

Series Eight—1977

ON THE INITIATIVE OF PAUL 6 AND SECRETARY OF STATE VILLOT, THE VATICAN STARTS TO PREPARE MINDS FOR COMMUNIST PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS

The first inkling of this initiative comes in June of this year. It starts in France. For the Vatican as for Moscow, France is the linchpin of Europe's political evolution, just as Germany is the linchpin of Europe's economic and military evolution. As France goes politically, so will go the rest of Western Europe—this is an axiom of Vatican geopolitics. Looking to the French national elections in March of 1978, Vatican officials reason that if the Communists, in alliance or not with the socialists, emerge as participants in government, this will be an example and a stimulus for Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

The French Bishops publish two documents in June of this year: on Marxism and Christianity, and on the condition of Christians in the world of the worker. Both are of Villot's (and ultimately of Paul's) inspiration.

The Bishops speak quite clearly. "Of course," they say, "Marxism and Christianity as philosophies are incompatible." But this incompatibility, they go on to say, does not allow us to refuse to welcome Marxists in government and elsewhere in public life. We must of course be vigilant and ask the right questions of Marxists. In sustained dialogue. And avoiding all rupture with them. But then we should leave them go to it. Why? Because: "We cannot ask religious faith to play a role which does not belong to religious faith. Now, religious faith is not supposed to inspire our actions."

Then, in the September 9 edition of the Vatican's *Osservatore Romano*, Vatican spokesman and mouthpiece for Paul 6, Federico Alessandrini, comes right out with it:

It is obvious that even a mere participation in power by the Communist parties in some Western countries such as Italy, France, and possibly Spain would mark a substantial success for the Soviet Union. . . . But as things stand, the hypothesis does not seem remote from reality. Nor can one see how the United States could oppose an action carried out in line with the self-determination of peoples.

This is a clear warning to the United States that the Vatican has made up its own mind; that the United States should respect the democratic ideal of a free vote in Italy bringing Communists to power, and should not interfere with the internal affairs of Italy.

On September 19, Paul receives a delegation from the Czechoslovakian Communist regime headed by Karel Hruza, Director of the Religious Affairs Secretariat of the Czechoslovakian Council of Ministers. Together, Paul and Hruza go over new agreements between the Vatican and Czechoslovakia. Paul is on his way to obtaining greater freedom for the 11 million Roman Catholics in that country and removal of the ban on the 540 priests who have been under a law of silence and inactivity imposed by the Communist regime.

When President Jimmy Carter's personal envoy to Paul, Miami lawyer David M. Walters, meets with Paul for an hour's discussion on October 6, Paul's replies and remarks to Walters are diplomatically couched but clear: We are not against Marxist participation in government here or elsewhere.

When President Carter's human rights program comes up as a topic in Roman conversations, authorities are cautious. After all, they point out, Carter has just received Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and greeted him as "a superb politician who holds the key to the future of peace and equality of treatment and freedom in Africa." The United States Government knows, of course, that Nyerere has: re-located half his peasant population, burned their homes, beaten and killed them when they resisted; allows no right

to strike, no free press; holds over 7,000 political prisoners in filthy jails; and uses torture and assassination to maintain himself without an effective opposition.

If there is any doubt still about the Vatican's position, Monsignore Virgilio Levi, Vice-Director of *Osservatore Romano*, writes on the front page of the October 27 issue:

"Marxism seems to be changing and Catholics must be taught by the Church to evaluate when they ought to collaborate with Marxists for the common good. . . ." Catholics must be instructed in such a way as to be "sensitive to socio-political evolution where such an evolution is taking place, to be capable of appreciating that which is valid in what is proposed, but able to be firm in measuring what deviates from Christ and from the Christian attitude toward life and behavior. . . ." So, with a view to collaboration with Marxists, the Church must develop Christians who are "ready to collaborate with frankness and clarity where collaboration is demanded for the common good."

The brutal fact is that in the parliamentary elections of last year, Italian Communists won 34.4 percent of the vote. The Democristians won 38.7 percent. Communists offer stability in a country where the people have long since abandoned the Christian view of government as defender and promoter of the common good. Political power in Italy—as elsewhere—is seen as a vehicle to promote their own economic good. "So let's take government with Marxists," the people conclude. Paul's Vatican goes along with all this. There is no other way.

