and our new number would be available next Monday morning.

Next Sunday, September 26 the Holy Father will visit at the gypsy camp 30 kilometers south of Rome. He will celebrate Mass. Each episcopal conference is invited to send two delegates to this "spectacular religiosum." Transportation to this event will be provided by the general secretariat; those desiring to use these facilities are requested to be at the Piazza Pio XII at 3:30 PM.

There were nine speeches on the Schema 13 in general. Most of the speakers seemed satisfied with the schema in general, but had numerous suggestions for improvement. A very common objection is to the Latin; it simply does not lend itself to expressing the modern ideals dealt with. That is an example of trying to talk in terms that are intelligible to the people to whom this schema is addressed. Cardinal Rugambwa repeated a point mentioned by other speakers from India and Africa yesterday: we are talking only about problems of western civilization and completely ignore the much larger segment of the world population living in Africa and oriental countries.

The rule of cloture was invoked by standing vote. After this a ballot was taken regarding the acceptability of the schema for debate in detail. Felici merely announced that the vote was favorable; he did not announce the exact count till the next day: 2111 favorable votes and 44 non-placet. There were two speeches on Introduction and I.

All during this General Congregation up to 11:30 we were balloting on the schema de Apostolatu Liacorum. The ballots succeeded each other very rapidly until six ballots were taken. Apparently that was all that had been planned for today since no more voting was done after 11:30 aside from the one ballot on the acceptability of Schema 13 for debate in detail. The pattern of the voting was very much the same as it had been the previous days on Revelation. The highest number of negative votes in the six ballots was 19. There was the

usual number of votes iuxta modum. I suppose if the Council Fathers had a dozen chances to offer amendments there would always be the same numbers!

The monotony of the meeting was relieved a bit when Cardinal Cardijn spoke. He is very emotional in his style of speaking. One can understand how he would arouse enthusiastic support from young people. If used with less noble motives, he would be a rabble rouser. His great weakness seems to be that he doesn't know when he should quit. But this time he was dealing with a more firm taskmaster in Cardinal Doepfner, who took over the chairmanship when we started debate of the Introduction and Chapter I in detail. He interrupted Cardinal when his time was up. Cardinal was in a very emotional passage at the time (His voice rose to a scream); but Doepfner replied in an equally loud tone and succeeded in getting Cardinal to stop.

At seven this evening Archbishop Byrne went to the Marist house down the street a ways (same street the hospital is on, but the name changes as the Viale Murale Gianicolensi turns to the left to follow the wall). It was a good sized party which had been arranged to bring all the Marist bishops and friends of the order together; this year to honor Cardinal Cushing. But Cushing asked to be excused the last minute. Father Buckley frankly told us that when Cushing could not come he called Cardinal Duval of Algiers! It was a very interesting evening, meeting a dozen or more Marist missionary bishops from different parts of the world. But we were disturbed by the reports concerning Cushing. He left for Boston this morning. (a week earlier than originally planned) because he was not well. He complained of being in great pain.

Gossip was inevitable in a gathering such as the Marists had. The only tidbit that is of interest here is the statement made by the Marist Father who is the general secretary of their congregation to the effect that a Benedictine is to be selected soon as the official master of ceremonies to the Holy Father. According to the report the idea is to have a Benedictine in that office permanently just as the Augustinians now are traditionally the Sacristan of St. Peter's.

SEPTEMBER 24; 135th General Congregation: Doepfner presiding; present 2182

Three deaths among the Council Fathers were announced today - One was Bishop Tief, who died a few days ago. The second was Bishop Ferche, an auxiliary of Cologne. The third was Bishop Elect Caselle, auxiliary of Melfi & Rapallo in Italy, who had been nominated but not yet consecrated. No details were given. The pattern of the debate continued much the same as the discussion of schema as a whole had been. The big difficulty seems to be in the terminology terms which are not intelligible are used, terms are used in different senses in different places, etc. etc.

The only note of humor to bring about a break in the monotony of the proceedings was provided by Bishop Himmer of Tournai. He had given a rather impassioned speech and then came to an end with the familiar "dixi: gratias" he said: " dixi; Deo gratias." The reaction of the Council Fathers was instantaneous as they broke into a roar of laughter which was as hearty in Bishop Himmer's case as anybody else.

We were very busy voting today, casting eight ballots during the course of the Congregation. This leaves eight more ballots to be cast on Monday to complete the voting on the Lay Apostolate. Today the highest number of negative votes on any ballot was 14.

Cardinal Frings was the first speaker today. He was not prepared to give his speech without manuscript as is his usual custom. Everyone was surprised when he announced that the General Secretary no less had graciously consented to read his manuscript for him. Felici did an excellent job reading the manuscript, taking special pains to read it slowly and distinctly.

SEPTEMBER 25 & 26: This is a real lazy weekend. The weather was fine on Saturday but on Sunday we woke up to intermittent showers and wind. I am fortunate in not having any dates away from Salvator Mundi today. It is not inviting outside.

Bishop Waters told one of the few good stories that I have heard this year. Bishop Waters came to Naples by boat from New York. On the same boat with him there were two priests from the St. Augustine Diocese who had been sent ahead by Archbishop Hurley with a rather forbidding amount of luggage. The Archbishop could not leave that early because of the celebration of the centennial of the Diocese. Upon arrival in Naples, the two priests were having considerable difficulty with the luggage owing to the fact that they were entirely inexperienced in travel of that kind and because they knew absolutely no Italian. Bishop Waters was traveling comparatively light and therefore had no difficulty getting through customs in a hurry. He decided to give these priests some help; their problem was all the greater because some of the cases they brought along had to be carried in the hold with the freight. They managed to get everything together and their porter, whose services they got with some difficulty, tried to move in at the head of the line awaiting attention by the customs officials. * Another porter who was handling the luggage of some lay people objected with the statement: "Since the Council the Church has become democratic; get in line like the rest of us!" In the end it took three hours before they got off the dock. * on the grounds that he was taking care of a bishop's luggage.

Bishop Waters said that while they were waiting they were entertained by cigarette smugglers operating from boat to dock. A policeman was patrolling the dock. Whenever he moved to the end of the deck where he was not in view of the other end, some smugglers on deck threw small packages containing about six packs of cigarettes each to accomplices on the dock who caught them and slipped them into hand bags. This went on quite some time in regular rhythm: they were busy about other things while the policeman was in view, then busy throwing cigarette as soon as he was not in view. The big question is: Was the policeman himself also an accomplice?

SEPTEMBER 27: 136th General Congregation; Doepfner presiding; present 2147. A message was read from the Holy Father acknowledging the birthday greetings sent to him last Friday. Felici announced that on Wednesday we would begin voting on the modi of the schema on the Pastoral Office of Bishops. He asked us to bring the revised schema to the meeting tomorrow because he will give some procedural explanations. I hope they don't have some more skullduggery up their sleeves! Felici also indicated the following in which various schemata will be voted on in so far as the modi are concerned: Religious, Christian Education, Priestly Training, Non-Christians and Jews.

Today the final eight ballots on the Lay Apostolate were cast. These ballots were taken in rapid order so that we were through before 11:30 which made it possible for Felici to give a complete report on the votes at the end of the meetings.

As announced last week, we all got new ID numbers today, which coincided with our seat numbers. I was "demoted" from D352 to D371. Last year my permanent seat number had been S372. That isn't much progress up the ladder of seniority. I have an idea that this is

accounted for by the fact that a considerable number of the older bishops and Archbishops who did not attend the second and third session came for the final session. Surely, there were more than one death in that group during the period since the third session. I am fortunate that Bishop Blomjous is still my neighbor; though it probably doesn't mean too much since he has attended only the first General Congregation this session. Bishop Holmes-Siedel told me that Bishop Blomjous went to the States after the Council opened. He had been in the States twice previously since the end of the third session for speaking engagements.

There were thirteen speakers this morning. Maximos IV was the first. He spoke in French and as usual he pulled no punches. He blames the presence of atheism in the form of militant communism on the fact that Christianity had not created the proper image which it should have if it had been completely faithful in carrying out its mission to preach the gospel. Cardinal Koenig pleaded for a better understanding of atheism so as to meet its challenge effectively. Archbishop D'Souza of Bhopal spoke in usual suave yet pungent sometimes cynical style. He certainly pulled no punches. He wandered afield a bit and was called by Doepfner. This is not an unusual experience for him; he is inclined to be something of a free-wheeler in his speeches and often goes overtime.

It was interesting to see (or hear) the two Generals: Arrupe of the Jesuits and Fernandez of the Dominicans. Arrupe made his "maiden" speech. He is quite unlike his predecessor. His speech

was brisk and crisp; without trimmings but efficient and to the point. He analyzed the present situation of the Church and then called for a typically Jesuit "military" organization to meet the challenge. He outlined a four-point organization in preparing to do this job. His speech caught the fancy of the correspondents who, at the press conference this afternoon, quizzed the panel about Arrupe's plan. Fernandez certainly was different in his delivery. He always makes me feel that he is "talking down" to the Council Fathers. Somebody behind me snored!

Joe Powers of Fargo called to see me at three this afternoon. He is spending a week here in town.

This evening we had the first of the regular weekly meetings of the US Hierarchy. We are still carrying on with the same set of officers which started during the first session. Well, at least we had a chance to elect them ourselves. There was an exceptionally good attendance, including Spellman and Ritter.

Archbishop Deardon reported on behalf of the Liturgical Commission. He indicated that all of the points regarding further concessions for the use of the vernacular received a favorable vote by a wide margin and the application for approval was submitted to the Commission for the Implementation of the Liturgy Constitution at the beginning of the fourth session. It is expected that the reply will be favorable and should be received soon. Deardon announced that Benzigers and the Catholic Publishing Co. will print supplements to the existing missals. Hence these missals which were gotten out a year ago will not be obsolete. Both publishers said that if conditions justify it, they will print new missals incorporating all the new parts that are to be in the vernacular. He also indicated that good progress has been made with the music for the vernacular texts. These will be printed in a Kryiale soon. The supplement is to be ready in four months from date of receipt of text.

Archbishop Hallinan made quite a speech about the manner in which the modi suggested by different bishops had been ignored by the commission when processing the last interventions made last year in the schema on Christian Education. Archbishop Cody took the floor

immediately and indicated that he is a member of the pertinent commission and that the text for the revised schema is in galley form and will be printed within a day or two. He said that in the present form this schema has been brought up to date in reflecting the wishes of the Council Fathers! Maybe I am too suspicious but this whole performance seemed a bit fishy to me! If Archbishop Cody's report was correct there simply wasn't any reason for Archbishop Hallinan's original statement. He spoke of six bishops who checked over the Education schema on which his remarks were based. Who were the six? Whom did they represent?

Bishop McGrath, who has played an important role in developing the Schema on the Church in the World Today spoke about forty minutes in giving us a run down on the second section of this Schema 13. As usual, he did a masterful job.

Rumors are flying these days about the schedule that the Council will follow. According to reports the discussion of the second section of Schema 13, which is supposed to begin tomorrow as rumor has it, will be quite drastically limited. It is even stated that the entire schema will be finished by Friday and all debate is to be completed by mid-October. But if they finish Schema 13 by Friday, it certainly will not get as much attention as it needs. And if it is finished by Friday, why will they need another two weeks to debate the odds and ends that remain? One thing is beginning to seem quite clear in my mind: there seems to be less and less doubt from day to day about our getting through with entire Council by the early part of December if not sooner.

SEPTEMBER 28: 137th General Congregation: Doepfner presiding; present 2161. The press gave considerable attention to the speech given yesterday by Father Arrupe, carrying over from the press conference yesterday afternoon. The whole tone of his speech indicated that he wanted the Church to start a real crusade against the atheist conspiracy which, he said, is dominating our generation. He spoke of a conspiracy among the financial powers, press, radio and television, etc. In the press conference already the correspondents closely questioned the panel on this point and wanted to know just where the Council as a whole stood on the crusade called for by Arrupe. (There are those who consider Arrupe's remarks as reflecting the mind of the Holy Father, if they were not directly inspired by Paul.) It is no secret that the Holy Father is an admirer of Arrupe. Practically every member of the press panel went out of his way to say that Arrupe's remarks were unfortunate and certainly did not represent any official attitude on the part of any large sector of the Council Fathers. Msgr. Higgins, Msgr. Hurley and Father McCool were quoted directly in the stories carried in the Daily American and the NY Herald Tribune. McCool, who teaches at the Biblical Institute, stated bluntly that he was sure that the Jesuits as a group would never go along with their new general in this matter.

Bishop Blomjous returned to the General Congregation this morning for the first time since September 15. He has spent the intervening period in New York in the interests of some kind of a foundation he would like to establish to promote the welfare of Africa. He did not go into any detail, but apparently he has in mind some long range program of promoting growth not only of the Church but of the whole civilization in Africa. Many people from the mission fields in Africa are much concerned by the direct drive being made by the Chinese Communists to infiltrate the entire continents. I am told that information bureaus directed to all sectors of the population ---

I asked Bishop Blomjous what reactions he had observed on the part of the people in the States concerning the visit of the Holy Father to the UN. All he said was: "Well, his speech better be damn good" We pursued the subject a bit farther. He speculated about which

language the Holy Father would use. He can be quite free to use whatever language he pleases since the UN has the services of some of the best translators in the world and, like all statesmen who speak there, he may use his mother tongue. Bishop Blomjous expressed the hope that Paul would speak in Italian, in which he is so much more fluent than the other languages he speaks. He did say that a weak speech or one in which he says the wrong thing would be an absolute disaster in so far as his own position of leadership in the world and the image of the Church is concerned. This is an occasion in which a strong statement is expected and is badly needed. The statesmen of the world have a right to expect no less; if Paul is not ready to give such a statement it would be much better if he stayed at home.

The first item on the agenda aside from the announcement of the death of another Archbishop was the distribution of the latest revised schema "de Pastoralis Episcoporum Nunere in Ecclesia."

This 126 page book gives the earlier text, the revised text, a report on all the modi submitted and the propositions on which we are to vote during the days ahead which cover the action on the modi. This will be the final step in the voting before the formal action on the completed project later.

Bishop Blomjous and I took a quick glance at those points where some emendations in the text were made. We detected at least one instance which illustrates how alert the Council Fathers must be if they are to get a final text which reflects their thinking and that has not been subjected to some omissions or insertions which distort the document. I refer to Chapter II #17, line 26 to 31 on page 42 of the copy we just received. In the original version of the text it was urged that the people be encouraged and strongly urged to participate in the various programs of the Catholic Apostolate. The revised text reads "... et praesertim Actionem Catholicam participant aut iuvent." This revised text departs from the original text by the insertion of the word "praesertim" and the capitalization of Actionem Catholicam.

Reference to pages 70 and 71 indicates in the report on the modi that one request was received to omit all reference to Catholic action because this term is a subject of dispute at this time. They then went on to give the reply: "Non admittitur, quia Actio Catholica valde commendata est a Summis Pontificibus."

Then in the next modus reported on there was a request that the word catholic action occurring in this paragraph be spelled with capital letters. This also was proposed by two Council Fathers.

The reply was: "Admittitur modus." But they not only used the caps as requested but also inserted the word "praesertim" which had not been requested by anybody.

I am sure that a strong effort will be made by Cardinal Heenan and other English speaking Fathers to defeat this proposition when it will be submitted to a vote in connection with #17 of Chapter II. The proposition is listed on page 97. The whole question of Catholic Action as it refers specifically to the form it has taken in Italy has been fought by Cardinal Heenan. Many agree with him that the lay apostolate should in no way be associated with specific forms of the apostolate such as Catholic Action. It is objected to here particularly because in practice it is merely a strong political arm of the Church. I have an idea, however, that it will not be easy to defeat this proposition.

Abbot Baldwin and I walked around by the coffee bar today looking for Father Placid Jordan, OSB. We failed to find Father Placid but we did run into Abbot Butler from England. Our conversation with Abbot Butler had hardly started when Cardinal Heenan joined us. This was

the first time I spoke to Cardinal Heenan since back in 1954 when I was with Archbishop Muench at the centennial celebration in Fulda. That was the occasion which I have frequently talked about. At a big reception in connection with the centennial celebration, Archbishop Muench was on the program, and I was on my own to find a seat. I saw an end seat vacant while the second and third seats in the row were occupied by two bishops. I sat down and apologized for breaking in on them. The first bishop replied in perfect German, guttural and all. In my poor German I tried to explain to the two that I was the auxiliary of the Nuncio back in Fargo. The first man said in his broad German: Was? So I slowly repeated the lingo again; when he replied: "Well, why don't you talk English so that I can understand you?" It was Bishop Grant from Scotland and Bishop Heenan, then from Leeds. (He was transferred to another see shortly after that.) Bishop Grant had the perfect Scottish Burr. I spent most of the time for the remainder of the two days we were in Fulda with Bishops Grant and Heenan. I met Bishop Grant later again when I was in Cologne for the Katholickentag in 1956.

Today there were 15 speakers, a few more than during the past week because there was no balloting going on. There was nothing particularly exciting about the speeches. It came as a great surprise, however, when Doepfner announced at the conclusion of Bishop Romero's speech that everyone who had asked to speak on the first section of the schema had spoken and that therefore we will proceed to the second section tomorrow.

This evening Bishop Hoch and I were guests of Dr. and Mrs. Quanbeck at dinner. It was a thoroughly delightful evening. Mrs. Quanbeck is a most gracious person and her husband is a good story teller. He had a new "Ottaviani" story. It seems that Ottaviani had gone to a movie with a lady friend. Some of his co-workers chided him in the matter; but he replied: "Why should you complain about this action of mine; I am only a Cardinal Deacon!"

In the course of conversation, Dr. Quanbeck brought up the question of the encyclical, "Mysterium Fidei." This apparently bothers him more than I had anticipated. His objections are confined almost exclusively to these two points: a) the Holy Father's insistence on retaining the scholastic terminology; the prejudice against scholasticism is deeply ingrained in the minds of protestant theologians. b) the Holy Father's defense of the private Masses. Quanbeck considered that in a large measure a negation of the liturgy Constitution. He also had some gossip about the origin of the text of the encyclical. It is supposed to have been written by someone in the Holy Office; and the draft originally submitted to Paul is supposed to have been much stronger in reactionary tendencies. The Holy Father toned it down considerably. The story also goes that Alfrink and Schillebeeckx called to see the Holy Father to inquire about the authenticity of the press reports, especially in Italy to the effect that the aberrations of the Dutch theologians brought about the publication of the encyclical. Some rumors even go so far as to say that the encyclical was inspired by the Dutch pastoral letters! I am still trying to get a French copy of the Dutch pastoral to compare it with the encyclical. No English copies are available.

SEPTEMBER 29: 138th General Congregation Suenens presiding; present 2191.

It seems that Felici did not do his "home work" adequately. It took a long time before he began making his preliminary announcements. A letter from Cardinal Cicognani acknowledged, on behalf of the Holy Father, the message of thanks the Council had sent for the Apostolica Sollicitudo, and Mysterium Fidei.

After completion of discussion of Schema 13, we will take up the general discussion of the schema on the Missionary Activities of the Church.

The first matter of regular business was the voting on the modi of the Introduction and I Chapter of the Pastoral Office of Bishops. Bishop Hengsbach of Essen was the relator for the modi of the whole schema as presented by the commission. While he is not as emotionally eloquent as de Smedt, in his own way he is just as effective. His pronunciation of the Latin is excellent; he is very easily understood. He got a great hand.

Seven ballots were taken, six on propositions giving effect to the modi which the commission recognized and one on the chapter as a whole. The different ballots kept us going quite steady until about 11:40. Felici has worked out a pretty good technique. After the relatio, which was fairly long, one ballot was cast after each speaker in the debate on the second part of Schema 13. In this way we got through balloting early enough so that we got the results of all ballots before we adjourned at 12:30 PM. There wasn't anything particularly exciting or controversial in the voting. The negative votes ranged from 8 to 54 in the various ballots. Apparently there had been no noticeable effort to water down the text in any way. In fact, few phrases were added to strengthen some paragraphs.