**CARDINAL BENELLI APPEARS SLATED FOR
MAJOR ROLE AS POPE PAUL PREPARES FOR
COMING MARXIST DOMINATION OF WESTERN
EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS**

Pope Paul's actions appear to reveal a serious uncertainty in his mind about the ultimate success of the revolution he wants in Church government. He has, to be sure, done all he can through his appointments of new Cardinals to increase the chance of a Third World Pope. At the same time, in his revision of Conclave rules, he has emphasized the status of the Pope as Bishop of Rome, apparently to make it possible for the future Pope to sit with the heads of other Christian Churches as a specially

honored equal with his equals—first among his peers, a Bishop among bishops.

He is still convinced that a full revolution is coming. But by now Cardinal Vagnozzi, among others, has convinced Paul that a pan-European candidate is the best he can hope for as an interim move in order to stave off worse. Worse, in this case, could be a stampede of a majority of the Electors in favor of a complete Traditionalist. And, if there is a pan-European candidate and Pope-elect, at least that may serve to rope in those Cardinals who are tending to ultra-Progressivist solutions—something Paul does not favor within the Church itself, even though he is willing to accommodate Marxists in other ways.

By early 1977, Paul has revised the rather freehanded way in which he has regarded the possibility of a Euro-communist government in Italy and elsewhere. There have, of course, been pressures from outside the Vatican on Paul to change his original stance on this point. One example: At a meeting held in April of the previous year at the *Center for Strategic and International Studies* at Georgetown University, the participants—people such as Horace Rivero, William Colby, John Connolly, Clare Boothe Luce, Ray Cline, among others—made clear the disastrous effect a Communist government in Italy would have on vital United States interests.

Paul's continuing revision of his previous stance is in large degree due to the work of American officials, disturbed by the "open" policy Paul has been pursuing. In addition, Vagnozzi, who is Vatican finance expert, and others as well, have pointed out that, despite the Sindona losses, Vatican finances now depend vitally on the United States and its favorable attitude to the Vatican.

Paul, therefore, reverts somewhat to an idea he had back in the sixties: a united Europe capable of once more becoming an economic and political force in the world, even if it may have to go through a period of "Finlandization" by Russia. "In the final count," Paul would remark in August of this year, "nothing new is coming out of Russia or China—culture is dead, their technology is borrowed from the U.S.A. And the U.S.A. is over the hill. Europe still has the resources spiritually and intellectually and culturally to blaze a new path."

It is with this in mind that, on June 27, he proceeds to make his trusted aid, the 56-year-old Archbishop Giovanni

Benelli, a Cardinal. He has of course other reasons for doing so. Benelli, faithful to Paul, is hated by certain other powerful Vatican figures. If Paul were to die, say, and leave Benelli as a simple Archbishop, Benelli could very well end up as resident Bishop of some seven-parish, walled town in distant and mountainous Calabria, or finish his days copying documents in an obscure office of the Vatican. He has to be protected. And he has to have a voice in future Conclaves—possibly be elected Pope at some future date.

But chiefly, Benelli's Cardinalate will give him the standing with which he can undertake a new role: that of organizer of a "new soul" for Europe. Benelli will seek to galvanize political, religious, economic, and cultural interest in, and support for, a new unity in Europe. As Cardinal, Benelli, together with a group of Catholic Bishops, is to meet this fall with various European political leaders.

Casting an eye over the prospective roster of Cardinal Electors in the next Conclave, Paul also decides that the tendency toward "openness" requires some brake. Besides Benelli, he creates three other Cardinals who, he is sure, will constitute that sort of a brake: Father Luigi Ciappi, Dominican priest and theologian to three Popes—including Paul; the 55-year-old Archbishop Bernardin Gantin of Benin, already a member of the Roman Curia; and Josef Ratzinger, Archbishop of Munich. Of these three, Gantin and/or Benelli could one day be Pope.

*PAUL REVIVES RUMORS OF HIS EARLY
RESIGNATION—DRAWS ELECTIONEERING
MOVES INTO OPEN. MAJOR WORLD
POWERS RESPOND*

Fed by Paul's own statement on at least three occasions that "the end is near," rumors of his resignation run wild for the first nine months of 1977. Some chanceries begin to prepare for an autumn resignation; many chanceries proceed to act as if Paul's entourage no longer has the power or the prestige of the Pope's entourage.

The United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia make official inquiries of their Vatican contacts about the possibility of Paul's resignation. For, no matter what various factions within those countries may think, the happen-

ings at the Vatican have a deep import for the various powers.

Meanwhile, just before Paul leaves for the Papal Villa of Castel Gândolfo, Vatican Radio and the Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano* come out with scornful denials of Paul's impending resignation.

There are, of course, ample grounds to suppose that Paul has allowed—and even has fed—such rumors. His motive: to bring electioneering moves out into the open—to tie as many opposing hands as possible, as far before the fact as he can.