There were ten speakers who spoke on the second part of Schema 13. Most of the remarks, as might be expected were devoted to the first chapter, that on Marriage and the Family. Owing to the fact that the Holy Father had withdrawn the subject of the "pill" and birth control through contraceptives from the competence of the Council, it is impossible to give a balanced and adequate statement on the entire subject. This left the whole presentation on the part of various speakers somewhat weak, just as the schema itself is rather weak. An attempt was made to discuss family planning, including the principle that it is up to the husband and wife to determine the number of children. But that is left hanging in the air because the Council Fathers were not free to discuss just how this is to be accomplished, aside from some general statements on a Christian attitude towards the family. It is just like a discussion on the control of a disease at a medical convention without any discussion of the medications or treatments that are involved! No worthwhile statement could be made with the subject, as it were, taken out of context, to say nothing about a strong or adequate statement. This point, of course, was not missed by the press and people in and out of the Church who are interested and who isn't interested. The six o'clock now over AFN already in its roundup today quoted different people who used a variety of adjectives to describe the debate today: inadequate, badly written, evasive, etc. etc. Those adjectives were used to describe both the schema itself and the speeches.

Ruffini led off the debate this morning. He was true to form: he condemned everything that was different from the ancient manuals. He deplored the fact that nothing was said about the different forms of birth control; these should have been specifically condemned. (He must have forgotten but this subject was withdrawn by Paul.) The same applies to his remarks about failure to mention periodic continence; at least he knew something that does not go back to the last century, even though he did not use the term "rhythm"!

Leger followed Ruffini. He gave the best statement of the day. His speech will be well worth reading in its entirety. He criticized the definition of marriage because it seems to be concerned only with the human species but overlooks the human individuals who make the marriage contract. He went on to suggest an excellent revision of the definition of marriage based on the idea that it "is an intimate community of life and love." If that idea were worked out adequately according to the points he mentioned I am sure it would be a significant step forward in this field. Cardinal approached the subject from a more scientific viewpoint. He pleaded for more research work in the entire field of marriage with all the medical, physical, psychological and social factors involved. Such research should be encouraged by the

Church. He must have been thinking of the fiasco at Catholic University in Washington when the Apostolic Delegates prevented the University from going into a research program of this kind which would have been financed by a large foundation. Thank God, it didn't get away from us entirely. I believe that Fordham and Notre Dame have since gone into such programs. Suenens also had a pertinent question: he asked that since we have renewal of baptismal vows, religious vows and the promises of holy orders.

Archbishop Colombo based his talk mostly on the idea of the integrity of the conjugal act, which has always been held as essential and that voluntarily vitiated conjugal acts are contrary to the law of God. This idea must be retained to preserve continuity on the teachings of the Church. Otherwise many will think that the doors are being thrown open by the Council to the opinion that there is to be a substantial change in the Council's moral judgment in the field of birth control.

Bishop Zoghby, Patriarchal Vicar for the Melkites in Egypt called attention of the very grave problem involved in the situation of an innocent party whose consort leaves him or her at a young age to remarry illegally. The innocent faces the choice of heroism or perdition. But Christ did not make salvation dependent on heroism. He said "If you wish to be perfect..." The Orientals have always been aware of the Church's power to solve this problem according to Mark 5:32 "excepta fornicationis causa.." This passage has been understood in the restrictive sense in the Latin Church; not so in the East. He made a strong case for more thorough exegetical studies of this point.

Today Abbot Baldwin, Father Ulric, Father John and Father Placid (Jordan) were here for dinner. It was a most interesting gathering with the conversation vying with the food for attention. Father Placid as usual came up with some interesting tidbits by way of council stories. He had another version of the ORATIO CONTRA RUBRICISTAS: (sub unica conclusiones) Deus, qui per rubricistarum ordinam viam coeli impedisti, da nobis, quaesumus, ipsis in mare rubrum detrusis, ut per aliam viam vitam aeternam consequamur...." Father Placid also said that Lercaro told him this morning that we may expect conclusion to all debates by October 15. To this rumor he has added the plan that the Holy Father will call a meeting of all chairmen of Episcopal Conferences to arrange with them the beginnings of putting the Synodus Episcoporum on its feet. This is to be done during the interim period between the debates and the completion of the work of the commissions.

Archbishop Nicodemo of Bari went overtime and was called by Suenens: Velis Excellentissime Peter concludere". Nicodemo merely answered "Subito.." and in the usual meaning of the term, the subito meant a few minutes!

SEPTEMBER 30: 139th General Congregation: Suenens presiding: present 2177. Bishop Blomjous returned to the Council chamber again this morning and had further additions to the rumor concerning the conclusion of debate (he said between October 15 and 20). The reason why the Holy Father will summon the chairman of the various Episcopal Conferences is not merely to exchange pleasantries, but to put pressure on them to activate their conferences even before they leave Rome. Blomjous' story was that Paul had granted an audience to Suenens in which he outlined his ideas concerning the eventual activation of the complete setup for the SYNODUS EPISCOPORUM. He wants the episcopal conferences to get busy to demonstrate how efficiently and prudently they can operate on the national level. The better they do their job the less cluttered will the program of the Synod of Bishops have to be and eventually, the less administrative and legislative power will be in the hands of the curia. This is the foundation of the statement made by Father Placid that the meaningfulness of the Synod

of Bishops will depend on the effectiveness of the conferences on the national level. It is there that we can demonstrate the ability of the bishops to bring about the process of updating the Church. If it works on that level, it will then be possible to make the work of the Synod more effective as a means of renewing the Church universal.

The Holy Father is supposed to consider a number of items as an acid test of the effectiveness of the national conferences. Among them are the drafting of a realistic set of statutes to control their own activity; a process of educating the clergy in each country in the implications of the program outlined by the Council in its proceedings, especially in the liturgy, ecumenism, religious education, lay apostolate, etc. etc. The aggiornamento of John XXIII will not reach down to the grass roots level unless it is promoted by ordinaries, and especially by the pastors and assistants on the parish level.

According to the rumor, this is supposed to be the plan of Paul VI. It is to come as an answer to those who think and say that Paul is incapable of decisive and prompt action. If this really is his thinking it is an indication that he is much more realistic than his critics who understand neither the program aggiornamento, the needs of the Church in this period of transition nor the nature of the problems which the organizational structure of the Church create. Paul knows the Curia better than anyone else; he understands just how tenaciously the present generation of the curia will cling to its position and its powers. He knows that the curial reform can be achieved from within indeed; but not in the manner in which that phrase which he used has been interpreted. The reform from within will not come from a program initiated by the Curia itself but as a natural consequence of having the episcopal conferences do more things effectively on the national and diocesan level and thus automatically and without a struggle decentralizing the bureaucracy which now exists here in Rome.

Felici announced that we will be voting on the modi of the schema on Religious next Wednesday. Five ballots were cast today on Chapter II of the Pastoral Office of Bishops. The effort to defeat the exodus concerning Catholic Action did not produce much by way of results. A total of 726 negative votes would have been needed to defeat the modus; we got only 185. This demonstrates the entrenched position a text achieves by the time it reaches the stage where we vote on the modi. Aside from that ballot this morning, no ballot had more than 32 negative votes.

In spite of the fact that we had five ballots this morning, which are quite time consuming, there still were 13 Council Fathers who spoke on the Schema 13.

Cardinal Journet devoted his entire speech to a reply to the Patriarchal Vicar for the Melchites in Egypt who had referred to the practice of the Oriental Church in permitting remarriage after a divorce obtained because of desertion, total insanity, attempted remarriages by the guilty partner. He referred Matthew 5:32 "except for fornication". Journet emphatically rejected this as contrary to the doctrine of Christ and St. Paul on the indissolubility of marriage.

Heenan came back to the question of the translation of the schema: the Latin means nothing in this instance because the document is addressed to all men; the vernacular is the essential medium of communication in this case. He also objected to the title "Constitution". For a statement of this nature; it is merely a message from the Council to the world. He repeated what most speakers said yesterday; this is not an adequate presentation of the morality of the contraceptive marriage act. It is a fine exhortation but provides absolutely no guidance.

De Roo did a good job in presenting conjugal love in the context of the whole family life; outside of that context it will not be fully developed and will not achieve the true vocation of the married state. He did an excellent job in getting his ideas across.

On the whole, the debate followed very much the line of previous days. Cardinal Browne had the usual flow of Scholastic terminology which served mostly as a medium of confusion and misunderstanding of the whole question.

OCTOBER 1: 140th General Congregation. Suenens presiding; Felici began by dismissing those not entitled to remain in the aula by saying: "Egrediantur omnes!" I am wondering whether he is going to start the game again which amused us no end for a considerable period last year: namely, to have different formula each day for telling people to get out.

The first in the order of business was a detailed run-down of the Council calendar for October. It is not necessary to repeat the details here since they are given in full in the COUNCIL DIGEST for today. In General it is hoped that discussion of schemata will be finished by October 15 (a special General Congregation will be held on October 16 if necessary to achieve that end). There will be a solemn beatification on October 17. A suspension of the General Assemblies from October 18 through 23 to allow the commissions to catch up. Felici explained that this time will not be a "vacation" in the sense that we will have nothing to do. Not only the commissions will be busy; the various episcopal conferences are to work on the suggestions to be prepared for submission to the Holy Father. The chairmen of these commissions will be notified of the subject and how the conferences can best communicate with the Pope in these matters. The fifth public session of the Council is planned for late in October. And Felici in a general way mentioned December 8 as the target date for adjournment.

According to the detailed schedule we certainly will be doing a lot of balloting on days when general assemblies are held. Next Monday and Tuesday will see regular general congregations, but on Tuesday speeches will be suspended around noon so that we can hear the Holy Father who is to come to the aula directly from Fumacino.

Today we completed the balloting on the modi of the Pastoral Office of Bishops. Next Monday before beginning the schedule of ballots booked for that day, there will be a final ballot on this entire schema.

There were five speeches on Chapter I of Part Two of the Church in the World of Today. At 11:00 A.M. cloture was invoked on discussion of the First chapter and we then proceeded to the second chapter. Cardinal Gracias suggested that this schema be reviewed by competent laymen for suggestions and revisions before its text is made public.

Cardinal Slipyi appealed for making the schema applicable to conditions in Oriental civilization as well as Western civilization. The two mentalities are different and what is understood in the West would be a puzzle to so many people in the East. Practically every speaker from the Eastern Church made this same comment.

The criticism of Chapter II runs in the same vein as comments on the previous chapter: the document is not thorough enough and the language is not satisfactory because of difficulty in making the Latin intelligible to modern man. Even Latin experts in so far as classics are concerned, have difficulty in following the meaning.

One of the things I have noticed in this fourth session is the fact that the last two speakers in a given General Assembly get a better break than in previous sessions. At first I thought this was due to the fact that Lercaro did not indicate in advance who would be the last speaker. But the other Moderators consistently make this announcement before the second last speaker takes the floor. Now there is less moving around and less talking in the aula while the last two speakers have the floor. At least those who want to listen have no difficulty understanding.

Heard a story today which takes us way back to the days when Paul VI as Msgr. Montini was Substitute Secretary of State. Someone remarked that Msgr. Bendas is being carried around on a plush pillow by Cardinal Pizzardo during the sessions of the Council. The Cardinal has his car and chauffeur at the Msgr's disposal at all times, etc. A curia member pointed out that there is too much of this in the Curia; they use people like Bendas as long as they are useful (by useful is meant providing funds for one purpose or other.) This spokesman went on to say when Paul was in the Secretariat of State he was a minor secretary in the same secretariat. On one occasion a prominent American bishop had an interview of an hour and a half with Montini. On his way out the bishop stopped to talk to this secretary; among other things he said: "I was with Montini for an hour and a half, but never once during all that time did he mention the word 'dollar'. And that is unusual in any experience here in Rome!"

On October 2, I was called from the supper table to take a call from Fargo. A thousand ideas passed through my head while walking from the dining room to the office, regarding the possible reason for this call. It was Allan saying: that my sister Anna passed away very suddenly a few hours earlier. That possibility had not entered my head; Ann's death was entirely unexpected. Abbot Baldwin and I flew to Minneapolis on Sunday, arriving there at 5:25 PM. The funeral was on Wednesday and we returned to Rome by noon, October 10.

OCTOBER 11: 146th. General Congregation. Agagianian presiding; 2128 present. It was extremely difficult to get back into the atmosphere of the Council. It seemed like coming to a strange world. One reason may have been the fact that I was too sleepy to stay awake. This was brought on by a combination of the loss of sleep on the plane trip and also the early hour at which I got up this morning. Today is the patronal feast of the Salvatorian Sisters and we had a concelebrated Mass at 6:00 AM! Bishop Cody of the Salvatorians was the principal celebrant. Bishop Hoch and I were concelebrants along with Father Cormack, Father Dexinger, Father Lessard and a Salvatorian Father. Whatever the reason, I had a hard time keeping awake during the speeches. I probably would have dozed most of the time if it had not been for the fact that we cast ten ballots this morning, the final one on Religious and the first nine on Seminary Education.

The Holy Father sent a letter to Cardinal Tisserant, which was read in the aula by Felici. Paul had been informed that a few of the Council Fathers wished to discuss the question of celibacy of the clergy during the discussion of the final schema that comes up this week on the Life and Mission of the Priest. Without infringing on the freedom of discussion to which the council fathers are entitled, he wished to let it be known that in his opinion it would be unwise to have a public discussion of a subject that important and delicate. He proposed further that we should rather strengthen celibacy in the Latin Church rather than weaken it by showing how necessary it is today for a total dedication to the apostolate. If one or the other Father thinks it necessary to express his opinion he may do so in writing and send the letter to the presidency. The reaction at the time was one of enthusiastic applause both during and after the reading of the letter. Since the council meeting, I have heard very few references to this letter, either pro or con. I have no way of knowing or estimating how many speeches would have been made if the Holy Father had not ruled out the subject or how many of the council fathers might be

interested in having the matter debated or how many might want to abolish or mitigate the law of celibacy. Naturally, the public press headlined the action of the Holy Father, but the text of the news stories was very restrained.

There were twelve speeches today on the subject of the missions. It is easy to see that the general sentiment of the council Fathers has changed considerably when compared to the reaction to the famous incident last year when Agagianian got the Holy Father to endorse the proposed "declarations" relative to the missions. Whereas these declarations were voted down very decisively by the Council Fathers even though the Holy Father had endorsed them; now the sentiment seems to be largely in favor of the schema now under debate.

There was one interesting incident in connection with this schema. Father Schutte, Superior General of the S.V.D's was the relator for this schema before debate started the other day. It referred to the fact that in drafting the schema the Commission unanimously approved of a provision which would place the administration of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith into the hands of a group selected from all over the world and subject directly to the Holy Father. Then in the end of his relatio he indicated that the schema in no way would prejudice the position of the present members of Propaganda, the voting members which consists solely of cardinals resident in Rome.

At the CCCC this afternoon Father Schutte spoke on this schema to an audience consisting mostly of people connected with the press, public and Catholic. A priest questioned Father Schutte concerning the contradiction involved in the position taken in the proposed schema and the final modus which was proposed and will have to be voted on. The adoption of the modus would simply cancel out the section which is the heart of the schema. He frankly admitted that this was done on order from higher authority.

Father Lessard just came in as I was typing this. He said that the word is around that the American bishops are falling down on the job in that we are doing nothing to prevent the sabotaging of this mission schema. There is a rather bitter feeling developing among some of the American bishops over the fact that nothing is being done by our group as a body. Neither Spellman nor O'Boyle is in Rome. We don't know anything regarding the matter that went from the Holy Father to the Presidents of the various national Episcopal Conferences; we don't know whether any meetings are to be held or what is to be discussed if such meetings should be called. Nobody seems to know what is going on.

Just as I was typing this, the Council Digest for October 12 came in. It contains a notice that Cardinal McIntyre (I don't know when he came to Rome; He was not here when I left on October 3) has called a meeting of the US Episcopal Conference for 4:00 PM on Thursday, October 14. The purpose of the meeting is to organize a method of studying and submitting observations on the Propositions referred to all Episcopal Conferences by the Holy Father. I am sure this announcement comes as a relief to the US Bishops; at least it does to me.

Father Lessard also brought the news that a South American bishop who had planned a strong intervention in the matter of clerical celibacy, turned over the written copy to the Presidency; but also released a part, if not all of the intervention, to the press. That could mean screaming headlines tomorrow.

OCTOBER 12: 147th General Congregation. Agagianian presiding; present 2126.
The big news for today is the announcement of the meeting of the US Bishops mentioned above. I sincerely hope that this will be the beginning of some concerted action on our part.

Other hierarchies are desperately anxious to collaborate with us or, I should say, would like to have us collaborate with them. Next to the Italians we have the largest number of bishops attending this Council. With a little leadership and concerted action on our part we could wield a dominant power in this Council, which could insure proper action which would enable the Holy Father to carry through the program of reform he has in mind. Today is the third anniversary of the first general congregation of the Council held in 1962.

The Holy Father's letter of yesterday to Tisserant was acknowledged today. It referred to the applause as evidence of the council fathers' approval of the Holy Father's wish regarding the discussion of celibacy.

A public session is to be held on October 28 to commemorate the election of Pope John and to pray for peace. There was no reference made at this time of any promulgation of any acts of the Council that are ready by that time. In an earlier announcement by Felici we gathered that promulgations would take place during various public sessions.

Seventeen speakers were given the floor today. Of these Abp D'Souza of Bhopal said that he would not deliver his speech since others had already said what he had in his manuscript. He was applauded as though he had delivered the best speech of the day.

Bishop Soares de Resende of Mozambique made many practical suggestions to amend and perfect the schema. Towards the end he made proposals that were not too complementary to the Propagation de Fide and Agagianian cut him off for going overtime!

At 12:10 cloture was invoked by a near-unanimous standing vote. At the same time a ballot was cast accepting the schema as a basis for emendation and perfection.

Bishop Lamont had already filed his application to make a speech, supported by more than 70 signatures. He was given the floor before the conclusion of the meeting. His speech was most interesting. He was one of the speakers who last year rose to condemn the propositions on the missions that had just been recommended by the Holy Father. Now he spoke with enthusiasm of the new schema which was substituted for the old propositions. His praise at this time was as extravagant as his condemnation had been a year ago!

Along with the unusually large number of speeches today we also cast six ballots. This leaves one ballot for tomorrow covering the entire schema on seminary education as a unit. Tomorrow we also begin voting on the new "quaesita" on Christian Education. There is general dissatisfaction with this schema as there had been with the communications schema. For one thing additional "quaesita" had been requested in order to be in a position to pin-point some of the objectionable features. I am not too familiar with this schema since I was away when the copy was distributed.

I went with Bishop Hoch this afternoon to attend the panel discussion by a group of American periti on the schema covering the Life and Mission of the Priest. It was a most enlightening discussion. Father Barnabas Ahern evaluated the part of priestly spirituality. He did a marvelous job, and I hope that his suggestions will be accepted.

OCTOBER 13: 148th General Congregation; Lercaro presiding: present 2210
Felici started the announcements off on a sour note; Owing to the large number of speakers it will be necessary to have a general congregation on Saturday, October 16 and probably another one on Monday, October 18. The groan of disappointment which filled the aula made

it quite plain that this plan is not appreciated by very many. I am sure that a large number of council fathers have already made arrangements to leave Friday afternoon or Saturday to extend the recess as much as possible. No doubt many of them will not change plans with the result that those general congregations will have a very slim attendance.

The first item was the final vote on the entire schema on Priestly Training. There were only 15 negative votes.

Bishop Daem of Antwerp introduced the voting on Christian Education by making the "relatio" on behalf of the commission. We cast the first nine ballots on that schema and Felici announced the results of the first six ballots. Only one of the six ballots received over 100 (111) negative votes and there were never less than 76.

There were ten council fathers who had received the endorsement of more than 70 others and who took the floor to talk on the missions even though the rule of cloture had been involved. I gained the impression that Lercaro was quite upset over the large number of speakers after the subject technically had been closed. He cut several of them short and was quite brisk in his manner of conducting the meeting.