At the same time, he displays a *vitalità*, as the Italians delightedly call it, quite ill-suited to a Pontiff supposedly on his last legs and about to die or crawl away helpless. He goes to Pescara by train in the September heat; he preaches in the rain to those who come for the Eucharistic Congress; then, to top all that, when saying goodbye to one group of Spanish pilgrims, he cups his hands and shouts in hearty good humor: "*Tornate! Tornate! Vi troverete ancora all'appuntamento!*" (Come back again! Come back again! Be here for your next audience!)

This old and infirm Pope, a "solitary Atlas" in the words of Cardinal Suenens, is playing a much cleverer end game than many of his younger colleagues.

*AMERICAN CARDINALS TRY TO RETRIEVE
AMERICAN INITIATIVE PLAN.
SURVEILLANCE, HARASSMENT,
PERSECUTION, ISOLATION ARE ORDER
OF THE DAY FOR CHURCH IN
EASTERN EUROPE.*

The first major move to mend fences and repair the hopes of the American Initiative is made on August 1 of 1977 with Cardinal Cooke's trip to Poland. He engages in talks in Warsaw with Church officials in the chancery of the Cardinal-Primate of Poland, Stefan Wyszynski—notably with Bishop Zbigniew Kraszemski, who will certainly be a Cardinal. He makes an extensive tour of dioceses in northwestern Poland for five days. He participates in the national Polish pilgrimage to the venerated shrine of the Virgin at Czestochowa where he prays with 80,000 Poles.

At Czestochowa, also, he goes into the matter of Papal

candidates with Cardinal Wyszynski, as also with Roman-based Cardinal Nasalli Rocca (also a pilgrim at Czestochowa). Rocca is a Traditionalist.

After that, Cooke proceeds to Krakow for similar talks on the same topics with Wojtyla.

The second major move for the restoration of the American Initiative begins when Cardinal Krol, Archbishop Joseph Bernardin of Cincinnati (the President at this time of the American Conference of Bishops), and Bishop James S. Rausch of Phoenix, Arizona, leave together from Philadelphia International Airport on September 20 for a week's visit with Cardinal Lekai of Hungary. They are going on the heels of Billy Graham who is just concluding a visit there and will come home saying he found religious freedom in Hungary. A fond dream, that, but not one that blinds many men's eyes—and certainly not Cardinal Lekai's.

On the face of it, this is a churchly visit by one Cardinal and two Bishops to a fellow Churchman. After all, Paul 6 himself had received the Communist head of Hungary, Janos Kadar, in the Vatican, earlier in the year. How natural then for these important prelates to celebrate a High Mass, as Krol and Bernardin do, in Budapest's St. Stephen's Cathedral before a congregation of 3,000 that includes the entire Hungarian hierarchy of Bishops and the Honorable Imre Miklos, chief of the Government Office of Religious Affairs. Appropriate too for them to baptize 60 infants, and to attend a festive music celebration at Matthias Coronation Church in honor of Paul 6's birthday. This visit is filled with many such appropriate churchly rounds.

Privately, the Americans check out the progress of Vatican-Hungarian diplomatic discussions. Things are progressing slowly, and nothing promising is being achieved. The Hungarians are only interested in gestures that will have great propaganda value: public normalization of relations, so that Communist officials can be photographed with clerics: the return of St. Stephen's crown to Hungary (the United States Government has possessed it for many years), something the American prelates can easily arrange with Jimmy Carter; and so on. The American prelates are interested in substantial matters such as freedom of worship and freedom of publication.

The Americans make their mind clear on other points to Lekai. And they have a complex message to deliver to

the Cardinal of Hungary: The most feasible *papabile* now is a pan-European. The stand being taken by a growing majority of the Cardinal Electors favors a policy hewing closely to the weaving United States policy of allowing Eurocommunist governments to accede to power in European countries, but not to express even tacit approval of such a change in ideology.

None of the Americans come away totally reassured that the safety of Hungarian Churchmen's families and friends will not be used as a means of ensuring that those Churchmen hew to a pro-Marxist line in their activities and public utterances. Nor can the Americans find out exactly how far the sympathies of Hungarian Churchmen extend toward a Marxist-Christian alliance. On his way home from Hungary, Krol stops for two days—September 29–30—in Prague, Czechoslovakia, to speak with Cardinal Frantisek Tomašek. The picture is bad for the Church in this country—the bleakest picture apart from North Vietnam and Albania. It is the subject of unremitting persecution, harassment, and isolation. "What's the main problem?" Krol asks at one point. "To be or not to be," is Tomašek's grim answer. Tomašek does not entirely appreciate Pope Paul's Hamlet-like indecision regarding Marxism. "Doesn't His Holiness realize that we are being throttled here?" Tomašek exclaims.