We did have a rather encouraging experience. A certain lay auditor from Togo (colored), Eusebe Adjakpley, was given the floor and he delivered a speech in faultless French. He spoke with a calm self-assurance which gave an explanation of why he was selected as a lay auditor. Here was one man with whom the missionaries certainly had done an excellent job.

Father Schutte, Superior General of the SVD Fathers made the final summation of the schema on the missions. He completed his remarks at about 12:23. This means that the entire speaking program this morning was devoted to the schema on the missions even though debate had been formally terminated yesterday. It is no wonder that an extra one or two general congregations are necessary since extra speeches upset the calendar which had been planned.

The council fathers were visibly annoyed when Cardinal Lercaro called on Archbishop Marty of Rheims to make the relatio on the final schema to be debated: "Priestly Life and Ministry." It was all the more frustrating when Archbishop Marty, in his high pitched voice, read the entire printed relatio, word for word: it wasn't short. I believe that adjournment at 12:35 was the latest that any general congregation was ever adjourned.

Pursuant to the decision made yesterday following the panel discussion of the schema on "Priestly Life and Ministry" that the panelists prepare an intervention summarizing their remarks to be submitted to the General Secretariat; such an intervention was prepared and will be submitted over the name of thirteen of us bishops who were present at the discussion. The intervention referred to the relationship of the bishop with his priests, and also to the type of spirituality recommended in the schema. It also referred to three other minor points. Whoever prepared this intervention (I suspect it was Father Norris of San Francisco and Father Barnabas Ahern) did an excellent job and I certainly do not object to having my name on the intervention.

OCTOBER 14: 149th General Congregation; Lercaro presiding; present 2189.

Felici announced the results of the voting yesterday on Christian Education. The schema was adopted by a final vote of 1912 placet, 183 non placet and 1 invalid ballot for a total of 2096 votes cast. This schema will be in the same category as that on the communications media; It

is accepted, not because there is any enthusiasm for it but because circumstances put a bad schema into our hand to which we must give a favorable vote or else have the Council go down in history as having said nothing about Christian Education at a time when this subject needs more attention than at any other time in modern history. Yet, we are in a position where we have to give an affirmative vote to a document which is utterly inadequate. What is said is perfectly acceptable; but the document represents no advance since the encyclical ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF YOUTH which was a great document when Pius XI published it. Our present schema is merely a rewrite of some of the principles propounded by Pius XI, even though the whole picture of education has broadened immensely since those days; we are not adding a single thought to adapt the principles of Pius XI to conditions as they are now. Just as in the case of the communications media so in the matter of education, the world and especially our Catholic people have a right to expect a powerful document representing a real Magna Carta on Education. As it is we have a document which repeats, in a weak way, what Pius XI had said with vigor and clarity. And we leave the entire field of the problems created by the increase in the number of children to be educated and by the much higher percentage of all children and youth who are being educated or are seeking admission to schools that we haven't got. We say nothing significant about the part that education is to play in the war against poverty, etc. I can imagine that the only people satisfied with this document are those in the Curia who want the Council to do nothing constructive in any field so as to leave the whole field open to them to dominate the whole picture as they did in the past. The document of education is a monument to one of the several failures of the Council to meet the challenge of the world in particular areas of the Church's responsibility. Now we can do no more than hope against hope that Paul before too long will issue an encyclical on Christian Education that is really adequate.

Today we started voting on the modi in connection with the schema on the relations of the Church with non-Christians. Cardinal Bea gave the relatio and presented the document for the council fathers' action. There were 8 special quaesita representing the emendations of the text made by the Secretariat for Christian Unity. Bea vigorously defended the changes that had been made in the face of much criticism from the Jews and from many of the supporters of the schema. One criticism arose from the fact that the word "deicide" was dropped from the text and the other was that the text was weakened by dropping the word "condemned" in connection with any form of anti-Semitism and substituting therefore the word "deplorable." The former change was made to preserve a more charitable tone since "deicide" is a terribly harsh word, and the latter change was made to bring the document in line with traditional terminology. "Damnare" referred to the condemnation of formal heresy whereas "deplorare" is used in denouncing crime.

We balloted today on the first 6 "quaesita", leaving the other three as well as the vote on the entire schema for tomorrow's session.

Archbishop Marty of Rheims had read the relatio for the schema on Priest Life and Ministry yesterday. So the debate on the text can begin in earnest today. There were 12 speakers on that subject, which was a goodly number in view of the fact that so much time was taken up with the balloting.

The first speaker was Cardinal Meouchi. Like practically every other intervention made on any topic by any oriental council father, this one started out with a complaint that the schema reflects a "western mentality." The cardinal said that aside from a few general references to the priesthood, the schema contains nothing of interest or value for the oriental clergy, especially the married clergy. One can well understand why that is true in this particular

instance, probably more than in any other. In our panel discussion the other night Father Barnabas pointed out that the schema which has a good theological basis for its statement in the first section is very weak in the second section which is devoted to the spirituality of the priest. Instead of being based solidly on the theology of the priesthood, it is oriented entirely to the obligation of celibacy. The essence of the priestly vocation is derived from the nature of the priesthood, the Church and the priestly ministry. Celibacy is something essentially a special vocation and not the foundation of priestly vocation as such. This is one of the weakest points in the entire document, and we hope it will be remedied through modi. Cardinal Leger, with his usual keen perception of matters under debate covers this subject very well in his intervention. We can only hope that his suggestions, and similar suggestions being made by many others, will be incorporated in the final text. Colombo also put his finger exactly on this point.

At long last we had a meeting of the US Bishops this afternoon at 4:00, Cardinal McIntyre presided. As always, he did a very poor job in conducting the meeting. It was fortunate that McIntyre had asked Archbishop Krol to assist him. Since the matter to be discussed was labeled "sub secreto" special pains were taken to have everybody who was not an ordinary leave the room. Even after the meeting had started Abp. Krol asked that the balcony be cleared and McIntyre again asked everybody who was not a bishop to leave.

We were supplied with a copy of a schema of a Constitution to be studied and approved for presentation to the Holy Father for action by him as he saw fit. The subject of the constitution was PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCH.

Along with the copy of the proposed constitution was a letter from McIntyre stating that the presidents of the national episcopal conferences have been summoned to a meeting which is to be held on October 21st. From this meeting the Holy Father wishes to get some idea of the reaction of the different hierarchies to the proposed constitution of penitential discipline in the Church. McIntyre was quite confused in his presentation of this matter. But he did get across the fact that there is special urgency arising from the fact that we are only a few days away from the date of the meeting and nothing has been done. Now they propose that each bishop take a copy of the proposed constitution and submit his comments in writing. We are to have our comments at the NCWC office no later than Monday, October 18th. It seems a committee has been appointed, by whom, we don't know, and who is on it is not entirely clear. But in any case, this committee is to take the reports from the different bishops and coordinate the material so as to provide from McIntyre a good summary reflecting the thinking of the US hierarchy as a whole. That will not be an easy task. For one thing there are those, led by Cardinal Ritter, that we should make no comments or suggestions, but simply give "placet" or "non placet". Others feel that the whole matter will be bungled unless concrete suggestions are made for a completely new approach to the question of penitential practice. I feel strongly that the second group proposes the correct procedure.

What will come of this is hard to say. It seems that the whole matter is being rushed through to some definitive action without the study that it requires. This is indicated by what has already happened.

The "proposed" schema is dated, July 1, 1965. The Sacred Congregation of the Council is competent in matters of penitential discipline. It is quite obvious that they went ahead on their own, without any consultation with anybody who ever had any pastoral experience or who knows what is going on in the world outside of the walls of Rome, and drew up a new set of rules for fast and abstinence and put it on the Holy Father's desk for signature. Fortunately for

the Church, he looked it over first and refused to sign it; he ordered that it be submitted to the hierarchies of the world for study. It is only too bad that not more time was allowed for study. But the very fact that the meeting for October 21 has been called at all is very helpful; at least the bishops will have a chance to point out the utter impracticability of the set of rules that are proposed. There is no "new approach" to this problem, although the question is crying for a new approach and has been crying for several generations. This proposal simply wants to retain the whole structure of penitential practice and merely change the details. They try to retain the basic fallacy of the penitential discipline promulgated in the Codex in 1918. They still have not learned that you simply cannot write a set of rules for fast and abstinence or penitential practices in general that is applicable to every country in the world. But that is what the Congregation of the Council tried to do; thank God they didn't get by with it. It is part and parcel of the desperate efforts being made by the Curia to jump the gun and confront the bishops of the world with a fait accompli. In this way they try to nullify the work of the Council and retain complete control and sole legislative power in their own hands. What comes of this will be a good test of practical value the SYNOD will be.

Individual US bishops now can do nothing more than submit their suggestions by Monday and then hope that the matter can be followed through with real study of the problem in an effort to get something in the field of penitential practice that is realistic and a real help to clergy and laity in their spiritual life.

October 15: 150th. General Congregation: Lercaro presiding: present 2111

In his announcements this morning, Felici threw in a little more light on the calendar for the remaining of the Council. He carefully avoided any assurances about the time of the ultimate adjournment but he did in fact he did not mention even tentative dates after November 18. As it now stands we can expect the following:

A general congregation tomorrow, October 16; the first Saturday meeting during this session. This congregation will be devoted to further discussion of priestly life and Ministry. If any still wish to speak after the close of tomorrow's congregation, or who may wish to speak in the name of 70 council fathers in case cloture is involved tomorrow, will have an opportunity to do so on Monday, October 25. But they will be required to submit their complete manuscript to the General Secretariat before Monday, October 18.

During the coming week there will be many meetings of the commissions and episcopal conferences. This is a recess and not a vacation, according to Felici. On October 25 the general congregations will be resumed and the council fathers will proceed to the voting on the modi of the Declaration on Religious Liberty, the schema on Divine Revelation and the schema on the Apostolate of the Laity. I presume that they will be treated in that order, just as the general debate took place on the projects in that order. On October 28 there will be a Public Session of the Council for the final voting and eventual promulgation of documents dealing with the Pastoral Duties of Bishops. The Renovation of the Spiritual Life and Seminary Education. Felici indicated the order that would be followed in the public session. It is good to note that they are having the reading of the texts and the voting before the Mass and the remainder of the formalities after the Mass in order to prevent the long delay while the ballots are processed. After the public session on October 28 it may be necessary to hold another General Congregation (October 29). In any case general congregations will be suspended from October 30 through November 8. On November 9 general congregations will be resumed in order to vote on schemas which are ready at that time. At a later date, maybe November 18, feast of the dedication of the Basilica of SS Peter and Paul there will be another Public Session for approval of further texts. Beyond this Felici did not hazard a guess concerning the calendar, though he did indicate that there might be another recess around mid-November.

There is a great deal of impatience among the bishops to get things wound up so that they can go home. It is to be hoped that this feeling does not get so strong that the Council fathers as a group will want to rush pell-mell through the remaining formalities just to get through. There is a danger that some important things may be overlooked or "sleepers" in some of the modi or documents may get by us and leave us saddled with something that the Curia wishes or needs to retain unlimited control over. Dr. Warren Quance used the following illustration: "I gain the impression that council fathers would be willing to vote for a declaration of a fourth person in the Blessed Trinity if that were necessary to get things finished." That may be quite extravagant, but there is a touch of truth in it. But one thing is certain. The members of the commissions are going to be very busy up to the last week of the closing session.

The voting on the modi of the declaration on non-Christian religions was completed and the results announced during this congregation. The final vote on the entire schema found 250 negative votes cast. That was about what was expected. It will be interesting now to see what the reaction of the Arabs and others will be. At times when this matter was under discussion in the commission and on the floor there were threats of reprisal by some Arab Governments; we will not see whether that was only a bluff or a threat made in earnest.

One interesting point is the fact that there were more invalid ballots marked during the voting on this schema than ever before. We seldom had more than three invalid votes; during the voting on this schema we had 14 invalid ballots twice, 9 twice, 10 once, etc. I am sure that is no more than a coincidence; but the newsmen noticed it and asked questions about it at the press panel today.

There were 16 speakers on the Life and Ministry of Priests today, of whom 7 were cardinals.

Cardinal Doepfner objected to the terminology. There was too much of the "bella figura" so much loved by the *L'Osservatore* and *stylus curiae* of the Vatican generally. Doepfner said some parts read like spiritual reading instead of a simple and direct statement of principles. One phrase that he singled out with the comment that priests would certainly be annoyed by it, runs like this: "special spiritual crown of their bishops."

Many speakers insist that the life and mission of the priest should stress more contact (or dialogue, if you will) with those outside of the fold. The schema too often talks of things already past. Great emphasis should be made on the need for having our pastoral work anticipate developments and future needs to avoid the great fault of the past, namely, fighting evils which no longer are a real threat while the ground is falling from under us in current conditions.

A rather interesting document was delivered to us earlier this week - I believe it was on Tuesday - concerning the document on Priest Life and ministry. No explanation was given, though the document consists of four brief articles - two by Father Lyonnet, S.J.; Father Clement, S.J. and Father Audet, S. J. The articles all deal with clerical celibacy. While they do not openly campaign for a married clergy, they actually made a very strong and logical case for a married clergy in such cases where the man wants to be a priest but does not want to lead a life of celibacy. The subject is treated in a general way and obviously not in great detail because the articles are quite brief which would preclude possibility of treatment in depth.

I will mention only one point here. There is a great shortage of priests all over the world; that shortage will become more acute as the population growth continues to rise. Since there are

many who refuse to enter the priesthood because permanent celibacy is a sine qua non, whereas they would like to be a priest if that did not necessitate celibacy. The unspoken question in the article is this: Does the Church have a right to insist on celibacy in view of the shortage of priests and the fact that many who have a vocation do not follow that call because of the rule requiring celibacy?

Today Lercaro "goofed " in a manner to provide a bit of entirely different humor to relieve the monotony of the Congregation. After Archbishop Charue had finished his speech with "dixi, gratias" Lercaro said: "Faveas peter concludere!" This incident really drew a laugh.

OCTOBER 16: 151st General Congregation ; Lercaro presiding; present 1594. Bishop Hoch won a bet on the attendance today. I had bet that at least 1900 would be present for this Saturday General Congregation. How far I was wrong! It was obvious the moment I stepped into the aula that there would not be anywhere nearly 1900 present. The attendance of 1594 was the lowest in any of the 151 General Congregations that have been held in the four sessions. After using a little "hindsight" it is easy to understand why so few came. In the first place, everybody by this time is so tired of the discussions on the floor that a special General Congregation at a time when they know we will be here a long time with practically nothing to do does not appeal to the council fathers at all. Secondly, we are not having any General Congregations next week and hundreds of the fathers have made plans for more or less extended sight-seeing trips which begin tonight or tomorrow morning already. They have no intention of canceling or changing plans just to be here for a special meeting which they know will be devoted solely to speeches on the final schema coming up in the Council.

There is to be a special meeting of the American Periti at the Sala Transpontina at 4:30 pm, October 28. There will be a discussion lead by Father Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J., on the subject of indulgences. This is in preparation for the fact that the Holy Father is submitting this topic to a discussion by the periti and the council fathers generally just as in the case of fast and abstinence.

There were 16 speakers this morning who made an intervention on the subject of Priest Life and Ministry. Eight of these were Cardinals. Heenan as always was a bit caustic in some of his remarks. But he did have some good ideas, even though it was a bit unfortunate that the press concentrated on his remarks concerning the priest with personal moral problems. It resulted in an unfair presentation of his intervention in the press.

Bishop Leven, much to the surprise of most of us who signed his request to speak, gave an excellent talk. It was received with applause because he called for some reference to the assistant priests, chaplains and others engaged in special work outside of being actual pastors of a parish. Leven made a strong appeal for something that is badly needed: an arrangement whereby priests who have become mature through a good seminary training and especially through a great deal of pastoral experience can be treated as grown up men and not children. Many of our priests are still assistants and treated like mere beginners without any capability for assuming positions of leadership at an age and with a background of experience when those in industry and commerce are at their peak. There are men at the head of some of the biggest corporations in the country who are no older and have had no more experience in their work than very capable priests who are still assistants. It is a real problem to have some of our most capable priests with twenty or thirty years of pastoral experience being treated in exactly the same way and listed in the same category as the priest who is newly ordained. Even the newly ordained are not treated in the proper way in our present system; so what should one say about the priest who has already been ordained from 10 to 30 years!? Then when they do

get a parish in our small dioceses after 8 or 10 years, they are sent into an isolated rural place where there isn't even a decent place to buy some groceries; let alone an opportunity for contacts with their peers or an opportunity for a real challenge in their work! In my own personal experience, I only too often feel it to be an act of cruelty when a priest has to be assigned to places like Berlin, Zeeland, (St. John) etc.!!!

In general the interventions that were made today seemed to be on a higher plane than usual. It was obvious that much care and study went into the preparation of these interventions. They represented enough material for several priests' retreats, and also for a good retreat for bishops. I wonder why no one has ever arranged for a special closed retreat for bishops! If somebody made a real effort to arrange for the right kind of retreat-master under circumstances where a really "closed" retreat could be made, I am sure there would be a good response. It would be a chastening experience if we made a retreat like that, especially if it were conducted by a retreat-master who would have the courage to say the right thing and say it with emphasis.

The rule of cloture was invoked at 11:30. In the ballot on the acceptability of this schema for processing by the commission there were 1507 placets, 12 non-placets and two invalid ballots, for a total of 1521 votes. Archbishop Marty gave the final summation of the subject on the Life and Ministry of the Priest. Felici announced that those who could get the support of 70 fathers would get an opportunity to speak at the next General Congregation. But he said that each speaker must get 70 signatures for his own intervention; in other words you can not use a set of 70 signatures for several speakers!

October 25: 152 General Congregation; Doepfner presiding: present 2028. There were no general congregations during the past week. On Wednesday, Abbot Baldwin, Father John OSB, Father Godfrey OSB and I made a trip to Florence, Ravenna, Bologna and Siena extending from Wednesday forenoon, October 20 to Saturday evening, October 23. Hence no entries in the diary for those days. During this week of recess there was feverish work on the part of the commissions and feverish activity on the part of the conservatives to safeguard their position. Some gossip reached the papers concerning the representations supposed to have been made by the missionary bishops to the Holy Father protesting the action of Cardinal Agagianian and Roberti in compelling the commission to add certain modi to the text of the declaration on missionary activity which negates the essence of the document which had been approved almost unanimously by the members of the commission. There also was a story in the papers saying that Pope Paul will promulgate some rules requiring resignation of all heads of congregations at the age of 70 and also providing for the termination of all offices held by curial cardinals at the time of the death of the Holy Father to allow the new pope to appoint his own choices to the various curial positions. This latter rumor is quite extravagant and, it seems to me, impractical in some of its features.

The General Congregation today was given over to a whole series of announcements concerning the public session on Thursday and the program to be followed after that.

Felici then announced the voting schedule on Religious Liberty which is to begin tomorrow. Bishop DeSmedt, for the sixth time, made a relatio on religious liberty. This time he explained the revised text which had been the basis of debate and then amended according to the wishes of the council fathers who made interventions. This time he was more matter of fact in his delivery and did not become so dramatically oratorical as had been the case in previous instances when we were fighting for the life of this document.

On the whole, the changes made in the text as compared to what we received last summer were confined mostly to emphasizing the teaching regarding the "true church" and establishing our claim to being the one and only true church. This will not sit so well with Protestants but I feel that this point was emphasized with restraint and in good taste.

There were seven speakers today who had their last fling at making a formal intervention on the floor. This took care of all council fathers who received permission to speak because they had received the support of at least 70 other council fathers.

Bishop Arrieta of Costa Rica made a desperate plea for equalizing the number of priests in proportion to the number of Catholics all over the world. This should not be attempted through a pious exhortation by the Council but through strict instructions, rigidly enforced.

Some of the speakers, including Archbishop Connolly of Seattle, complained that the subject of priestly obedience was not treated properly. More should be said on that subject based on a better exposition of the theology of the priesthood.

During the Mass this morning, the Sistine choir was replaced by the "Dom Spatzon" (Cathedral sparrows) of Regensburg. This is a well known boys choir from Regensburg. After the Mass they sang a very beautiful number after which Felici said: "Optime! sed exeat omnes!"

This afternoon the US bishops met at the North American College. The meeting was not very satisfactory. Cardinal Shehan presided and Archbishop Kroll provided practically the whole program. He reported on the meeting of the heads of episcopal conferences which was held on October 21 to discuss the question of penitential discipline. This report was anything but encouraging, even though the report on the recommendations made by US bishops was quite satisfactory. There were 155 bishops who submitted a statement on the proposed Constitution, of which the great majority voted non-placet as the schema stood. An even greater number wanted the fasting rules determined in each country by the episcopal conference so as to keep it in line with local conditions. But it seems that the suggestions from the 106 episcopal conferences represented at the meeting which was opened by the Holy Father and then presided over by Cardinal Ciriaci received scant attention and probably will be ignored for the most part.

Archbishop Krol gave a brief explanation of the proposed constitution on indulgences. Bishop Cleven told me that this matter was discussed in the meeting of German speaking bishops today. They were informed that the report on indulgences which was turned over to the heads of the episcopal conferences (one copy only was provided to each conference, even though we have over 200 members!) was prepared by nine persons, all Romans, of which one was a theologian and the others all canonists! The whole thing is quite unsatisfactory and certainly will not help us to present this doctrine to the world today in a manner that is convincing.

There was a long discussion about the matter of providing adequate English versions of papal documents as soon as they are published. This is an urgent matter because five separate documents are to be promulgated on Thursday. After considerable haggling it was voted to have the translation made by a group of periti turned over to the press as approved by the US bishops.

Archbishop Cousins announced that the meeting of the Administrative Board will meet November 13 and 14 and the regular bishops meeting will begin on November 15 and continue

as long as required to complete the agenda which include the question of reorganization of NCWS and the organization of the coetus episcoporum.

Page 37 was not present?

OCTOBER 27: 154th General Congregation. Agagianian presiding; present 2240.

The atmosphere in the General Congregations these days is very much the same as during "the last days of school" when we were kids. There very obviously is some impatience about getting the remaining formalities over with so that we can go home.

Felici announced that next Friday the voting on De Divina Revelatione will take place. Very probably at that time the commemorative medal of the fourth session of the Council will be distributed. This announcement sounded very much like a "bait" to get the Council Fathers to be present at the General Congregation on that day!

He also called attention to the fact that in the Public session tomorrow the final action on the decree "Renewal of Religious Life", among others, will be taken. When voting on this particular decree we are to keep in mind that through some error the following sentence in #11 page 9 was omitted: "Instituta saecularia, quamvis non sint instituta religiosa, veram tamen et completam consiliorum evangelicorum professionem in saeculo ab Ecclesia recognitam sucumferunt." In voting on this decree tomorrow the quoted sentence will be included in the text.

We were also reminded that when voting on the modi on Revelation next Friday we will need the latest text that was distributed to us in the summer along with the recent report on the modi which we received the other day because the latest report gives only the actual changes and not the completed new text. After action on the modi the new text will be printed giving effect to the action on the modi; that text will be the final to be used in the next public session when promulgation takes place.

The final ballots on the modi on Religious Liberty were taken today. Results to be announced on Friday.

After the second ballot was cast this morning the privilege of the floor was given to the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas Falls of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, who spoke on behalf of the "Pastor auditors: and the priests throughout the world. Msgr. Falls delivery of his paper was just about perfect. He spoke with self assurance, clearly and without the "American accent" which council fathers from other countries complain about. His speech was not merely a polite formality with obsequious platitudes. He did express in a dignified way gratitude to the Holy Father and the Council for the attention given to the pastors when discussing the Church, the Pastoral responsibility of Bishops and the priesthood.

At the same time, he pulled no punches when he added that the Schema should spell out in detail the concrete obligations of the Bishop to guarantee a decent living wage to every priest of his diocese. But this was only a passing, though direct, reference to the question of salaries. He did add other suggestions for improving the schema on Priestly Ministry and life by being explicit on the question of cooperation of priests with their bishops and vice versa. He then added a few excellent suggestions concerning the spiritual life of priests in a modern parish. Msgr. Falls received most enthusiastic applause from the council fathers at the close of his speech.

In the final announcements, Felici offered some explanations of the procedure to be followed tomorrow in the Public Session, especially in connection with the manner in which we are to affix our signatures to the documents which are being promulgated.

Finally, he added a word about the freedom of council fathers to vote non placet in the ceremonial ballot during the Public Session. He vigorously denied the rumor he had heard to the effect that in previous public sessions he had practically told council fathers that a non placet vote would be improper because "the whole world is watching". That is not true: The Council father may vote non placet if that is what he wishes.

OCTOBER 28: Public Session. The procession into St. Peter's by the Holy Father and the usual group of attendants of various classification started moving in exactly at 9:00 AM, the time scheduled for the ceremony. The Council Fathers had been instructed to be vested in amice, cope and white miter and to take their proper places without forming any procession. Along with the Holy Father, and his party only the Cardinals and concelebrants at the Mass were in the procession. The choice of concelebrants was truly a sign of the times: There were "Iron Curtain: Cardinals, Wyszynski, Slipyi and Beran; and then there were Archbishops from seven strife-torn countries, Vietnam, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Korea, Congo and Brazil. Among the 25 there also was Archbishop Bergan who is observing the 50th anniversary of his ordination. I was really edified to note that nobody came without cope!

Over 2300 bishops were present; that is one of the largest attendance marks for the entire fourth session. The order of the ceremonies was adjusted with a view to avoid the long wait for the results of the balloting. The Session was formally opened and then we proceeded immediately to the balloting. Felici read the opening and closing paragraph of each chapter in the five different ballots - one for each of the documents to be promulgated. When the ballots had all been taken the Holy Father vested for Mass and the concelebrants joined him at the altar and the Mass was celebrated. From the standpoint of rubrics and music, the ceremony not only of the Mass but the whole proceedings was very impressive. We had been provided with a copy of the entire ritual, with the music included for those parts which the entire congregation were expected to sing. And sing they did! The volume was adequate to fill the vast space of St. Peter's. We have made tremendous progress in one respect at least since the public session in 1962 when the council was opened. There were no bishops reciting their breviary while the Mass or other ceremonies were in progress. That was also true of the regular morning Masses during the fourth session.

The Holy Father preached a fifteen minute homily at the Gospel of the Mass instead of the customary long and very formal allocution later during the ceremony following the Mass. The homily was very effective, but it is difficult to translate the Latin into English especially since they seem to insist on the "bella figura" with the stilted and archaic expressions that seem to be part and parcel of the Vatican atmosphere and stylus curiae. I am sure that the impact of papal pronouncements could be much greater in our generation if they would do away with the archaic form of speech. I do not see where any special dignity is given to any subject by expressing the ideas in a manner which no one else in the world uses. I am thinking, by way of illustration and contrast, of Kennedy's inaugural address. That was one of the finest flights of oratory I have ever heard. There was nothing flamboyant or stilted about either the language or delivery. The text was simple, direct and readily understood by all. It did not require tricks of oratory or bombastic language to get the ideas across. I just cannot understand why the Vatican alone, of all institutions in the world, must adhere to such

outmoded styles: the language is part and parcel of the feudal pattern of the Middle Ages which are utterly out of place in our day.

The ceremonies following the Mass were very short and dignified. Felici announced the results of the balloting; the Holy Father promulgated the documents with a brief formulary, and that was it. There were 2 negative votes on the pastoral ministry of bishops; 88 on the Jews and other non-Christian religions; 4 on the religious orders; 30 on Christian Education and 3 on the training of priests.

In the promulgation of the documents, the Holy Father provided for a "vocatio legis" until June 29, 1966 to provide for opportunity to make certain adjustments which are necessary before some of these documents, especially the one on pastoral responsibility of bishops can be put into effect. Certain requirements in the decree on the pastoral responsibilities of bishops require some very important changes in the relationships between bishops and the curia. The question of the episcopal conferences is one of more practical importance is the chapter which provides for authority of bishops to dispense from the prescriptions of the general law in all matters not specifically reserved to the Holy Father. Obviously, a rather broadly stated principle of that kind will have to be defined more carefully both for practical questions of administration and also to serve as some kind of a check on irresponsible and indiscriminate dispensing on the part of some of the local ordinaries. But I don't see why it will require all this time from October to the end of June to set up certain norms on this point. Of course, we suspect that the curia wanted a good long time to study this whole matter and work out procedures that will whittle down the impact of the document as much as possible. But I do hope that at least they will maintain the principle that by virtue of collegiality the ordinaries will be recognized as having ordinary jurisdiction for the government of their dioceses by divine right. In other words, the powers of bishops come to them by virtue of consecratio directly from Christ and not as a grudging concession by the Holy See. It is, of course, obvious that for practical reasons of administration certain things must be kept directly under the supreme authority of the Holy Father if proper order is to be maintained in the Church. But the thing that the Council Fathers have been fighting for is to get rid of the tremendous burden which curialism places upon the bishops of the world.

The Rome Daily American wrote a splendid editorial on the Public session. They entitled the editorial "A New Era for the Church". In some respects the editorial may be a bit naive in the sense that the writer assumes that every detail of the changes in the administration of Church provided in de Ecclesia and de Pastoral Munere Episcoporum will be put into effect immediately! That of course is far from the truth. While I am confident that the work done by the Council in these matters will not be entirely in vain, I never-the-less recognize, as anybody who has been close to the council will recognize, that the implementation of these principles will be a slow process which ultimately will be completely successful only if the occupants of the chair of Peter in the years to come are strong in their determination to prevent the council from becoming a dead letter. The present generation in the curia certainly are trying and will continue trying to prevent implementation of the principles spelled out by the council.

The day closed in a fitting manner by the observance of Archbishop Bergan's golden jubilee of ordination. There was a dinner at the Cavalieri-Hilton which was well attended and carried out with dignity. There was also a lot of "brass" there: Spellman, Ottaviani, Vagnozzi, etc.

I sat next to Archbishop Pocock at the dinner. He had been in Chicago for the installation of Archbishop Cody. He told me of Vagnozzi's speech on that occasion: that really must have

been something! I am glad I was not there. I have been told that he practically repeated the same line at the installation in New Orleans! Quousque tandem.....

October 29: 155th General Congregation; present 2240.

Here is a "first" for all general congregations of the four sessions: It is the first time that exactly the same number of council fathers were present on two successive occasions - there were 2240 on Wednesday and Friday. The session was called to order at 9:30 AM instead of 9:00 AM because it was rightly expected that the work cut out for us today would not take nearly as much time as during the days when debate was on.

NOVEMBER 8: The "long vacation" since the General Assembly on October 29 has come to an end. General Assemblies will be resumed tomorrow morning at 9:30. Apparently all assemblies to the end of the session and the Council will begin at 9:30. So far as I am concerned this vacation has been more or less a dead loss. I picked up a slight cold ten days ago. In spite of every kind of medication I could think of as soon as the first symptoms appeared, the cold became progressively worse. I spent almost all of the week in my room but I got little work done. And the cold still hangs on. The doctor left orders that I was to remain inside for another two or three days, which means I cannot go to the General Assembly tomorrow.

Since I couldn't get around these past ten days, I heard very little discussion about the remaining work of the Council. The press carried very few stories.

The Sunday appearance of the Holy Father to bless the crown (estimated at 20,000) was somewhat more formal than is customary. Paul addressed an "Exhortation" to the Catholic world, hierarchy and laymen alike not to relax at the conclusions of the labors of the last three years at the Council, but to carry the momentum which has been generated over into the work of implementing the historic changes which the Council has introduced. He counseled a middle of the road course; on the one hand we dare not cling to old habits and practices which have been superseded by the renewal instituted by the Council; and on the other hand, to restrain intemperance among those who seek to indulge personal whims. On the whole, the Holy Father's talk was such that it can be used very effectively from time to time in encouraging priests and people to adapt themselves to the new norms established by the Council in the field of the liturgy, ecumenism, and the organizational functioning of the Church. At the same time the Holy Father emphasized the fact that prayer will be needed as much after the conclusion of the Council as during the periods of its sessions. He asked that a triduum of prayer be observed immediately preceding the Feast of the Immaculate Conception on December 8. This all but confirmed the general opinion that the Council will be concluded with a solemn public session on December 8. He was not very specific regarding the exact program to be followed during this triduum of prayer. No doubt it will be left pretty much to the initiative and imagination of the different ordinaries and pastors in their respective jurisdictions.

This triduum is a happy thought on the part of the Holy Father. Those of us who have been right here in the middle of things during the four sessions of the Council probably do not realize that there are many people - both lay and clerics - on whom the Council made very little impact while the sessions were in progress. Some people, of course, made a special effort to find out what was going on, but the great majority have received very little information aside from the brief press reports that appeared regularly in the secular press. As a consequence most people have only a very vague idea of what the Council has done. Most of them are aware of the fact that some vernacular has been introduced into the liturgy but in parishes where pastors are dragging their feet - and there are only too many of these - many of our people

know practically nothing of what went on in the Council. They certainly have no idea of the impact the Constitution on the Church and on the Pastoral Responsibilities of Bishops, will, or at least, should have on the renewal of the inner life of the Church. For that reason there was every reason for the Holy Father to make this appeal to bishops, priests and people to shake off their inertia and accept the program which the Council has started.

NOVEMBER 9: Today is the first time that I missed a General Assembly during the four sessions, aside from the week when I went home in October for Anna's funeral. The session today probably will be more boring than most, because they are voting on the Lay Apostolate which does not contain very lucid controversial matter. If something does develop, I will add it later.

The Council has taken final action on ten projects and six projects remain: The Lay Apostolate, Revelation, The Missions, Ministry and Life of Priests, Religious Liberty and the Church in the World Today. The Rome Daily American carried a story this morning which indicates that the commission has pretty well agreed on the text for Schema 13, except that the section on nuclear weapons has not been finalized. The present status of the text, according to this news story, reflects such drastic revision of the text we voted on that this particular section will probably have to be brought back to the floor for discussion. If that is true, we may have something lively and really controversial to fill in the time between ballots. There has been a definite division of opinion on the matter of nuclear weapons ever since the topic first came to the floor last year. The American and English bishops generally have felt that there should be no outright condemnation of nuclear weapons designed strictly for defense. This stand was different from the first draft, which condemn nuclear weapons outright. The reaction from American and English bishops was so outspoken last year that the next draft provided for defensive war with nuclear weapons if a nation has been attacked by an enemy using nuclear weapons. Now the story is that the section has been revised once again ruling out the use of nuclear weapons in any manner and under any circumstances.

Frankly, I do not understand the attitude of the people who want to outlaw all nuclear weapons on a unilateral basis. If it were possible to outlaw nuclear weapons effectively by international agreement or international law of some kind, then obviously it would be criminal not to do so. But with the situation as it is now, that is simply impossible. Communist Russia can never be trusted to disarm itself completely even if the free world agreed to do and actually did the same. This is not a mere matter of seeing two communists under every bed; it is ordinary common sense. Communist leaders have stated openly time and again that they are out to bury the free world and to subjugate the entire world to communist rule. As recently as last Sunday when the Soviets had their military display in Red Square, they openly paraded their whole arsenal of nuclear weapons for the whole world to see. They even showed the huge rocket which is capable of putting a nuclear warhead into orbit. Their boast that they could drop this bomb on any target any place in the world may be an exaggeration under present status of nuclear science, but we can be sure they never will stop working on this project and sooner or later they may or will succeed. In the fact of the nuclear power they can throw at us, it would be fool-hardy to make a sitting duck of military targets in the free world by disarming. Until better methods of inspection which are foolproof are developed, we should not disarm even if the Russians signed a treaty to that effect. That can safely be done only if and when we know that Russian has disarmed; as of now we could never be sure of that no matter how solemnly they entered an agreement. I am sure there will be a fight on the floor if and when this item comes back for debate.

The Rome Daily American carried a very interesting story this morning under the headline "VATICAN NEEDS A SPOKESMAN." This story is particularly interesting to us here at Salvator Mundi because it deals with a speech made last Sunday at Assisi before a forum on "Freedom of the Journalist in the Church." Cardinal Koenig advocated a good long look by the Vatican at its policy concerning its relations with the press. The speech must have been quite effective and realistic, judging from the story. He called for the appointment of an official spokesman for the Vatican and definitely objected to the idea (proposed by some bishops) of having a Catholic information office under the direction of a priest set up here in Rome, and enjoying a monopoly on all news coming from the Vatican and Church universal. He suggested rather that there be an authorized spokesman similar to what we have at the White House. Newsmen now complain that Vatican Officials who release any news now are merely "sources" or "Vatican Circles" which quite often are denied or contradicted by other "circles."

But the thing that is specially interesting to me is the fact that Cardinal Koenig had a private audience with Pope Paul on Saturday forenoon, before he went to Assisi. The Cardinal returned from Vienna on Friday afternoon. Saturday morning he was at table for breakfast with Bishop Hoch and myself. He explained that he had this audience scheduled for 11:20 that morning, but his luggage would not arrive in Rome till Saturday afternoon because that was being brought by Father Dechsinger, his secretary, who was returning from Vienna by car. He found himself here without a house cassock and asked whether either one of us had one that he could borrow. He wore my cassock to the audience and when he returned it, there was a bit of good natured joshing. In view of the fact that Koenig spoke quite critically of Vatican press policies and made a suggestion that would represent a drastic departure from present practices, I am almost compelled to believe that the Cardinal cleared this speech with the Holy Father.

Certainly the suggestion that a press officer be appointed by the Vatican who would handle all news releases and do so in a realistic manner consonant with modern responsible journalism is something that is badly needed. There seems to be no doubt that a very large percentage of the information coming from "a high Vatican Source", "Vatican Circles" etc. is obtained through bribery. I know from at least one instance which I personally observed that news items were leaked for a price to the representative of the press; and the information in question dealt with an action taken personally by Pope John and which was of a nature that it could have been obtained only through confidential contact with the Holy Father. Of course, it is common knowledge among newsmen that you can get any news from the Vatican, provided that you get to the "right" person.

Any arrangement that would, first, provide for orderly and responsible press relations, and secondly, do away with the international scandal of the bribery going on to get Vatican news, would render a great service to the Church and would improve her public image in a very important matter.

The 156th General Congregation was presided over by Cardinal Doepfner; 2152 council fathers were present.

Bishop Hengsbach of Essen made the relatio for the voting on the modi on the Apostolate. Six ballots were cast on the schema on Lay Apostolate.

Cardinal Cento introduced the subject of Indulgences, stating the "position" on that subject. Several documents were distributed.

Speaking of indulgences recalls a rather cryptic statement that Cardinal Koenig made at breakfast this morning. Only Bishop Hock and I were at table with him at the time. The conversation drifted to the subject on indulgences. I made the remark that this subject does not belong in the council chamber since it was not on the agenda and they did not follow the "Regolamenta" in bringing it to the floor. I said that it is too bad that this matter can not be stopped now and postponed to a later date so that the whole field could be properly studied. The Cardinal said: "I will do something about it - today!" He said no more and I haven't heard anymore. The subject was introduced by Cardinal Cento as announced.

NOVEMBER 10: 157th General Congregation; Cardinal Suenens presiding; present 2224. Since the cold had not cleared up yet, I remained away from the meeting this morning.

The Holy Father was present at the Mass this morning which was offered for the council Fathers who passed to their eternal reward during the past year. The voting this morning was a final ballot on the Lay Apostolate covering the whole project. Then the first ten ballots were cast on the Missionary Activity of the Church. There were six reports made by the Presidents of various Episcopal Conferences; among them was Cardinal Shehan who spoke on behalf of Cardinal Spellman.

The Religion Editor (Torkelson) of the Minneapolis Tribune was here this afternoon for an interview. He is trying to see all bishops of the Province and hopes to write several stories on the Council. He will not base each story on the report received from a given bishop; rather he will devote each story to a particular phase of the Council and refer to the reactions of different bishops to each of those topics.