Tomašek's attitude is clear, if finally a little disappointing. He will stand with the Poles in the matter of a *papabile*. He thinks Lekai is under too much surveillance and control and is totally isolated. Although Tomašek will stand with the Poles, personally he would rather wait and see in the matter of a pan-European *papabile*. He is not sure if, after all, the Church doesn't need a Traditionalist Pope—at least for a period of time. "Well, what about a pan-European Traditionalist?" is the burning question.

PAUL HAS REVIVED HOPES OF EFFECTING REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

Paul, actually, has no intention of resigning in September 1977. Again, circumstances forbid it. Currently, there are delicate behind-the-scenes negotiations with Communist governments in Prague and in Budapest. Discussions with intermediaries of Russia continue intermittently. And the

very subject of the talks gives Paul some hope that his idea for a reform of the Conclave system (and, with it, of the method of government in the Church) can be achieved. For one of the chief subjects under discussion is the fate of the Moscow Patriarchate and its relations with the Papacy.

The flow of intelligence and events this year adds to Paul's interest. Jesuit Father General Pedro Arrupe takes a trip to Moscow and other places as a contact man and to pick up reports of a delicate kind. Arrupe's statement on his return—that he saw signs of relaxation in religious persecution in Russia—is flatly contradicted by Father Casimir Pugevicus, Director of Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid. In his letter, smuggled out of Russia, Pugevicus blasts Arrupe's statement as a "time-serving Soviet manoeuvre" used in order to create a false impression.

At home in Italy, negotiations of a new agreement between the Italian State and the Vatican are almost completed. The new agreement will replace the Lateran Concordat of 1929 and will place the Church where Paul thinks she should be: Catholicism will no longer be the official religion of Italy, and the Church's teachings and laws about marriage, divorce, and such matters will no longer be binding on Italian citizens. At the same time, quiet discussions continue about the entry of Communists into the Italian Government.

In Paul's view, there is new hope, therefore, that he might yet attain his goal: reform of Roman Catholic governing structures; in particular, the method of electing the Pope and the relationship of the Pope with the heads of other Christian Churches. If he were to reach these goals, then Paul would resign. Otherwise, he would die in Peter's sandals. The probability is that he will, indeed, die as Pope.

But still he hopes.

NO 80TH BIRTHDAY RESIGNATION BY PAUL

In the August 30 edition of *Osservatore Romano*, associate editor Reverend Virgilio Levi has protested against what he called the "uncivil" campaign in the Italian press which, "without any factual basis," has been spreading "imaginary and eccentric news" about Paul's resignation.

Vatican spokesman Reverend Romeo Panciroli goes on Vatican Radio to strike the same note.

On September 26, his 80th birthday, Paul gets up at the same time as usual (6 A.M.) and goes to bed at the same time as usual (2 A.M.). There is no resignation. Nor will there be any during the coming Synod of Bishops which starts in four days' time. Paul receives congratulatory messages from world leaders, and unveils a new set of bronze doors to St. Peter's Basilica.

The celebration of Paul's birthday culminates in the Nervi. Here, sitting on his Papal throne before a packed audience, Paul listens to a concert in his honor. Behind him, finished and installed for the occasion, is the bronze sculpture by Pericle Fazzini, commissioned by Paul 12 years before.

Reportedly, the materials and castings cost half a milliard of lire; further work expenses cost one million lire and Fazzini's personal fee was fifty million lire.

It is huge. Fazzini's theme is Resurrection. The sculpture's central figure rises, leaning forward dynamically as if in motion. Splayed around it are masses of branch-like arms and fingers, and masses of bronze, flailing, rising, rising, leaning forward. Fazzini has almost achieved the impossible. For that zarefa of dynamic bronze reminds onlookers both of the branches of an olive tree—the symbol of peace and resurrection—as well as of an atomic explosion and world disintegration.

BISHOPS MEET IN ROME—

DRESS REHEARSAL OF CONCLAVE 82

Pope Paul opens the 5th International Roman Synod in Rome on September 30. There are 204 Delegates, including Bishops, Cardinals, and Patriarchs. There are prelates here from Eastern European satellite countries—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria (but not from Hungary)—as well as from Africa, Asia, and the two Americas. There are two from Vietnam: the Cardinal of Hanoi and the Archbishop of Ho Chi Minh City (Saigon). There are also some observers—Protestant and Jewish—and a group of Charismatics invited to Rome by Belgian Cardinal Suczens. Average age of the Delegates this year is five or six years

younger than the average age of those who were at the last Synod in 1975.