A feverish effort is being made by a group of the council fathers, including several Cardinals who are not from mission territories, to get several modi adopted in connection with the schema on the missions. The principal point at issue is to have a goodly number of missionary bishops made members of the governing body of the missions. The one modus states that all parts of the world are to be represented on the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. These men are to be elected by the Episcopal Conference from the area; they are to be elected for a specific term and are to have a deliberative voice in the proceedings of the Propaganda. It is also stipulated that all members must be called to attend meetings at stated times.

But I have little hope that this idea will be put across. Cardinal Roberti's commission for the reform of the Curia intervened once already to nullify the efforts of the commission on the Missions to insert something similar to the modus now being proposed. He stated that such a provision has no place in this schema because it involves a element of reform of the curiae. That is within the competence of the special commission which he heads; not the commission on missions.

NOVEMBER 11: 158th General Congregation; Agagianian presiding. Present 2204
This is the first meeting for me since October 29th. After I got to my place and assisted at Mass, I almost wished I had stayed at home. I got quite weak, but managed to hang on till the end of the congregation. Even though I had no temperature, the cold took a lot out of me; it must be something about the climate because colds do not always hit me that hard.

Something new was added to this morning's congregation. For the first time a group of sick people assisted at the Mass. The group came from Faenza and made the trip to express gratitude to the Holy Father for the gift of the Council.

Felici announced that there is in preparation a volume which will contain a "typical" edition of the constitutions, decrees and declarations that are being promulgated by the Council. He said such a volume would be made available gratis to all council fathers. During this session they distributed a single pamphlet which contains all documents, that is the three decrees and two declarations; which were promulgated in the public session on October 28.

Felici went through a big long explanation of the nature of the public sessions, and for purposes of accurate references he listed the ten public sessions that have been held: I - October 1, 1962 which marked the inauguration of the Council by Pope John; there was no public session closing this first period; II - November 9, 1963 opening of the second period and profession of faith by Pope Paul and the new Council Fathers; III - December 4, 1963, promulgation of the decrees on the Liturgy and the Means of Social Communications; IV - September 14, 1964, opening of the third period and profession of faith by the new Council Fathers; V - November 21, 1964, promulgation of decrees on the Church, Oriental Churches and Ecumenism. VI - September 14, 1965 and opening of the fourth period and profession of faith by the new Council Fathers. VII - October 29, 1965 promulgation of decrees on Pastoral Office of Bishops, Religious Life, Priestly Training, Christian Education and the Church's Relations to non-Christian Religions and the Jews. VIII will be on November 18, 1965 - foreseen for promulgation of same decrees. IX - December 7, 1965 for promulgation of decrees and X - December 8, 1965 foreseen as the formal closing of the Council.

The voting today proceeded at a hectic pace, since the ballots were cast to complete the work on the mission schema. We will have a good test of how anxious they are really to reform the curia when it comes to deciding what to do about the modi that are being made to get a workable setup in the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. The votes on Chapters IV and V as a whole permitted modi; and when those ballots were collected it was obvious that many voted iuxta modum, since the tellers really had a fist full of paper along with the ballots. Council Fathers also have time till tomorrow to get their modi in if they voted iuxta modum. If there is a large number of the modi calling for the election of representatives from the missions to membership in the Congregation of the Propagation, the real test will be whether the commission will be permitted to give affect to the modi in the revision of the schema. The modi that were circulated by the group referred to yesterday provide for the election of the members of the Propagation of the Faith by the Episcopal conferences and not appointment by the Holy Father. I have little hope that this will be accomplished because the commission on the reform of the Curia headed by Cardinal Roberti interfered once before and I am sure they will try to interfere again. This in spite of the fact that the letter accompanying the proposed modi on this point carried the names of Cardinals Shehan, Frings, Rugambwa, Henriquez, Rossi and the Archbishop Fernandez of India, Baudoux of St. Boniface, Canada, Athaide Archbishop of Agra in India and three other bishops. When the modi are processed there will be a real confrontation between the two tendencies in relationship to the Curia; what they do could set some kind of precedent. And I am quite sure that the Curia will not miss this opportunity to set up the right kind of precedent. Just as they did when things were maneuvered in such a way that the first instructions issued by the Consilium for the implementation of the Liturgy were channeled through the Congregation of Rites. That is the accepted pattern now.

There were six reports on Indulgences given today, all by Cardinals. The last two were made by Koenig and Doepfner who admittedly collaborated; and what a job they did on the Positio

stated by Cardinal Cento of the Sacred Penitentiary! Their statements were so precise and to the point that it could well be considered the last word! The L'Osservatore for November 12 which reported on this congregation is very interesting. In their report on the session yesterday when several other chairmen of Episcopal Conferences, including Cardinal Shehan for the US, they gave a brief summary of everything that each speaker said; today they merely mention the names and said they made comments on the Positio of the Sacred Penitentiary!!! We will see what tomorrow brings. On the way home from the Session this morning Bishop Hock says: "I bet there will be no more reports on indulgences!

NOVEMBER 12: 159th General Congregation, Lercaro presiding; present 2174. Cardinal Slipyi and others celebrated a Mass in the Byzantine rite which lasted an hour and fifteen minutes but the music was the most striking of any of the Oriental rites we have had this year. This morning was the first time that we were delayed in getting to St. Peter's because of rain. The traffic was terrible and we were almost ten minutes late in getting there though we started at the usual time - one half hour before scheduled opening of the Congregation. On my way to my place, as usual, I passed by the chapel normally used by the Canons for their recitation of the office in choir. I was amazed to see practically all seats taken (I was told afterwards that was also true of the present temporary Blessed Sacrament chapel and the regular Blessed Sacrament Chapel! The thought struck me: these bishops seem to be utterly uninterested in the celebration of the Eucharist in a rite which they do not understand; they wait it out by finding any convenient place to read their breviary until the liturgy has been completed! Yet for fifteen hundred years and more we subjected our people to the ordeal of having them attend Mass which was being celebrated in a language which they did not understand!!!! Certainly the reform of the liturgy was long overdue.

When the results of yesterday's voting were read by Felici it was revealed that 702 bishops voted iuxta modum on the 455th ballot which covered the ballot on the critical question of who elects or appoints whom to the Propagation of the Faith!

This morning we had a good example of the kind of thing which I wish they would get rid of at the Vatican. Very seriously and very solemnly Felici announced that by special decree of the Holy Father the Cardinals who are in attendance at the Council may go home after December 8 without special permission from His Holiness!!! The Rome Daily American (I am sure with tongue in cheek) ran a story on this world shaking matter!!! It was a separate story covering just that detail which put the whole thing into bold relief. I wonder whether some of those people will ever get a real idea of what John XXIII was talking about when he said we must speak the language of our generation.

I hope that nobody tips off Israel Shenker of the Time-Life organization about this announcement about cardinals leaving Rome; wouldn't that give him a good chance to end up his article summing up the Council after the close of the same with a real smart note!

They handed out the second section of Schema 13 today. The first part is to be delivered to us during tomorrow's session. Voting on this schema is to begin Monday morning. I imagine it will take at least three days to finish the voting because Felici says there will be about 31 ballots to be cast. With the length of the text and their insistence on reading the whole thing, they will have to hurry to get in ten or eleven ballots daily.

Felici also made another interesting announcement. He said that the General Secretariat of the Council had been asked whether the conferences scheduled during this month at the Domus Mariae were official or were at least authorized. In a very emphatic manner he said

that the answer to these questions is negative. I don't know much about the Domus Mariae and have had no notice of any meetings out there so it is hard to figure out what is behind Felici's announcement. In the first place it is silly to ask whether any of those lectures given by many people on every conceivable subject would be official; nothing that is said is official except what is said in the Council Chamber. I am wondering whether somebody did not ask that question simply for the purpose of eliciting such an emphatic denial from Felici.

Today we did nothing but vote! That means Bishop Hoch won his bet; there are no more reports from Episcopal Conferences on the question of indulgences. However, here was a practical reason for not having speeches today; it took the secretaries a long time to read the entire text of the various matters we voted on, so much so that the ballots could be handed out and then collected as fast as the texts covered by each ballot could be read. We had nine ballots in only about an hour and forty-five minutes.

The L'Osservatore today listed fifteen prelates who filed a written votum on Indulgences with the Secretariat of the Council. There were several cardinals among them, mostly of conservative leanings.

NOVEMBER 13: 160th General Congregation; Doepfner presiding; present 2090. In looking out over the crowd this morning it looked as though there was a surprisingly good attendance for a special meeting on a Saturday morning. I did not get the report of the attendance as yet from L'Osservatore; but the largest number of votes cast in any ballot today 2142, which is a respectable attendance for any day and remarkable for Saturday. These special meetings are not popular.

Felici announced that the next public session would be on Thursday, November 18 on the feast of the Dedication of the Basilica of SS Peter and Paul at 9:00 AM. He received a big hand when he announced that a number of periti have been invited to join the number of concelebrants offering the Mass along with the Holy Father. That is a gracious gesture.

There were seven ballots cast this morning to complete the voting on the schema pertaining to the Ministry and Life of Priests.

Before we started voting Felici made an announcement which caused most of the buzzing in the aula to stop. He said that there will be no time for further reports of the Episcopal Conferences on the subject of indulgences because the reading of the texts in the voting that must be done takes so long. Furthermore when the Holy Father instructed the Sacred Penitentiary to prepare the "positio" on indulgences he gave them a mandate, not to write a theological tract on the subject of indulgences but merely to prepare a revised set of rules governing indulgences!!!! Of course, there is always the question whether in cases like this the Holy Father has intervened personally or not. Felici did not say that he did in this case; but he certainly implied that the reports from the Episcopal Conferences were out of line because they criticized the theology of indulgences - or I should say lack of sound theology - as expounded in the "positio" prepared by the Sacred Penitentiary. It is also true that the statements made by many of the chairmen, especially Koenig and Doepfner made the people in the Sacred Penitentiary look rather bad. Whether this has come to the attention of the Holy Father is not known but it is sure that the Curia generally is not very happy.

This coming after the drubbing which the Propagation of the Faith got in the mission schema, along with the history of that schema, must make the people in the Curia feel that they are being publicly raked over the coals - which is not too far from the truth!

There is no doubt about the fact that the Curia is becoming quite restive under the pressure of the Council. One of the secretaries in one of the Congregations was quoted as saying the other day that once they get the bishops out of Rome and back into their dioceses, they will quickly put them into their places again and everything will be the same again as before the Council. It is hard to believe that any of these people think the Council has made no permanent mark on the life of the Church. No doubt some of them feel that their great mission after the Council will be to save the Church from the mistakes made during the Council; but they just can't be so naive as to think they can wipe the whole Council off the record like the erasure cleans the blackboard after class and leaves nothing of what had been written by the instructor! Well, we will see! Maybe the first prescribed reading for all members of the Curia the day after the Council is over should be the "Exhortatio" addressed to the bishops and people of the world on November 6 in which the Holy Father exhorted everyone to enter earnestly into the task of putting the Council into practice.. Postea videbimus!!!!

NOVEMBER 15: 161st General Cong.; Cardinal Suenens presiding; present: 2199.
Felici made an announcement before beginning the voting on Schema 13 that each modus should be submitted on a separate sheet since this would facilitate the process of classifying the modi.

He also announced that the theological note issued by the Theological Commission on March 6, 1964 would also apply to the Declaration on Revelation. A printed copy will be provided tomorrow. This note referred only to the fact that no theological definitions would be made on any subject during the present Council, but that this is an ordinary exercise of the teaching magisterium of the Church and that these constitutions and declarations can not safely be disregarded.

As we started the work of the Session this morning, I could not help but think of the reaction of Cardinal Doepfner to the announcement yesterday that the mandate to the Sacred Penitentiary by the Holy Father did not call for a theological treatment of the subject of Indulgences, but merely a modification of the rules. Doepfner was presiding at the General Congregation: this remark by Felici was quite clearly a rebuke to Doepfner, Koenig and the other chairmen of episcopal conferences who went into some detail in consideration of the "position" prepared by the Sacred Penitentiary. Doepfner and Koenig had gone into considerable detail to collaborate in stating a theological position on indulgences, and to have this remark made by Felici just after the two of them presented their interventions or reports made it seem rather obvious that this was directed at him. When he continued presiding at the meeting it was very noticeable that his voice had a rather lack-luster quality and not the usual sharp and precise enunciation.

The meeting today consisted of nothing but two relatiois, introducing the schema on the Church in the World Today and seven ballots. The relatiois by Archbishop Garrone of Toulouse and Mark McGrath of St. James in Panama were a bit long, and the text of the seven ballots was very long. So these relatiois and ballots filled up the time completely. Felici announced that tomorrow we would start at 9:00 instead of 9:30 to make sure that we would get through with the voting on Schema 13 by Wednesday. The reading of the text was very boring; three or four of the subsecretaries took turns at reading the different sections; Felici always announced the vote on a whole chapter which allowed of votes iuxta modum. The reading was done

hurriedly and many mistakes in pronunciation were made, which caused the whole session to be very boring.

NOVEMBER 16: 162nd General Congregation, Agagianian presiding. present 2210. Today we had the relatio by Bishop Hengsbach of Essen on the second part of the Schema 13. He read his relatio in an excellent manner. He obviously knows Latin very well. There were at least a half dozen typographical errors in the text of the relatio; but Hengsbach caught each one of them and corrected them even though he was reading his text quite rapidly; he did a much better job of the reading than any of the subsecretaries.

There were fifteen ballots cast today: this really was a boring experience! Between trying to keep a record of the voting and trying to follow the text of the schema as it was read by the subsecretaries. We were just about exhausted by the time the Congregation was over at 12:30 PM. There was just nothing to break the monotony, not even an attempt at a few jokes by Felici.

I was a bit disappointed that we received no text of Religious Liberty nor was there anything said about it's being delivered to us tomorrow. Felici last week announced that we would begin voting on Religious Liberty on November 19; if that is true the text must be delivered to us tomorrow. It simply makes me nervous when they push this declaration around in this way. I am still not convinced that they will not try some trick to sidetrack this whole thing and send us home without any official action on the declaration!!!!

This week we are having the regular annual meeting of the NCWC starting last night and continuing through Wednesday night. We meet at the North American College. The meetings run from 4:00 to 7:00 PM with dinner at 7:30. Cardinal Ritter is presiding; Spellman has missed the first meetings. We have been told that the regular business should be finished by Wednesday night, and that they would have meetings also on Thursday and Friday afternoons and evenings in order to discuss the question of the organization of the Coetus Episcoporum. This is something new, provided for by the Council. We will have some interesting hours devoted to discussion of this new setup. I do hope that they do a good job of it because so much depends on how this is handled. I am convinced that if the various episcopal conferences really make something of their organization and convince the Holy Father that we can contribute something constructive to the administration of the Church, he will make something really worthwhile of the episcopal synod.

NOVEMBER 17: 163rd Gen. Cong. Lercaro presiding; present 2261. It was announced that the voting on the modi of Religious Liberty will take place next Friday. There will be only four ballots pertaining to the modi as such, followed by a fifth ballot to cover the entire project. The General Congregation on Friday will "for various reasons" begin at 9:00 AM.

In the relatio on Schema 13, Bishop Garrone mentioned the fact that many council fathers objected to the idea of having Schema 13 designated as a "constitution" even though it is qualified by having the title: "Pastoral Constitution." Felici announced that pursuant to the suggestion made by Bishop Garrone that the council fathers be given an opportunity to make comments or suggestions concerning the title to be finally given to Schema 13, there will be an opportunity make such suggestions in writing. These suggestions are to be turned in either directly to the General Secretariat by midnight, November 19 or they may be turned in to the ushers at the time of the voting on Religious Liberty next Friday. Those who are content to

retain the present designation as "Pastoral Constitution" need not do anything. Those who make no intervention will be considered as favoring the present title.

The remaining ballots on Schema 13 were cast today. The schema as a whole was voted in by the usual huge margin.

Archbishop Hannan had made quite a campaign in order to get a modus adopted to change the text pertaining to banning the use of nuclear weapons. His one man campaign attracted a great deal of attention in the public press. The stories did not convey an accurate picture of what Hannan had attempted. The headlines seemed to indicate that the US bishops failed to support him in his efforts to concede to any nation the right to stockpile nuclear weapons as a deterrent against invasion by an enemy nation.. Actually this was not an issue involving the US bishops as a block espousing a cause which was opposed by the council fathers generally. The text ballot on this question was #504, in which 523 votes were cast iuxta modum. We can assume that most of these iuxta modum ballots were accompanied by a modus such as Hannan had fought for. Since there are scarcely 200 US bishops at this session, it would seem that the great majority of them used the modus that Hannan has supplied for us. We have not as yet seen the final copy of Schema 13 and therefore don't know whether any change will be made; it is hardly likely that Hannan's suggestion will be followed. I have not noticed anything in the public press to indicate that the strong statement against nuclear weapons actually is regarded as a criticism of American policy. On the face of it, the abatement certainly is contrary to actual US policy, but I have seen no criticism of the statement made by anybody outside of the council fathers who spoke along the lines suggested by Hannan.

The third and final meeting of the NCWC, representing our regular annual meeting, was held at the North American College tonight. They managed to complete the regular reports that were on the agenda, but practically nothing was done by way of consideration of the Varia. Since many of these items directly or indirectly were involved with the coetus episcoporum, this whole section was pushed off for consideration when reorganization is considered.

NOVEMBER 18: Today there was a public session of the Council at which the Holy Father promulgated the Constitution "De Divina Revelatione" and the Decree "De Apostolatu Laicorum". In the ceremonial balloting which took place before the Mass, there were 6 negative votes cast against "De Divina Revelatione" and 2 against "De Apostolatu Laicorum."

The striking thing about the Mass was that the Holy Father had invited some of the periti to concelebrate the Mass with him. Very prominent among the group of the concelebrants was Father John Courtney Murray. He stood out for two reasons: first because he towered over everybody else at the altar because he is much over six feet tall; secondly, because of all the periti in the entire Council he probably was the most controversial because he is regarded by many as "the architect of the declaration on religious liberty." I don't know whether it was accident or by design, but the fact is that he was first in line as the concelebrants marched into St. Peter's along with the Holy Father as the ceremony opened, and at the altar, he was directly opposite the Holy Father. This made him stand out even more since he was at the center of the altar with his back towards the nave of the church occupied by the council fathers.

If any of the periti deserved this recognition, John Courtenay Murray did, not because he was the greatest theologian in the group - he certainly was not - but because he had probably the most up-hill fight on behalf of the declaration of all the periti. He personally was more directly

identified in the minds of liberals and conservatives with this particular schema than any other periti was identified with any other schema. In fact, I know of no other document which was openly identified with any given peritus as this one. Other periti no doubt make just as valuable contributions to specific schemata, as for instance some of the scripture scholars in connection with the Constitution that was promulgated today on "De Divina Revelatione" which had a career in the Council as stormy as that on Religious Liberty but for one reason or another - probably because of the American press - Murray was publicly associated with this document.. The US bishops have every reason to be grateful to John Courtney Murray. We had more at stake than any other group in the fate of this document; there was no other group so directly interested in this document as we were even though men like Bea, deSmedt and others, were personally as much concerned as any of us from the States. The US bishops had "to carry the ball." And John Courtenay Murray called most of the signals in the commrecall that the first time Murray talked to the US bishops, I believe, during the second session, he outlined the different approaches and he insisted that at this time, during the present Council, the whole question of the theological and philosophical basis of freedom and religious freedom in particular had not matured sufficiently. He felt that if we tried to become too detailed in stating a complete theology we would lay ourselves open to too many attacks from the conservatives and would our own position too much. As a consequence, the final document on religious liberty is something of a compromise among its proponents. Certainly many, many scholars will have to devote much research and speculation to the subject of liberty, freedom of conscience, etc. before a final statement can be made on authority, freedom of conscience, etc. by the Church.

After the Mass the Holy Father went through the brief formality of promulgating the two documents and then he addressed the assembly for about 35 minutes. For the second time in two weeks the Holy Father looked ahead to the postconciliar period in public statements. On November 6 he pleaded with everyone to enter into the postconciliar period with an enthusiastic support of the program which the Council will have outlined and a willing acceptance of the new norms which the Council is establishing. Towards that end he asked for a triduum of prayer just before the adjournment of the Council on December 8.

Today the Holy Father spoke openly and to the point about what he will do by way of introducing the reforms which are asked for by the Council. It was quite clear from the tone of his speech that he considers the different conciliar documents as a mandate to carry out the reforms which are specified by the Council. And he did not talk in mere generalities nor did he "stumble over pious platitudes" that mean nothing in the long run; he did not try to evade or sweep under the rug any of the issues raised and resolved by the Council. He spoke of reform; he mentioned the Roman Curia; he stated specifically that he had already instituted the Episcopal Synod and would call it into meeting probably in 1966 or certainly not later than 1967; he said that the first stop would be to provide a new statute for the Holy Office. Neither did he rush into this subject without restraint or prudence; he paid a great tribute to the curia in general and the Holy Office in particular; he said that the reform would be achieved according to the needs of changing conditions but would not be accomplished by a destruction of the existing system. He did warn that this would be a slow process, but that it would also be a thorough process dictated by the needs of the Church. It was very obvious that Pope Paul VI has a well balanced approach in mind and will try desperately to avoid two extremes which could have tragic results; he does not intend to tear down everything in the central organization of the Church, nor does he intend to pass over the work of the Council by merely making some token changes which would not touch anything basic nor accomplish any of the reforms which the Council demanded.

Then the Holy Father also turned to the all-important question of the attitude of bishops, clergy and people towards the program that the Council tried to set in motion. This portion of Paul's, to my mind, was simply magnificent. If the exhortations of the Holy Father will have an effect on everyone in the Church to the point where the reforms planned by the Council are actually carried through during the next generation or two, then this Council will truly be a major turning point in the history of the Church. And Paul pleaded for not less than that. Any bishop who heard the Holy Father and then later read carefully a vernacular text of the speech must realize at this time that a period of tremendous responsibility lies immediately ahead. God, give us the courage to follow through!!!!

Mrs. Ken White and daughter Susan of Carmel, California are in town this week. (Ken White is a brother of Harold White of Minneapolis, husband of Abbot Baldwin's sister and my niece). I arranged for their admission to some good seats during the public session this morning and they also joined Abbot Baldwin and myself for dinner here at Salvator Mundi tonight. They are on a four week tour of Europe which was made possible for very little expense by the fact that Susan is a flight stewardess on Pan American. The enthusiasm with which they talked about what they were seeing in Rome and Florence was really heart-warming. It reminded me of the first few experiences I had in Rome. They seemed to have literally been in heaven during the four hours they spent in St. Peter's this morning; they stayed on as long as they could - that is until the guards almost literally pushed them out after practically everybody else had left! I mention their visit mostly because Mrs. White's older son is in First Philosophy at Mt. Angel in Oregon. Carmel, their home parish, belongs to the diocese of Monterey-Fresno. Their major seminarians normally attended seminaries in southern California, especially in the Los Angeles Archdioceses. But there are seven in Ken Jr.'s class, and they all insisted in going to Mt. Angel and not to Los Angeles. Alma said that Los Angeles is losing vocations right and left because of the Cardinal's policies and she spoke freely about the disappointment among the clergy. What a pity that such a situation exists. No doubt there is exaggeration since the average lay person could hardly be a competent judge; but in this case we have a devoted mother worrying about what is happening to her son who wants to be a priest. Abbot Baldwin and I could do no more than remain silent whenever this point came up in conversation as we visited. But there seems to be a critical situation which is reaching into the neighboring dioceses and which could build up to a big blow-up!

I did not attend the meeting of the US bishops this evening because of the dinner for the Whites; but the reports indicate that it was quite a mess. There was open conflict on the floor about the manner we should proceed with reorganization of NCWC and implementing the coetus episcoporum. Abp. O' Boyle was presiding and apparently disregarded some fundamental elemental parliamentary rules in order to make the reorganization take the pattern which the Administrative Board wants, but which it seems is not the pattern most bishops want.

NOVEMBER 19: 164th Gen. Congregation, Doepfner presiding; present 2268.

The first in the order of business was the relatio by Bishop DeSmedt on the manner in which the Secretariat treated the modi that had been submitted on Religious Liberty. This was the seventh relatio made by DeSmedt; it was a little more matter-of-fact than previous relations by him. There wasn't so much opportunity for oratory because the relatio referred merely to what had been done; why some suggestions could not be accepted and why others were not acceptable. In most instances where modi were rejected it was because the text had been adopted in the voting some weeks ago and therefore "was in possession." That means that no alterations in the text could be made according to rules which involved more than typographical or grammatical corrections; any substantial changes in the letter or spirit of the

text as ruled out. That is why in most instances the only answer given was: "This modes is contrary to what the council fathers already accepted."

While DeSmedt made the relatio the ushers distributed the copy of the centennial edition of Dante's Divine Comedy which we received with the compliments of the Holy Father. It is a beautiful leather bound edition with a special dedicatory page: the Holy Father dedicated it to the Council Fathers. In making the announcement Felici emphasized over and over again that only the Council Fathers were entitled to a copy of the volume and each council father was entitled to only one copy. He ended by asking the council fathers, please, not to embarrass the ushers by asking for more than one copy or for a copy for a council father "who is not here!"

Five ballots were cast on Religious Liberty, the first four covering four batches of modi and the fifth covering the entire project. Felici announced none of the results, but said those would be published tomorrow in a special notice in the L'Osservatore. This went relatively fast since Felici said no text but merely the quaesitum.

Between ballots Felici announced the calendar for the remainder of the Council: There are to be four more General Congregations; a public session on December 7 for final promulgations and the solemn closing on December 8. The dates are as follows:

November 26, There will be no general congregation, but the report on the modi in the Mission schema will be delivered to all council fathers living in hotels or institutions in Rome during the Council; but they would not be delivered to permanent residents in private homes or apartments. These have to pick up their copy of these modi at the General Secretariat.

November 30, Tuesday- General Congregation at 9:00 AM. At this time there will be a vote on the disposition of the modi on the missions. At the same congregation the report on the modi on Priestly Life and Ministry will be distributed.

December 2, Thursday - A General Congregation at 9:00 AM with voting of the disposition of the modi on Priestly Ministry & Life. At this time the report on the disposition of the modi on Schema 13 will be distributed.

December 4, Saturday - the last regularly scheduled General Congregation will be held to vote on the disposition of the modi on Schema 13.

December 6, Monday - in case that not all voting could be completed, on December 4 an additional General Congregation will be held on this date.

We were entertained by a very fine mixed choral group - men and boys - between votes. They were magnificent. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.

This evening we attended a general audience for the Canadian and the US bishops. We were scheduled for 7:00 PM but the Holy Father did not show up in our audience chamber until 7:50, which was something very unusual for him. Actually, however, he was not late; it was merely a matter of poor planning on somebody's part. The Canadians were scheduled at the same time as we were; but the Holy Father went to them - they were in an adjoining audience chamber - and greeted each one individually. Then he came to our chamber and greeted each one of us individually. After that we all went to a larger chamber and there the Holy Father talked to us informally in Italian (translated by Msgr. Marcinkus) and then spoke formally from a manuscript in English and in French.

The Holy Father was most gracious. I noticed again, something that has been obvious throughout the whole session and at the UN in New York: the Holy Father looks ever so much

better than he did in 1963 or 1964. That became even more noticeable closeup than had been the case at a distance in St. Peter's or over the TV in New York. Apparently he must have learned how to carry the burdens of his office without letting them get him down.

As he greeted each of us individually he was most pleasant; he smiled all the time without having the face become frozen. When Marcinkus - who called each bishop by name as the Holy Father approached and named the diocese - gave my name and mentioned Fargo the Holy Father reacted very noticeably: "Oh Fargo - Cardinal Muench: I was a good friend of Cardinal Muench." Then Marcinkus giggled a little bit when he translated the next remark: "I am your good friend too!!!" It seems that the Holy Father always reacts to the mentioning of Fargo. He did on previous occasions when I was presented to him; and Ken Gallagher and John Sandell of the North American College told me that when they were presented to the Holy Father at their usual audience before the opening of the fall term, he reacted in the same way when it was mentioned that they were students for Fargo. Ken Gallagher said it created quite a sensation at their audience, because he and John were the only ones who got more than just a word of greeting as they were presented.

It is always a thrill to have a word personally with the Holy Father. One always must admire the Holy Father - I have met three, Pius XII, John XXIII and Paul VI and they were all notable in this way - that he is pleasant to everybody who comes, no matter how many there are. That phase of their work must be burdensome, but in different ways every pope seems to have the faculty of being pleasant and acting as though you were the only person he greeted that day. Each, of course, is different, depending on his personality. Pius XII was always serious; showing most of his interest in your conversation through the sparkle in his big eyes set deep behind the heavy horn-rimmed glasses he always wore. He was or seemed to be intensely alive and interested; but he also had the faculty of getting his guest to do most of the talking. He asked short but pointed questions to draw you out.

Pope John, as everybody knows was informal and jovial; he could come up with a humorous remark at any time. I have never yet had a private audience with Paul VI but I did meet him after public audiences and on the occasion of our audience during the Council. I am sure, however, that when regular quinquennial visits are resumed after the Council a private audience with him will be a real experience.

NOVEMBER 20: There was no general congregation today, but the results of the balloting which took place yesterday were announced in the L'Osservatore for today. I must confess that I was a bit surprised to learn that the highest number of negative votes cast on any ballot connected with religious liberty was cast in the final ballot on the schema as a whole! The number of negative votes was 249 out of a total of 2216. There were 1954 placets and 13 ballots were invalid. This means that approximately 11 1/2% of the total votes cast were negative. This compares with the 224 negative votes out of a total of 2222 in the first ballot cast on religious liberty, September 21 in the 132nd General Congregation. This means that in the final ballot on this subject the number of negative votes increased by 1 1/2% over the number cast in the very first ballot.

I had hoped that in the final ballot there would be a smaller number of negative votes because I felt that we would gain some ground during the process of the debate; but that was not the case.

Yet, if you analyze the composition of the council fathers as a whole, you are surprised that there were not more negative votes all the way through. The total number of Italian bishops is 349, not counting the number who are nuncios, internuncios and apostolic delegates. There

must be more than forty of the latter. Then there are 85 bishops in Spain and close to 700 in the Latin American countries. Italy, Spain and South America are always considered the countries which do not accept our idea of religious liberty. They have a total of approximately 1100 or almost fifty per cent of the total number of bishops in the world. This would mean that less than one out of four bishops on the average in Italy, Spain and South America, voted against religious liberty. That is a good figure to keep in mind when talking about these countries. Considering all the noise that was made on the subject of opposition to a declaration on religious liberty, it is amazing that only 11 1/2% of all bishops, and less than 25% of the group that is supposed to be most intransigent on this subject cast a ballot against such a declaration. We have come a long way in our generation!

There is one humorous incident to relate in connection with the balloting on religious liberty. Bishop Cleven told us last Friday evening at supper that one of his neighbors is a Spaniard who voted non-placet right down the line in the first four ballots that morning. Before the ballot for the fifth vote was passed out by the ushers, Cleven said he wanted to go to the coffee bar. He asked his neighbor as he was leaving to make his ballot "placet" for him. He said, "I wanted to make sure that he either had to violate his own honesty or cast at least one vote in favor of religious liberty! After some of the things which happened in connection with this project during the last three sessions of the Council, one is almost tempted to ask: "DID HE?"

I should mention one fact in connection with the religious liberty schema. The increase in the number of negative votes may be accounted for at least in part by the very determined campaign which Bishop Carli and some others from "The International Committee of Bishops" (That is the group sponsored by Ruffini, Carli, etc.) carried on right down to the wire to secure negative votes on the religious liberty issue. They wrote letters, circulated modi as late as the night before the vote on religious liberty was taken in the council. But with all of their campaigning and scare tactics, the results they achieved were not impressive. I might add that they did the same in connection with Schema 13. I received at least fifteen modi from them while we were voting on schema 13. These all referred to Section one of that schema. When it came to section two, they just gave up! The letter they sent me (which means they sent this to everybody because I certainly would not be singled out for special treatments) took a defeatist attitude. They said that the whole second section was so bad that it could not possibly be made tolerable through modi; just vote "non-placet" on every ballot.

NOVEMBER 27: This was a free week and in spite of best intentions I got exactly nothing done aside from writing a number of letters. After the great pressure during the early part of the fourth session and also during last week when we had the meetings of the US bishops in addition to the regular general congregations, there was an irresistible temptation just to relax. In that mood there wasn't any chance of getting some serious work done on the speeches on ecumenism and religious liberty. We have only four general congregations left besides the two public sessions; but there are so many receptions and other social contacts to be made yet before December 8 that there probably will not be much accomplished in connection with these speeches.

The Sisters gave us a grand Thanksgiving dinner. Besides the regular residents, the sisters invited the bishops from Wisconsin along with Bishop Zuroweste. Cardinal Koenig was not in Rome this week (except for a meeting of the post conciliar commission for revision of Canon law) but Patriarch Maximos was here and in great spirits. He just took our breath away after the dinner was over. We sang a few songs, which didn't go too well because everybody remembered oldies but was a bit fuzzy on the lyrics. Then all of a sudden the Patriarch rose at his place and intoned "My Country 'tis of Thee" and carried through with the words for the

entire first stanza. He then explained that many years ago he learned those words for use at an occasion when he appeared before an English speaking audience. Those are probably the only English words that he knows!

Experiences like our Thanksgiving dinner indicate some of the by-products of the Council. We have an opportunity to meet bishops from all over the world, not only in the more or less formal atmosphere of the council chamber, but also under the relaxed and informal atmosphere of social functions of different kinds, to say nothing about the coffee bars during the congregations. At least this generation of bishops will have a little more of a cosmopolitan attitude. No matter how much the curia may try to revert to the status quo ante the present generation of bishops will not be contained within such narrow limits but will have a better understanding of and greater interest in the church Universal. And if Pope Paul succeeds in effecting the reform of the curia, even though this will be a slow and gradual process, a great deal of the provincialism will be destroyed. In this respect the Church simply cannot remain the same and we cannot remain untouched by the spirit of the "Second Pentecost" which is the Council.

Things were rather quiet in Rome during the past week, with the exception of the flurry caused by Father Ralph M. Wiltgen when a release by the SVD News Service which Father Ralph has been running since the first session, fell into the hands of some newspaper man who produced a story run by the Rome Daily American on the front page of the November 24 issue. The headline was somewhat sensational: "Irregularity charged in Council procedure."

Father Ralph a few days previously had issued a release which was not a straight factual statement, but was an effort to plead a case. He referred to a petition signed allegedly by about 450 Council Fathers asking that the Council include a strong and direct condemnation of Communism. He charged that this petition was pigeon-holed by a Council official so that it would not appear in the schema on the Church in the World Today, in the section dealing with atheism. He went on to say that "The fact that such a representative document could be withheld by a single man from reaching the proper Council commission to which it was directed is one of the great tragedies of this second Vatican Council.

It is true that when the revised schema was returned to the council fathers on November 13 the text pertaining to atheism remained unchanged indicating that the petition had been ignored. As indicated in this diary earlier, there was a feverish activity on November 15 to get some modi in order to get a last minute inclusion of the condemnation of communism into the final text. Whether any attention will be paid to these modi remains to be seen when we have the final vote on the manner in which modi were disposed of next week.

The Daily American story indicated that Msgr. Achille Glorieux, secretary of the commission handling schema 13 was the responsible party since he did not pass the petition on to the full commission or subcommission. Thereupon Felici and Tisserant are supposed to have investigated this matter, which they regarded as a serious breach of Council procedure; they also pinned the blame on Glorieux. According to the story, they became so disturbed over this incident that they personally reported it to the Holy Father. The story ends: "The mixed Commission has meanwhile officially acknowledged that it was guilty of neglect in this matter."

What the final outcome of this incident will be, one can only guess. It is possible that it will be squashed entirely since it is hard to know just how accurate Father Ralph's release and the Daily American story really were. There also is the fact that the Holy Father wants to go to Poland next year for the millennial celebration. An outright condemnation of communism by

name would not be a good preparation of such a trip. The Polish bishops themselves do not want such a formal condemnation now nor did they ever want one since the beginning of the Council. They have consistently opposed such action from the very first general congregation in the first session when the Council issued a message to the world. But the die-hard conservatives, especially in Italy, Spain and South America are still clamoring for such a condemnation. I am sure that they are convinced that the Council would be guilty of a serious breach of responsibility if it did not formally condemn something before we adjourned!!! I cannot understand that mentality; schema 13 very definitely makes a pronouncement on atheism and points out its dangers in our generation. But the schema tries to word this statement in a manner that will help people understand the dangers of atheism, something which would not be the case if there simply a solemn condemnation. Pope John asked the Council to open doors, not slam them in the face of the people whom we are trying to reach.

This morning there was a news story to the effect that Pope Paul asks that the text of schema 13 on "responsible parenthood" be toned somewhat and that greater emphasis be placed on the obligation of Catholics not to use any method of family planning which is condemned by the church. But there still is no indication of when the statement will be issued on this subject or what form it will take. Dr. Noonan, a member of the special commission is in town and gave an excellent speech last night (which unfortunately I missed). But there is no indication whether this commission is now meeting or has met or will meet. I feel that this delay is most harmful because the confusion on the subject is growing by the day, not only among Catholic people, but also among confessors. The reports from lay people that contradictory advice is being given by different confessors, sometimes in the same parish are becoming more frequent. I greatly fear that the whole fabric of authority in the Church is being seriously weakened by all this delay, I feel that whatever statement is finally made by Paul will consist essentially in a reaffirmation of the traditional teaching on the subject; but the longer the statement is delayed the greater will the reaction be when it does come.

NOVEMBER 30: 165th Gen. Cong.; Agagianian presiding, present 1922.

There is something wrong with the report in the L'Osservatore that there were only 1922 council fathers present at the congregation this morning. This is evident from the fact that 2229 votes were cast in the first ballot this morning.

This morning Bishop Blomjous and Bishop Ribeiro of Goias in Brazil were both present, making the first time in the fourth session that all six bishops in our row were present. In fact this is the first General Congregation that Bishop Ribeiro attended this year. I find it very difficult to communicate with him since he speaks only Portuguese and Italian; any effort at communicating with him in Latin or English is simply wasted effort. I am surprised to find anybody who knows less Latin than I do!

This morning they distributed the copy of the schema on "De Presbyterorum Ministerio et Vita" along with the text that has been revised according to the modi that had been submitted. The vote on the acceptance or rejection of the emendations will be taken at a General Congregation Thursday morning December 2.

They also distributed two "Intimatios" this morning giving us the direction for the public sessions to be held on December 7. These documents give another example of how completely the curia lives in the past. The title of each document reads like this: "Intimatio per Cursores Facienda." !!!!! Before the days of easy communication by phone or direct contact on frequent occasions such as we have during the general congregations, "cursores" or messengers or couriers were the accepted means of communication. To entitle an

announcement as being made by means of a courier makes one think of the eighteenth century or earlier times. This may be a very small matter and might be merely amusing, if it were not a symptom of the state of mind of the people in the curia. This is not merely a nostalgic effort to keep some relics of the past alive out of mere curiosity; it is an indication of the age of the thinking. They not only communicate with us through couriers; they send messages or make announcements that could in every detail have been brought by couriers of the 16th century! One could very well tolerate the costumes of the Swiss Guards or the attendants at the Vatican, if the clothes they wear were designed merely to produce a dramatic setting for the work of the Holy See or to provide a show for tourists; but the whole thing strikes me as tragic when you can see from day to day how completely the people in the Vatican live in those bygone ages. It is true, they talk of poverty and evangelism, etc.; but they talk about these things in the context of 17th century conditions. It is difficult to understand why the appeal of John XXIII to let in some fresh air; to talk the language of the present generation has not had the slightest effect on the minds of people like Ruffini, Staffa, Felici, etc. That is why they are fighting a running battle right down to the close of the Council against any changes in their pattern of thought and action. That is what frightens me so much over what the prospects are for the future, once the bishops have left Rome and the curia will have little or no competition to overcome in their efforts to keep the Holy Father a prisoner on the Chair of Peter.