The topic of the Synod: Catechetics—that is, the teaching of religion—in the world today, with special reference to children and youth. But the subject occupying the attention of anybody important at the Synod is the next Pope and the Conclave. In many ways, this Synod is almost a dress rehearsal for Conclave 82.

Catechetics are discussed from the various points of view that the Delegates bring to the Synod.

The Africans are interested in how to adapt Catholicism to local native ways and mentalities.

The Latin Americans are divided: Some are pushing liberation theology (they are rebuffed severely); some are pushing "democratic socialism" either as a political solution or as a military-political solution (they are also rebuffed); and some are pushing Traditionalism (they do not find very many to support them). But one problem *all* Latin Americans are talking about is how to deal with rising Marxist movements.

Delegates from developed countries bring up problems created by technology and by living conditions higher than are found elsewhere: their countries are in danger of atheism and secularism.

The Eastern European and Asian Delegates are concerned about the lack of freedom of worship, of schooling, of the press.

And most European Delegates are concerned with the specter of Communism hovering on their near-future horizon.

The opening ceremonies, which take place in the Sistine Chapel, are televised and transmitted overseas by satellite. Pope Paul tells the Delegates: "We have been chosen, called and invested by the Lord with a transforming mission. As Bishops, we are the successors of the Apostles." Observers are struck by Paul's use of the term "transforming." This is straight out of Paul's mentor, the late philosopher Jacques Maritain, from whom Paul learned all of his ideas of "integral humanism." It is also a term very much in use by the "new theologians" and the Marxist-minded in the Church, who speak of "transforming human society"—meaning the installation of Marxism in place of capitalism. They no longer speak of "converting" people to their

Catholicism or of "preaching the salvation of Jesus"—just "transforming society."

Those acquainted with Paul's proposed reform of Conclave and Church government realize what he is saying: "From now on, our function is to witness, to evangelize ourselves, to stay with all men and women, to become part of their world, to perform services in the social and political field. And just wait." All the Delegates feel complimented at being included with the Pope in Christ's commission to "transform" the world. None of those who come from the Communist dominated nations of Eastern Europe like Paul's address.

Symptomatic of Conclave attitudes and of the deep factional divisions among the Electors is the choice (by vote of the Delegates) of group moderators for Synod workshop discussions: Archbishop Bernardin of Cincinnati (Conservative); Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban (Progressivist); Archbishop Dermot Ryan of Dublin (Traditionalist); Archbishop Roger Etchegaray of Marseilles—the Pope-maker of Europe, as he is called (Progressivist); Cardinal Marty of Paris (Progressivist); Cardinal Felice of Rome (Traditionalist). Charismatics—some Americans are among them—are to be "available for private meetings between Charismatics and Delegates."

Cardinals and Bishops with left-wing leanings are tremendously encouraged and enlivened in their pre-Conclave electioneering hopes by the address given by Archbishop Van Binh of Ho Chi Minh City. Says the Archbishop trenchantly: "The Vietnamese Catholics are determined to co-exist and flourish with Communists. The Communist regime is seeking to unite all our Vietnamese citizens in the rebuilding of our country. And, thus, we Catholics of Vietnam refuse to live in a ghetto and to remain on the margin of society." Binh concludes: "We Catholics expect shortly to be impregnated with Marxist-Leninist doctrine. But we will remain true Catholics."

Archbishop Franic of Spalato, Yugoslavia, caps all this when he asserts loudly that "Communist atheism is not the real danger." The real danger is: "the moral permissiveness, the eroticism, the drug-addiction, the decadent music, and the violence of Western culture." Words that could have been taken from the proceedings of the 25th session of the Soviet Praesidium. And he adds: "Since 1950, the population of Latin America has increased from

164.4 million to 341.9 million in mid-1977. Is capitalism going to feed them?"

Such speeches have a profound effect on the Italians, Spaniards, French, and Portuguese, faced as they are with the possibility of living under Communist governments in the near future—or at least faced with the choice of such governments.