The story is around that within the last few days the Consilium for implementing the Liturgy turned over a project they had completed in their work on some phases of the liturgy aside from the Mass, to the Holy Father for approval. His Holiness submitted it to the Secretariat of State. The document was promptly returned to the Holy Father with the votum; "This is not opportune at this time and should be delayed! Non sefedina.

I am afraid that this will happen to many things that the Holy Father plans to do in a program of following up the Council. The curia is absolutely deaf to the appeal of the Holy Father made in his homily at the public session on December 18 in which he asked everyone - bishops, clergy, religious and people to pick up the torch which is now being handed on by the Council and translate into action the matters on which the Council legislated. I am sure that many in the curia feel themselves divinely commissioned to sabotage as much of the work of the Council as possible in order to "save the Church from the evil consequences of the ill-advised action of the bishops from the world outside of Rome". The wild ravings of the monsignor who was quoted at length in a French publication during the third session relative to the character and work of the bishops from outside of Rome may not be repeated publicly by the curialists; but I am sure these ideas are harbored by many of them.

I went way off on a tangent when recalling the title of the intimatio that was distributed during the congregation this morning! The task of taking the ten ballots on the manner in which the modi on Missions were handled was very much routine. The whole process was completed by 12:15, even though there was an Oriental Mass which lasted until ten o'clock and in spite of a very long relatio by Father Schutte.

It was a pleasant surprise to see how well the modi concerning the administration of the work of the Congregation of the Propagation of Faith were handled. There is general satisfaction over the set-up which is put on paper; we can only hope that it will actually be put into practice in good faith.

This was a very delicate matter. After all, the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith is an agency of the Holy Father; its task is to direct the work of the missions, i.e., it should be

providing most of the dynamism behind the evangelization of the world which is the basic task of the Church. It should provide the leadership in obtaining the assistance that missionaries need in their work. It should reach down into every parish to inspire the people to be missionaries in their own right and in discharge of their duties to "preach the gospel to every creature." Certainly, the public image projected by the congregation of the Propagation of the Faith during the past century and more was far from the ideal proclaimed by Our Lord. In fact the Church as a whole has been so far from the ideal in missionary activity that such words as "witness." and "evangelism" have been appropriated to themselves by the Protestants.

The missionaries in the field had a right to be dissatisfied with the manner in which Propagation has functioned. It was a tremendously important matter for them to get some of the conditions corrected. When they acted as though they wanted to take some of the power out of the hands of Propagation, they were not disloyal to the Holy Father and were not trying "to clip his wings"; they were interested in the basic work of the Church.

At the same time it is obvious that since the Propagation is a Roman Congregation and such an agency of the Holy Father, they could not expect that the Holy Father would not want a situation in which he could not control the designation of the membership of that Congregation. Yet, as Bishop Blomjous said, the missionaries took steps to ask for more than they could possibly get in order to dramatize the desperate situation. The technique was successful because the present wording of the schema clears the way for correction of most of the defects. The Episcopal Conferences will not elect the representatives of the missionaries in the field on the Congregation; but there will be such representation and the Episcopal Conferences will be consulted (*auditis conferentis episcopalibus*) when appointments are made to the Congregations. And these representatives can not be ignored. They will have a deliberative vote when there is question of determining policies to be recommended to the Holy Father for approval. In this way there will be no infringing on the authority of the Holy Father; he will have the final and decisive word. But at least there will be some people who know the missions, work in and/or for the missions who will have a voice in defining policies both in actual mission work and in the collection and distribution of funds to be devoted to the missions.

We were surprised upon arrival at the aula this morning to see that the Holy Father attended the opening Mass. This was entirely unannounced. The Holy Father remained only for the Mass and took no part except to give the final blessing. It was a most gracious gesture on his part after the sad experience he had a year ago when he came to the aula and spoke in the defense of the utterly inadequate schema consisting of a few propositions which was submitted under pressure from Agagianian; one could not blame him if he had refused to show any special interest in the document which was now being substituted for the one rejected by the council fathers last year. I like to think that the Holy Father took this extraordinary step, first, to emphasize the supreme importance of the work of evangelization in the Church, and secondly, specifically to approve of the new document which was developed on orders from the council fathers at the time they rejected the earlier schema.

In any case, the Holy Father was present for the Mass, and then left immediately without any comment on the document on which we proceeded to vote.

Felici announced the results of only the first three of the ballots. They indicate that the Council will give overwhelming approval to the whole document. There were only 20, 18 and 26 negative votes, respectively in the ballots on which Felici reported before the close of the congregation.

This evening we went to the reception given by the American Ambassador for the US bishops and periti. It seems that every English speaking priest or lay person in Rome was invited to this reception. It was close to 8:00 PM when we got there. By that time the crowd had thinned out, but I was told that there was a tremendous crowd earlier.

DECEMBER 1: The pressure of the last week before the end of the Council is on. While there was considerable leisure this morning to get caught up with the paper work, the round of receptions and dinners also started today. At 6:00 PM we went to the Grand Hotel for a reception given by Senator and Mrs. Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota. Gene at one time spent a few weeks in the novitiate at St. Johns; he left the novitiate during the summer and in the fall registered at St. John's in the major seminary. He had been accepted by Bishop Muench as a student for Fargo. He did not remain in the seminary any longer than he had been in the novitiate. But he has always been a fine Catholic gentleman and is making his mark in politics. He is now the senior senator from Minnesota and ranks next to Sen. Fulbright on the Foreign relations committee. Senator McCarthy, George Schuster of Notre Dame and Father Colman Harry OSB were at Munich to speak at some program sponsored by the West German Government. The importance of that occasion is evidenced by the fact that Chancellor Erhard attended the sessions. From there Father Coleman and the McCarthy's came to Rome and will remain here till after the close of the Council.

It can be seen how crowded the Holy Father is at this time, from the fact that no private audience could be obtained for Senator McCarthy; the best they could do was a "Bachio mano" following the public audience today. This means that McCarthy (and several others) were present for the general audience and then was given a few minutes privately with the Holy Father following the public audience. The reception was a very selective affair. Congressman Olson and his wife from Minnesota were there; Cardinal Shehan, Abp. John Krol, O'Boyle and the hierarchy from Minnesota, plus Abp. Byrne, who was well known to the McCarthy's in the Cities. There were only a few priests, including Abbot Baldwin, and very few laymen there. The reception was not of earthshaking importance, but was an effort on the part of McCarthy to show a courtesy to some of the Council Fathers and periti whom he knew. It was the first time I had an occasion to meet either the senator or his wife.

This reception was only the beginning of the evening! Father Herman Schmidt SJ, who had been at St. John's for the summer school in June and July and who conducted a workshop on the liturgy for us in Fargo during the first week of August, 1965, invited Abbot Baldwin, Father Colman, Father Lessard and myself to a dinner at 7:30. We picked up Bishop Bartholome at the McCarthy reception, which added a bit to our transportation problem but also added much to the enjoyment of the occasion. Before we got very far the transportation problem became acute; when we got to the Gregorianum, Father Abbot, Father Colman and Father Schmidt said they would take a cab and Father Lessard was to bring Bishop Bartholome and myself. But, when Father Lessard returned to his car, which Bishop Bartholome and I had not left, and tried to start his motor, everything was dead! He then went back to see Father Schmidt and arrange for other transportation. He didn't return for quite some time, only to report that he couldn't find the others. Apparently they had found the last cab in the area and took off for the restaurant without delay. So Father looked for another cab for us to follow; but no luck. He then walked to the Casa Santa Maria only about a hundred meters away and borrowed a car and chauffeur there to take us to the restaurant while one of the fathers took charge of Father Lessard's car. We finally got to our restaurant at just a few minutes before 9:00 PM. This was a good hour for the Romans, but slightly late for Council Fathers and periti!

Father Schmidt brought us to "Zi Gaetana", Via Cola Di Rienzi, which is only a block or two from St. Peter's. We had a delightful evening. The restaurant has more "atmosphere" than most of the popular eating places and apparently Father Schmidt was well known there. The food was excellent but also different from what you generally get. But the real piece de resistance was the conversation, which in the beginning was a bit difficult until we asked the waiter to turn down the loudspeaker. (That is one thing I hate about so many good eating places in Rome; their music is too loud - usually reinforced by a PA system.) Even the conversation connected with ordering the dinner was most interesting; Father Schmidt apparently knows all the dishes offered on the menu and went through a most enjoyable explanation of each item before we were permitted to decide what we wanted.

There was a great variety of topics discussed during the meal - we didn't leave the place till 11:00 PM, early for natives but much too late for us. I brought up the rumor that the Secretariat of State did not want to clear for publication the latest project completed by the Consilium for the implementation of the liturgy. Father Schmidt immediately filled in further details after confirming the fact. This project dealt with the sacrament of baptism which tried to carry out the mandate of the Constitution to revise the Ritual.

The project was returned to the Holy Father with a "non expedire". But Father Schmidt was not very much upset over this incident; he went on to explain that this has happened to every single instruction or document of whatever type the Consilium has prepared since the inception of its work; he assured me that this did not and will not in the future prevent the promulgation of the various items prepared by the Consilium. This is another example of the stride the conservative elements of the curia take towards the work of the Council.

Another topic of conversation was the ecumenical liturgy which is to take place at St. Paul's Outside of the Walls, at 1:30 PM on Saturday. There seems to be no doubt of the fact that this function is wholly the idea of the Holy Father himself; he personally prepared the ritual to be followed. It is not to be Mass but something along the lines of a Bible Vigil. The important thing is that the Protestant and other observers will participate, and the Holy Father personally will participate in the recitation of psalms, prayers and hymns. He is also expected to preach a homily, which will be a historic pronouncement, no matter how simple or how brief it will be. Father Schmidt indicated that there is tremendous opposition among the conservatives, and it is only the sheer power of the Holy Father's personal initiative that makes it possible to have the affair at all. Bishop Hoch met Father Stransky the same evening. He said that this affair has been in the making since the middle of the summer; it has been violently opposed at every step, and is coming off only because the Holy Father insisted; and every step along the way he meets opposition with a very firm order. In the beginning, when it became apparent that it could not be prevented, an effort was made to have it absolutely private, with only the Holy Father and his entourage meeting privately with the observers for the function, without any public announcement or any invitation beyond the observers and strict exclusion of everybody else. At the Holy Father insistence the scope of the liturgy and the participation was expanded. But when the announcement appeared in the paper earlier in the week, it was still stated that the general public and the press would be excluded! But Stransky is hopeful that in the end, the affair will be public and will even go out on TV live!

This is a historic event; and certainly the conservatives are very near-sighted in trying to hush it up. Whether they allow the press to be present or not, the story will be written and will be published. It certainly will put the conservatives in a very bad light if the reporters tell all the world that they were not admitted to the function; something like that certainly will not help the position of the conservatives! But it seems that they have not even started to get over the

mentality which thinks its most effective means for doing good is to repress or condemn every idea that did not originate with them.

There was a brief reference made to the fact that the Holy Father was present for the Mass at the General Congregation devoted to the balloting on the mission schema. I remark that in my opinion it was a most gracious gesture on the part of the Holy Father by his presence at the Mass, though he did not remain for the voting, which was purely routine. And also it took great courage on his part in view of the fact that the previous schema was voted down and the present one substituted for it. Father Schmidt remarked that the Holy Father was very happy with the present Decree on the subject of missions. He was very anxious to show this publicly because he wanted to wipe out the last vestige of the impression created in the third session. He added that the Holy Father last year severely reprimanded Agagianian for maneuvering him into such an awkward and utterly false position in relation to the previous document. The way it turned out, the whole affair may prove to be providential. For one thing it highlighted the unrealistic situation in the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The efforts to entrench themselves in their position, they will find that their efforts have boomeranged and they will find that the Holy Father will follow up the matter more carefully to make sure that the letter and the spirit of the new schema will be enforced. This will be all to the good for the work of evangelizing the world. Yet at this point, one might ask whether they have realized this development has taken place. Agagianian presided at the General Congregation at which the final voting took place on November 30. In any case I am sure that he did not enjoy the huge majorities by which the final texts were approved!

DECEMBER 2: 166th General Congregation, Lercaro presiding, present 2280.

Without delay the voting on the disposition of modi of the schema on De Presbyterorum Ministerio et Vita was taken up. Felici began by calling attention to the fact that the word "sibi" in line 19 of page 10 was to be omitted. A rather long relatio was read by Archbishop Marty of Rheims. There were five ballots on the various chapter and one on the schema as a whole. Felici announced the results of the first two ballots.

The corrected text of the schema on the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World Today was distributed during this session. The book has 256 pages and gives the final text, the general relatio, the modi that are proposed for both the First and the Second Part. It had the report on the disposition of the modi only for Part One. It was announced that the report on the disposition of the modi in Part Two will be distributed to us tomorrow, Friday, December 3. We are to receive them at our place of residence, whereas those who reside permanently in Rome in a private dwelling are to pick up their copy at the General Secretariat tomorrow during regular office hours.

The voting on the five chapters on Ministry and Life of Priests proceeded very quickly. The final vote on the entire project was already taken by 11:15.

Since it is expected that the voting on Schema 13 will be rather prolonged, the Moderators decided that instead of calling of the meeting at that time Bishop Garrone should make the general relatio on schema 13 at this meeting. This was done and we still got out at 11:45.

The relatio cleared up the very controversial point which had been raised last week by Father Wiltgen SVD in connection with the petition of the 450 who insisted on having an explicit and formal condemnation of communism. Bishop Garrone went to great pains to explain this incident. First he called attention to the fact that explicit mention was made of the feelings of the commission and this stand was explained (in relations priori mens Commissionis explicite

est) in the previous relatio. There were 209 modi which asked for such a condemnation. Already among the interventions that were submitted in writing 332 asked this same action in exactly the same words. These interventions, even though they were received on time, in the office of our commission, were not turned over to the members of the commission; and therefore not examined at the proper time. But an examination was made of the modi which repeated the interventions word for word, and they were rejected for various reasons which will be explained in the pertinent passages; but in the matter of condemnation of atheism, reference is made to the text where such condemnation is explicitly expressed. This probably will not satisfy the die-hards, but it certainly proves that there was no irregularity in procedure in this matter.

This evening at 4:30 Father Lessard, Bishop Hastrich and I went to Sta. Sabina for the reception tendered by the Master General of the Dominicans. They had a concert in the Church preceding the reception. The concert was a rare delight. An opening and closing number was played on the organ by Monsignor Antonio Allegra, the number one organist at St. Peter's and Joan Marie Moynagh sang five solos. Miss Moynagh is a young aspiring soprano who is singing professionally. In fact, she is to have an audition at La Scala in the near future. She was guest soloist several years ago at a concert by the Fargo-Moorhead Symphony orchestra. She got caught in Fargo during a blizzard and couldn't get out of town for three days. Father Durkin and Father Lessard met her at the time and enjoyed the benefit of free concerts as different people entertained her at dinner while being marooned in Fargo. I had an occasion to hear her under equally informal circumstances during the third session. She lived for two months at the Pensione Sitea while Msgr. Yzermans and some of the observers lived there. Yzermans invited Bishop Hoch and myself to dinner along with the Cushmans and Outlers. After the dinner Miss Moynagh, who had not been at dinner with us, very graciously gave us a brief impromptu "concert" of Irish songs! Whether she has the stuff to go to the top at La Scala or not, I don't know; but she has a beautiful voice and a delightful personality.

The reception following the concert at Sta. Sabina was like any other except that Miss Moynagh (the Gaelic for Monaghan) gave us another impromptu concert of Irish songs. Her home is in the Diocese of Worcester.

DECEMBER 3: Yesterday we received the first volume of the final report from the commission that took care of Schema 13. Yesterday's volume contained the final, revised text, the corrections that were made, and the disposition of the Modi in the First Part, as well as the quaesita on which we voted in connection with Part One and Part Two. Today they delivered to us the second volume of this report containing the record of the disposition made of the modi in connection with the Second Part.

The First volume of this report has 255 pages and the Second Volume has 155, or a total of 410 pages! This is an indication of the amount of "paper work" done in connection with Schema 13; there was more of this in Schema 13 than in any other schema in the entire Council.

Another point highlighted by this report is the efficient job that has been done by the Vatican printing establishment throughout the Council. The work on this report of the commission was completed by the Commission on Tuesday and the copy delivered to the print shop; on Thursday morning the first volume was delivered to the aula and distributed to us; the second volume was delivered at our places of residence this morning. This is an indication of the tremendous speed with which they have been getting the printing done. When this material

comes to us we always find it done in a neat, attractive, and efficient manner. Typographical errors are relatively rare; the composition is excellent, the workmanship generally is on a high place, and the volumes are not stapled but stitched and provided with an attractive cover. They work around the clock, but even at that it is quite an achievement to get two volumes with a total of 410 pages set, printed, bound and delivered in 48 hours!

This evening Archbishop Binz had a dinner honoring the McCarthy's at Tre Scalini in Piazza Navona. We also saw the booths displaying Christmas ornaments and toys which are set up in the Piazza there; it is quite a sight.

DECEMBER 4: 167th General Congregation, Cardinal Doepfner presiding. Felici began to say that he would have many things to talk about today during the intervals between ballots. Then he continued with one of his rare puns: "Secretarius Generalis semper Felicia pronuntiat!!!!"

The first announcement was to the effect that the Holy Father will give a "golden ring" to each of the council fathers, as a symbol of the bond of unity that exists between the Holy Father and the bishops through the world. These rings will be distributed at the Congregation next Monday since it would not be very practical to distribute them during the public session either on Tuesday or Wednesday. This announcement drew considerable applause, but there was a questioning look on the faces of many of the council fathers. It is too bad that Felici placed such emphasis on the fact that it will be a ring of gold. This seems to be out of character along with the emphasis that has been placed frequently during the Council upon the Church as the "Church of the poor". In my opinion it certainly would have been much better if he had said that the Holy Father will give "a ring" or "a plain ring" as a symbol of the unity. No doubt the ring (at least I hope) will be plain and quite inexpensive; but by describing it as a "golden ring" a bad impression will be created, no matter what explanations are given. This, of course, does not obscure the fact that this is a most gracious gesture on the part of the Holy Father; but it could have been handled a little more prudently by those around him.

Felici also announced that a diploma will be given to each council father on Monday. Since each council father's name will appear on the diploma, it will be necessary that we remain in our seats during the Monday session so as to avoid hopeless confusion in the distribution of the diplomas and the rings. A message expressing the high regard and the gratitude of the Observers was read by Felici. I do hope that a copy of that message will be made available to all of us; it sounded very good in its Latin form. A message from Cardinal Wyszynski was read announcing the millennial celebration to be observed in Poland in 1966 in commemoration of the coming of Christianity to Poland. They also distributed a full color copy (it is very large) of the picture of Our Lady of Czestochowa.

An announcement was made at the fact that an International Eucharistic Congress is to be held in Bogota, in 1968.

The Liturgical Observance for the Promotion of Unity was announced. It is to be held this evening at St. Paul's Outside of the Walls. Attendance will be restricted to council fathers only, along with the Observers. We are to wear house cassocks, without Ferriaola. Felici had a bit of fun by using the Latin word for ferriaola, which nobody understood.

Twelve ballots were cast in connection with the disposition of the modi in Schema 13. We were through with these ballots in sufficient time to get the final vote on the entire schema, but the vote was not taken because of the fact that the votes on the individual chapters were not

all tabulated and announced. Technically the vote on the whole chapter cannot be taken until each chapter individually has received a two thirds majority. I am sure they did not want to take a chance because of the controversial nature of a few of the chapters in part two of Schema 13.

Archbishop Hannan got his name in the papers quite frequently in connection with his efforts to get a change in the draft of the number pertaining to nuclear weapons. He objected to the quote taken from *Pacem in Terris* on the ground that it was used out of context and furthermore because the whole paragraph represents, in his mind, a faulty translation of the original text which had been drafted in Italian. In other words he claims that because of this faulty translation the "official" Latin text used in the Council does not reflect the thinking of the Commission. He has been fighting this point ever since the first draft of this section came to the floor during the third session. When the matter was under debate, he made a campaign to get many written interventions; when the first voting on the passage took place he made an effort to get many modi; and now that the final vote on the chapter came up, he enlisted the aid of Spellman, Shehan, O'Boyle along with a few other bishops from South America, Mexico and Africa. He repeated the objections he had raised previously in a letter addressed to the council fathers in General and widely distributed among them. He also got the same group to sign a letter addressed to the US bishops.

This letter caused quite a ripple among the council fathers to a point where many of them began asking US bishops about the matter in an effort to find out whether we as a body supported Hannan and what our objections were to the revised text.

Before the actual voting took place today, Cardinal Shehan withdrew his name. But I am sure that, even though the US bishops generally did not support Hannan, there were many other bishops who followed Hannan's suggestion that we vote non placet on this paragraph. There will be a great deal of interest next Monday in the votes cast on this point.

Bishop Hoch was at the press panel this afternoon. He said that no one present agreed with Hannan and that the reporters were pretty rough on his efforts to get this change made. They maintained that his attitude was not justified by the facts; that it was he and not the commission that was reading things out of context. The Daily American on Sunday headlined a story about the efforts of "American Cardinals" to swing these votes; their write-up was not very sympathetic to this whole campaign.

This evening Bishop Hoch had a dinner here at Salvator Mundi for a group that proved to be most interesting. Present were: Senator McGovern from South Dakota, Dr. Cushman, Observer from Duke University, Father Thomas Stransky C.P. of the Secretariat for Unity, Father Colman Barry, OSB, Father Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., Abbot Baldwin, Msgr. Conway, Msgr. Yzermanns, Bishop Hoch and myself.

Senator McGovern is in Rome to be present at the FAO meeting; he is on his way home from Vietnam. After the dinner we questioned him for about a half hour and he gave a most interesting and shrewd report of the situation in Vietnam, basically and practically from the standpoint of strategy in day to day fighting. He probably allowed his judgment to be colored a bit because he did not want to be publicly critical of the administration's foreign policy. He defended the bombing which was being done because he said that the American command forces are the ablest he had ever seen in operation (he had been a bomber pilot during World War II). He did admit that some civilian population was being killed because of the very nature of the situation: the Viet Cong is everywhere and normal battle strategy is not too practical

because the enemy is everywhere. He stressed the fact that the Viet Cong troops are political agents as much as fighters. They are not looking to conquer territory and hold it; they want to get into an area in any possible way, do their propagandizing there and then move out to repeat the operation elsewhere. They want to get the people to think like communists.

He was questioned about the character and stability of the Vietnam government. His answers were not encouraging. The people are simply not advanced to a stage where they can govern themselves democratically. They know nothing but autocratic government. Politically the situation is fluid and forms a very weak base for our operations there. The different army officers - everybody seems to be a general - are in a constant struggle to gain control. The present General Ki (? spelling) is in a bit stronger position because he lives on the USA Air Force Base! McGovern said that without question of a doubt, the government would disintegrate within twenty-four hours after departure of US troops, if such a move were made. Naturally the questions then were: why do we stay there and bring in so many troops if we can not build up anything permanent ? ? ?

The most penetrating question was asked by Dr. Cushman: Since we have never declared war and are operating strictly by presidential order as we did in Korea, are we not doing a great deal of harm by eroding our constitutional system which provides that only the Congress can vote a declaration of war. We will soon have 200,000 troops in Vietnam; every increase invites a proportionate step up of the movement of troops from North Vietnam and step-up of political activity. Where will this end? Is it a healthy situation that so many US men can be exposed to death in battle on the basis of decisions made in the Pentagon and the White House.

McGovern answered this in detail. It is obvious that his thought ran in the same vein as Dr. Cushman's. He said he asked those same questions on the Senate floor, as did others. But he said they never get very far before they were approached privately by emissaries of the administration and asked to stop because such a line is harmful to our interests.

I asked him why Hanoi with its port and huge oil storage facilities has never been bombed; I had been told that if this were done the war would quickly be over because all supplies come through that port. I asked further: Is it true that these oil interests are owned by US, English and one other group of investors, and it is from pressure of these interests that the property is not destroyed? McGovern answered that this is only a modicum of truth in this charged, even though much harm could be done to Viet Cong war efforts. But to stop the war would not be that simple.

Father Stransky spoke at some length about the future of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. I was shocked when he said that this secretariat legally will cease to exist on December 8 when the end of the Council is formally proclaimed by the Holy Father. This secretariat was set up by action of Pope John for the purpose of bringing the observers to the Council and to look after them while here at the Council. Later their competence to present any schemata to the Council was challenged by the Holy Office, which claimed sole competence in the matters on which the Secretariat worked - ecumenism, non-Christian religions, and religious liberty. Both Pope John and Paul clarified their status on that point. As a consequence of this we have been able to get schemata covering these subjects onto the floor, even though the Holy Office never stopped trying to prevent consideration of any of these schemata, and failing this, they never stopped trying to nullify everything that was done in these fields.

Of course, nobody else present had thought of this angle of the situation. We all had simply taken for granted that the real work of the secretariat was only to begin now in promoting the dialogue with the other Christian churches.

Father Stransky explained that, looking at the matter, from a purely legal or canonical standpoint, he will be free to return to the States on December 9. But he said practically all of this might be providential. He does not expect that the Secretariat will be allowed to pass out of existence. But at the same time the matter of retaining it and what its competence might be should not be pressed just at this time because right now there is too much uncertainty about what the whole Curia will be within a few years. It was providential that the Secretariat was set up as an independent agency apart from anyone of the congregations and free from control by it. That would have been fatal, because if the secretariat had been under the jurisdiction of any congregation during the Council it simply would have been choked off and nothing would have been accomplished. Being an independent agency gave it real freedom to do many things because Cardinal Bea, the head of the secretariat, was directly responsible to no one but the Holy Father. Stransky related the story of the first meeting. Bea started by saying: We are only one half hour old; we have no past, but only a future; we have no antiquated rules, but only good sense in meeting present tasks assigned to us as a guide to our action; we are responsible to no one but God and the Holy Father! Stransky intimated that this was the strong element in their position. By not being tied to the regular rules of operation in the Congregations, they could make their own rules and establish their own precedents. He feels that the Secretariat will certainly be retained, though it may take some time to formalize their position. That very probably will be done in conjunction with the reformation of the curia, along with the secretariats for non-Christian religions and for non-believers.

There was a most interesting flow of conversation on various topics, and all in all, this was one of the most delightful evenings of this fourth session.

I should mention the subject of the Prayer Service for Unity which took place in St. Paul's Outside of the Walls this afternoon at 5:00. At Father Lessard's suggestion we went early and were on time to get into the third row of seats, which gave us a good view of everything and enabled us to understand everything that was said. The attendance was amazing. I have not seen any reports on the number present, but it could well have been 1,500 council fathers. They had benches covered with green cloth (there were no back rests, which made it a bit uncomfortable) that filled the entire width of the center nave at least two-thirds of the way back. So far as I could see, practically all seats were filled.

This ceremony impressed me as much as any other during the entire fourth session. It certainly was an historic event. If anyone had told me before this Council started that before it ended there would be a joint prayer service in St. Paul's, with the Holy Father presiding and preaching a homily while the scripture readings were read by Observers, I would have considered such a suggestion a futile dream! I was particularly delighted to hear Dr. Outler reading one of the passages from Scriptures. He was equal to the occasion.

At the point where the Holy Father introduced the Lord's Prayer in Latin and each one present recited it in his own language I was overcome with emotion; it is the first time in a long time that I said the Our Father in tears. The Holy Father's homily was in French, I could get only the general trend of his remarks; but they were very graciously received. I do hope that we will receive an English copy before we leave.

After the service was over the Observers were invited to a parlor where each received from the Holy Father a "diploma" evidencing his attendance at the Council, and also a cast bronze hand bell, about eight inches high, which had been designed and cast by one of the better known artists of Rome. When Dr. Cushman came to the dinner a bit later, he seemed to be walking on a cloud. For any bishop who is interested in doing anything at all to implement the Decree on Ecumenism, this event was an answer to a prayer. The very fact that the Holy Father participated personally, and had been the one who originated the idea, planned the details of the service and used his pressure to get it done is a great help to us when the time comes to plan something in our own dioceses. We need not hesitate to make it a real joint service with Protestants participating. It will also clear the way for us to reciprocate if later we are invited to something similar done under Protestant auspices. It should do more to promote earnest dialogue than any amount of theoretical material in the Decree or any number of suggestions in directives. The biggest help will derive from the fact that no one can criticize us for following the example set by the Holy Father.

Bishop Hoch had occasion since then to meet Dr. Outler and questioned him about his reactions to this event. He was very enthusiastic in his praise of the manner in which the whole affair was planned and carried. He said that the matter was planned in conjunction with the Observers themselves; so it wasn't just something that was thrust upon them out of the blue. They were given an opportunity to discuss the whole thing, to make their own suggestions and express their reactions, and approve of the final arrangement.

Outler stressed the fact that this was a genuinely ecumenical function, making a clear distinction between joint prayer and *communicatio in sacris*, i.e., participating in a denominational worship service which would or could have controversial undertones inimical to dogmatic beliefs of the different denominations. Outler said that this was a great moment in the spread of ecumenism.

There were also some characteristically Roman jarring notes. The published instructions concerning this event provided that no one would be admitted except Observers, and council fathers. The *periti*, general public and especially the press would be excluded. Then when we get there we are greeted by a whole flock of cameramen, newsmen and radio-TV men. I just naturally took it for granted, that with such a crowd, everybody was properly represented and that the news media would all be happy. But then on Sunday night we ran into several newsmen at Bob Kaiser's reception; they were boiling. They had been excluded because - that is what they said - they could not afford to pay the bribe that was necessary to get in.

The *L'Osservatore*, contrary to what I expected, carried a big front page story with a few excellent pictures. I certainly did not expect them to print the entire text of the Holy Father's homily; but they did, and on the front page at that.

Dr. Outler said that the Observers as a whole, took to the occasion very kindly and felt it was terrific. There was, however, some question on the part of the Observers from Germany and central Europe generally, about the propriety of having the Holy Father preside at the ceremony while all Observers sat down below, opposite the cardinal. They may have had a point, but Outler said this objection was not pressed very insistently and by relatively few. It would have been difficult to arrange anything different because there was no other personality there who could be considered an opposite number to the Holy Father.

All in all; it was a blessed day!!!

DECEMBER 5: This noon we were at the North American College for a farewell dinner given to the US Bishop's and the priest students at the Casa Santa Maria and all students at the College. Cardinals Cicognani, Pizzardo, Marella and our own Spellman, Ritter and Shehan were also there. It was a grand dinner (paid for by NCWC) and a very jovial occasion. No one complained of payment by NCWC because in the end it made no difference: it would have added to the deficit of accounts at the College.

Father McCool, SJ was here this afternoon to see Bishop Hoch and make a recording of a commentary on the Constitution on Divine Revelation. Bishop Hoch invited him and me to go out for dinner. We went to the Tre Scalini in the Piazza Navona. We were the first customers there and had a good dinner with extremely interesting conversation. McCool is a very delightful person.

From Tre Scalini we went directly to the quarters of the Loyola (Chicago) Roman branch for a reception given by Bob Kaiser. I learned from Father McCool just shortly before we went there that Sue Kaiser was also there. It was a real pleasure to see both of them; and I hope that our going there will be productive of at least a little good.

At the reception we saw many of the same people we used to see at Bob's receptions or open house during the first and second sessions, except that none of the Jesuits were there. Father McCool left us after he had dinner with us.

We chatted with several of the newsmen. It was from them that we learned of the fact that only Italian newsmen were admitted to the function at St. Paul's last night. And were they ever seething! In my opinion, if they have any evidence of the truth of their charge that the communications people who got in paid excessive bribes, they should make a formal complaint in a manner that will come to the attention of top people in the Curia. On the lower levels such techniques are common enough and no impression would be made.

We saw Msgr. George Higgins also. As we were leaving he told us that tomorrow morning there would be a break at the final General Congregation which we would like. He gave us no details and Bishop Hoch and I speculated about what it would be. We first thought up all kinds of dramatic possibilities. In the end, as we found out later, Bishop Hoch hit the matter exactly on the head. He said something will be done about the vote on Schema 13 as a whole to make it clear that the letter circulated by Archbishop Hannan and signed by Spellman et al was not an official representation on behalf of all US bishops! More of this tomorrow.

DECEMBER 6: 168th General Congregation, Suenens presiding, present 2392. The attendance at this congregation was amazing. A little later when the results of the one ballot were announced, there was a loud bit of applause as the figure who voted was announced. I did not check this point, but I am quite convinced that this is the largest attendance at any time during the third and fourth sessions. It is an indication that quite a number of bishops returned to Rome for the close of the Council after they have remained at home or gone home earlier in the session.

For some reason (revealed later) there was quite a delay before taking the ballot on Schema 13 as a whole, which was really the only important action of the General Session for today.

They started out by distributing final texts of the Constitution on Divine Revelation, The Lay Apostolate, and Ministry and Life of Priests. Then they also distributed the Ordo for the

celebration of the public session tomorrow, and the bulla proclaiming the Jubilee which is to run from January 1 to Pentecost, 1966.

Then Felici said "Bodie est Festum Sti. Nicolai, i.e. Santa Claus..." For that reason there will be gifts. They distributed a beautifully cast silver medal from the Roman government. The name of each council father inscribed on the back. We also received an invitation to a reception the evening of December 7 to be given by the Roman Government at the Campidoglio.

Finally they got around to distributing the famous "golden" ring over which Felici made such a fuss yesterday. Along with the ring there was a "diploma" issued to the council fathers as evidence of their participation in the Council. It is similar to the one given to the Observers at St. Paul's last night.

So far as I am concerned, there was a fly in the ointment: they did not have either diploma or medal for at least ten in our section. This is another example of the ability of the Romans to plan things in most minute detail, but then fall down in execution. We were told that we can pick them up either tomorrow or Wednesday afternoon at the General Secretary's Office.

The vote on the 13th Schema as a whole was taken in due time, after which Felici read the entire Constitution proclaiming the Holy Year.

The results of the vote on Schema 13 were announced at about 10:30 AM.

Of a total of 2373 votes 2111 were placet and 251 non placet. 11 were invalid. It is interesting to note that whereas there were 483 negative votes on Chapter 5 of the second part last Saturday, this morning there were only 251 today.

At 11:30 Felici announced that Schema 13 has been approved by the Holy Father tomorrow in the public session as originally hoped for. There was a prolonged round of applause. We were amazed when the final text of Schema 13 was handed to us just before 12:00 noon. When they learned of the voting on this Schema in its different parts last Saturday, they must have set to work immediately and stayed at it round the clock until they were through. They assumed that since all individual chapters were accepted, the entire Schema would also be accepted.

But that was in doubt for a while this morning. The big news that Msgr. Higgins prophesied last night was what Bishop Hoch guessed. There was a huddled conference between the Moderators, Presidency, Felici, Krol and Hannan at which time it had been suggested that Felici announce that the letter circulated in regard to Chapter V by Hannan et al was not an official statement by the US bishops. This was ruled out as being in violation of the Regolamenta. Then Felici, Hannan and Krol, along with someone else I do not recall, huddled during the Mass and finally went to call on the Holy Father. This took one half hour and accounts for the delay in getting down to business in the congregation. They suggested to the Holy Father the same as was contained in the letter, namely, that in view of the large negative votes, the entire schema be held in abeyance and turned over to Episcopal Conferences for consultation before promulgation at a later date. The Holy Father emphatically ordered that the vote on the whole Schema be taken according to the rules! The general congregation after dawdling along with so many things finally broke up when the schema in its final form was delivered to us.

According to Bishop Hoch's report, the press conference today - the last of the Council - was a dilly. The newsmen had a field day asking questions about the lifting of the excommunications hurled at each other by The Latin and the Orthodox Church, declaring each other heretics and schismatics. There apparently were many questions about technical details. Was this a lifting of the excommunication or a declaration of nullity. Was the original excommunication really valid since it probably was pronounced against Michael Cerulareus by virtue of faculties given by the pope who died before Humbertus actually used the faculty. etc. etc. They raised many questions on this subject, even to the point whether similar action would be taken in regard to the excommunication's imposed on Luther!!! Then somebody asked: Couldn't the Church simply grant a plenary indulgence to clear up the matter now!!

There was also a great deal of criticism of the wording of the Constitution proclaiming the Jubilee. Certainly the section on the special faculties, to be granted to confessors during the time of the Jubilee, presumably drafted by the Sacred Penitentiary, show absolutely no sign of any aggiornamento in that office. They talk about heretics, forbidden books, penalties incurred by rebellion against government, etc. as though these faculties are to be used in cases arising out of the fifteenth century. The newsmen were not slow to pick these points up.

Msgr. Higgins read a prepared statement in which he documented his assertion that Apb. Hannan was entirely wrong in his interpretation of the section on nuclear weapons, and that it was he who read passages of the document out of context and not the schema. I hope that this will lay this issue to rest and that we have heard the last of it. It is too bad that Abp Hannan should lose face so badly during the last days of the Council.

This is a sample of the ballots used during the Council.

It is one that my neighbor, Bishop Ribeiro, did not use.

On the extreme top edge is given from left to right:
first, seat number; secondly, number of the ballot; thirdly, name; fourthly, office, namely residential bishop; and finally, name of the Diocese, Goia.

VOTUM ON PAENITENTIAE OFFICIUM

Schema Constitutionis Apostolicae "De Disciplina Paenitentiali in Ecclesia" Omnino Non Placet..

The reasons for a negative vote on the proposed Constitution are as follows:

I. It is physically impossible to draft a law governing the practice of fast and abstinence which is fully applicable in all areas of the Church.

- 1/ Differences in climate and types of food which are available.
- 2/ Different economic conditions. A very large percentage of the people can not get enough food for an adequate diet on any day.
- 3/ This would mean that many indulgences would have to be granted immediately to make the new law meaningful in different areas.
- 4/ The only way in which an adequate penitential discipline can be spread to every section of the Church is to have the national or regional episcopal conferences develop the regulations according to the needs of their areas.

II. A distinction between different classes of the faithful (diocesan clergy, religious, novices, seminarians, etc.) would soon result in reducing all penitential practices to a minimum.

III. Any effort to prescribe rules governing the quantity or quality of food will usually lead to pure legalism resembling what our Lord condemned so roundly in the Pharisees. That approach weakens or will even destroy the penitential spirit. Making meat on Friday, etc., the difference between salvation and damnation is psychologically a poor approach to the question of penance.

It is suggested that the Constitution refrain from prescribing any day of fast or abstinence; but that the whole matter of penitential discipline be approached in a positive manner.

I. Propose a positive ideal of penance and self-denial which is possible of attainment by everybody according to his age, health, occupation and economic status, such an ideal should be proposed in this Constitution and then followed up by a program or education which would bear fruit over the years.

1/ Outline the theology underlying the need for penance.

2/ Give a strong Scriptural basis for penance with pertinent quotations from Old and New Testament. Surely many more telling quotations than the one from St. Paul are available.

3/ Emphasize the teaching and practice of Christ.

II. Exhort all faithful to cultivate the spirit of penance, not only in the proposed Constitution but also through a continuous educational program in the regular religion classes and catechetical sermons.

1/ Stress penance and self-denial as a part of our way of life.

2/ Positively correlate penitential practices to the daily practice of religion.

3/ Produce this effect through the integration of liturgical prayer and practice into the daily routine.

III. Emphasize that penance is a universal obligation:

1/ Because of our sinful state.

2/ Because Christ commanded it in word and practice.

3/ And not merely because the Church has made laws governing penitential practice.

..