AMERICANS CRITICIZED, SCORNED AT ROMAN SYNOD

During the Synod Sessions and informal discussions, many Delegates speak frankly. Cardinal Deardon's behavior over the October CTA meeting at Detroit is called "criminal." Archbishop Bernardin's behavior is called "feckless." The urbane negativity of Archbishop Jadot, Apostolic Delegate to Washington, is termed just that, "urbane negativity," with the motive ascribed "for the sake of his career." The American Bishops as a whole are blamed for not having supervised the election of delegates to the CTA, and for allowing the meeting to fall into the hands of "irreverent ex-nuns, lesbian nuns, unfaithful priests, ignorant layfolk, and crypto-communists."

In addition, the Americans are embarrassed over things such as the resolutions of the Brooklyn, New York, Diocesan priests' Senate (calling for married priests, optional celibacy, etc.) and the survey of Chicago diocese priests (a majority no longer hold with traditional church teaching on birth control, masturbation, and homosexuality). And, then there are documented reports with lists of names of nuns, priests, and some bishops who already belong to the Communist Party in the United States or to front organizations of the Communist Party.

In general, Americans are criticized for being interested in everything: the neutron bomb, the Panama Canal Treaty, national health insurance, environmental pollution, the disposing of atomic wastes, energy consumption—everything, that is, except the things that should be their prime concern, such as the living faith of the people and the soundness of doctrine. One Polish prelate asks: "Now, how could we consider an American *papabile* when most of you don't know any theology and some of you are

organizing a little *putsch* of your own?" "From their politicking for the Panama Canal Treaty, you would think that the American Bishops were interested parties in helping U.S. banks retrieve the \$2.77 billion in outstanding loans to Panama," was one complaint uttered.

Further, no one can explain to many Europeans and Africans why the American authorities have not yet dismissed Roman Catholic missionaries in Latin America and Africa who proclaim Marxist revolution—such as Sister Janice McLaughlin, only recently expelled from Rhodesia, who stated: "I support the freedom fighters . . . it's impossible to bring about change without war."

And the Africans have a further grumble. Why the strong political stand by the United States Bishops against South Africa? Do they not know, it is asked, that in Africa there are 21 one-party regimes, 13 dictatorships, 6 military dictatorships, and only 12 multiparty states (some of which are *de facto* one-party states; some of which are in an endless process of "drawing up a new constitution"), and that throughout all these countries, blacks have less liberty and economic well-being than in South Africa? Why grandstand for a political policy that is obviously dictated by purely political motives?

After all is said and done, the Americans proceed to put their feet in it, and display how deep goes their lack of sound doctrine, even on basics. When the revised and final draft of the Synod's conclusion is distributed to the Delegates, some of the Americans object to several elements. They object to speaking of catechesis as a "conversion process." They object to the fact that the draft presents a historical notion of Jesus rather than one of Jesus experienced daily. They object to the short shrift given to social justice and ecumenism—the two planks on which many American Bishops spend their episcopal life and activity.

PRE-CONCLAVE ELECTIONEERING AT SYNOD

The Delegates, Cardinals, and Bishops are busy about the Conclave and Paul's near-future plans. "The Conclave has already started," was one constant comment by observers. Indeed!

High on the *papabili* list stand three Italians (Baggio, Pignedoli, Felice), one Argentinian of Italian extraction (Pironio), and more than one non-Italian.

One Dutchman, Jan Willebrands, the Primate of Holland who also works in Rome, has been on an early *papabili* list. The Primate of England, Cardinal Basil Hume, has also been mentioned. At the present time, both are probably good "straw men"; that is, their names can always be used as outside alternatives, but only as the least of many evils.

Willebrands has his hands full in Holland where Catholicism is less vibrant than it is in the Congo. Besides, Willebrands has not got the breadth of mind required in a Pope. And he seems to be fascinated by anything that non-Catholic Christians do. Many Conservatives cannot abide his type of ecumenism.

The 55-year-old Basil Hume's attractiveness as a *papabile* lies uniquely in his background. Born of a distinguished Protestant father, Sir William Hume, and of a French mother, with a brother-in-law who is Secretary to the British Cabinet, Hume was educated at Oxford and then in Fribourg, Switzerland. As a noted Benedictine Abbot, he became well-liked by Anglican ecumenists. Given Britain's reduced status as a world power, Hume's ecumenical standing gives him a certain stature and appeal: he does not come from "a colonialist super-power." But again, and for different reasons, he will not move onto the primary list of *papabili*. As the doughty Cardinal Ottaviani remarked: "To go from an Italian Cardinal to an Anglo-Saxon would be too much for Europeans and too little for non-Europeans."

The "Pope-maker of Europe," Archbishop Roger Etcheagaray of Marseilles, is reportedly seeking a suitable left-wing candidate among the Italians and Europeans. Most of the French Electors now stand on the left.

The American Bishops have rallied with Höffner and the other German Cardinals (Bensch of Berlin and Ratzinger of Munich) and thus made temporary allies of the Poles as well in their stand against any really left-wing candidate. But the Germans fail to rally the French Cardinals.

Paul is quite active throughout the Synod. He lets it be known that he intends to create more Cardinals shortly. Some will be Traditional and therefore obligatory appointments, such as the Irish Archbishop of Armagh; some will

be rewards for work well done (as Archbishop Casaroli for his work in Soviet Eastern countries); but some, obviously, are meant to create additional Conclave votes in favor of Paul's policies.

SYNOD ENDS DELIBERATIONS ON A NOTE OF UNITY

In spite of deep differences, this 5th International Synod closes on a note of harmony and unity between Pope and Delegates, and between the Delegates themselves.

Cardinal Baggio, himself no mean *papabile*, holds a press conference and tells the journalists that "it is grotesque to have to defend an ecclesial assembly against the charge of having finished its work in harmony." Baggio's remark is aimed primarily at the "new theologians" and the Catholic left-wing intellectuals who continually represent the Bishops of the world as in total contention with the central government of the Church in Rome. They had expected the Bishops and Delegates to revolt during the Synod. They did not.

True, two main thrusts have emerged: one Rightist, that includes Traditionalists, Conservatives, and Radicals; the other, Leftist, that includes Progressivists, "new theologians," and the Marxist-inclined. But the dispute was kept between Delegates and behind closed doors. A compromise was arrived at between the two. The Delegates drew up a 3,000-word message to the People of God. They also submitted 34 propositions to Paul. These described the methods to be employed in instructing Christians in their faith. Paul will use them and the message to produce a Papal document on the whole subject of catechetics. The Americans submitted their own revisions, but they have had no effect.

Between Left and Right, one dispute concerns the meaning to be given to the term "authentic and complete" doctrine. The Progressivists insist it includes socio-political theory and activism. The others refuse this. The "new theologians" and the liberation theology of the Latin Americans finally get no pride of place. But, there is still no agreement on what "authentic and complete" Christian doctrine means.

**CARDINAL ELECTORS HAVE GRAVE DOUBTS
ABOUT PAUL'S JUDGMENT AND POLICIES**

Several Latin American Cardinals, together with Delegates from Europe and Asia, let Paul know that they cannot back his political outlook on Latin America. It is now clear that, while Paul acts as if he stood with the centrist-reformist position (those who stand here seek to reform abuses in the economic and social systems of Latin America, without replacing the system), he has given a green light to the leftist-reformist position (those who seek to replace capitalism with "democratic socialism"). Paul has no answer to those who point out that the leftist-reformists always side with the "violent terrorists who include guerrillas and terrorists, and who seek total Marxization of Latin America by violent means." This reaction must tell finally in the general pre-Conclave attitude of the Electors.

Among many prelates at the Synod there is a note of profound questioning: Has Paul 6 gone too far? Will he go too far yet? Has he pushed the Church too fast? Who really helps him make decisions that shock the majority of the faithful? Has he let go of too much too suddenly?

As of the end of the Synod, the College of Cardinals had 118 members eligible to vote as Electors of the next Conclave. Of these, only 4 (Siri, Wyszynski, Léger, and Gracias) participated in the election of John 23 at Conclave 80 in 1958; 12 of them (including Rugambwa, König, and Bueno y Monreal) were in Conclave 81 which elected Paul 6 in 1963. So the vast majority of Cardinal Electors in Conclave 82 will enter it without any experience of Pope-making or of Conclave politics. The only stratagem of ecclesiastical politics that most of the Electors know, and will bring to bear on Conclave 82, is the stratagem many of them employed at the Second Vatican Council: Before the event (in this case the Conclave), say "yes" to everything; then proceed to Rome, into Conclave, and overturn all commitments and promises, and by sheer weight of numbers carry the day in favor of what they really want.

*CARDINAL ELECTORS AND CONCLAVE
PERSONNEL AS OF NOW*

The 82-year-old Cardinal Luigi Traglia is buried on Thursday, November 24. Pope Paul is present at the funeral. Traglia's death reduces the College of Cardinals to 132. This number includes 34 Italians, 32 Europeans, 23 Latin Americans, 16 North Americans, 10 Africans, 12 Asiatics, and 5 Oceanians. Of these, 118 are eligible to enter Conclave within the calendar year of 1978.

Cardinals may not bring any personal assistants, secretaries, or aides into Conclave with them, except when grave illness necessitates such extra help. The Camerlengo and his Committee are the final judges in each case. Non-Cardinals officially admitted to the Conclave include the Secretary of the Conclave, who is in charge of Conclave documentation; the Vicar of Rome, who is a Bishop and who must witness the Election as the representative of the Pope's diocese; two or more assistants to the Vicar of Rome; the Papal Master of Ceremonies with his assistants in order to ensure due observance of all Conclave and Election rituals; one or more assistants to the Camerlengo to aid him in his duties; about three to five ordinary priests to hear confessions in different languages; two doctors with their assistants; an architect; at least two technicians and, as present plans for Conclave 82 are going, probably three times that number for electronic surveillance and security; two alternating teams of translators to ensure simultaneous translation at the Sessions of Conclave; and whatever other service personnel (carpenters, electricians, plumbers, barbers, a dentist, etc.) are judged as necessary and fit after careful consideration and scrutiny by the Camerlengo and his Committee. In addition to all these there are a couple of laymen who always enter Conclave with the Cardinals. Their duties belong to the secret of the Conclave. All in all, the total population of Conclave comes to something around 200-250 persons.

**PRECEDENT-SHATTERING BREAK WITH
TRADITION IS DECIDED UPON ALREADY**

It is now certain that with the consent and advice of Pope Paul 6, the decision has been taken not to hold Conclave 82 in the Vatican locale where all Conclaves but one have been held since the sixteenth century.

Traditionally, the Cardinal Electors in Conclave live in the Apostolic Palace overlooking St. Peter's Square, their rooms or "cells" clustered around the Sistine Chapel where all Conclave ceremonies and Sessions were held. There in the Sistine, beneath Michelangelo's long ceiling frescoed with scenes from Creation and Salvation, in full view of Michelangelo's *Last Judgment*, surrounded by paintings from the hands of Botticelli, Pinturicchio, Roselli, Perugino, Signorelli, Della Gatta, Ghirlandaio, Pope after Pope has been elected, usually by direct balloting and sometimes by unanimous acclamation. The history that has been lived in the Sistine overpowers its painting, its fresco, and its sculpture. There tradition was molded, adapted, preserved, asserted, and handed on faithfully.

Now all this is over and done with. In Conclave 82, only pre-Conclave exercises and ceremonies (swearing-in of Cardinal Electors and Conclave participants) and the Preliminary Session of the Conclave will take place in the Sistine. From then on, the working Sessions of Conclave 82 as well as the actual election of the new Pope to succeed Pope Paul 6 will be held in the "Upper Room" of the Nervi. The Cardinal Electors will be bussed morning, afternoon, and evening from the *Domus Mariae* where they will have their living quarters. The *Domus* stands in its own grounds at a distance of a mile or so from the Nervi, is surrounded by a high wall, and has all the conveniences. Security is going to be a problem.

The change, the decision to make the change, and the new locales chosen are just more clues to the anticipatory outlook of Paul 6 and those who today wield Vatican power and who are guiding the Vatican and its Church into the world of the twenty-first century and beyond.

They willingly say goodbye to the ancient setting of Conclaves in the Sistine. The Election result will not be signaled to the outside world by puffs of white smoke from

a stove fired with the ballot papers of the Electors. It will be electronically communicated by radar and television image. And the new Pope will give his blessing, not from the front balcony of St. Peter's Basilica overlooking Vatican Hill and the Square and Rome, as has been done up to this time. He will stand on the stage of the Nervi in front of Fazzini's *Resurrection* and, televised instantly to the four quarters of the globe, he will give his blessing and say some short words that will crackle out over the air-waves in simultaneous translation into 14 languages.

"For future elections of Popes, we need an ample space," was Paul's enigmatic reply, when asked why he made this change. The fact is that Paul was acting in this matter as he had acted in previous years on other matters. He banned the Latin Mass, although the Bishops at the Second Vatican Council declared themselves for the Latin Mass. He insisted that the priest face the people while saying Mass, although neither Bishops nor people wanted the change. Paul envisions a wholly new way of electing Popes; if not the next Pope, his own successor, then at least the Pope after that. Some who talked with Paul came away with the impression that he was thinking of the earliest Roman elections when all the Christians of Rome gathered in one place and chose their Bishop by acclamation and a primitive voting method.

At a still later date, so Roman rumors run, another candidate for Pope will stand on that stage in the Nervi and be chosen not in Conclave, but by a new, and as yet untried, global system which will be the twenty-first-century version of the ancient Christian Roman Church practice when a few hundred gathered to choose their spiritual leader. *Vox populi*. The voice of the people.