

"we are prepared to suffer with them", rather than giving admonitions on how they (the actors for instance) should cooperate with the regime.

On 16 December Archbishop Glemp and Archbishop Dąmbrowski, the secretary of the Polish Episcopate, sent a letter to the Marszałek Sejmu (Speaker of Parliament) criticising the new bill which, in exchange for suspending martial law, imposes tighter conditions on the population. "The concept of tying workers to their factory, reminiscent of feudal serfdom, is particularly unacceptable," said the bishops. They dismissed the bill as pretentious, because the lifting of martial law was replaced by equally repressive measures, such as a new regulation allowing for dismissal of anyone who "sows social unrest".

The Kraków Solidarity Bulletin, published underground, reported on 3 December that the police stations have been given the task of preparing lists of "extremists" among the priests but these were to exclude the names of those working with bishops in diocesan offices. Also the priests working in large urban parishes or professors at Catholic seminaries were to be excluded as they would be able to attract popular support.

The Press Office of the Polish Episcopate issued a strong protest against an article by Jerzy Urban, the government spokesman, who in the weekly *Tu i Teraz* (Here and Now) No. 5, 1983 used such words as "filth" or "anti-semitic" when describing the work of the recently canonised martyr, Fr Kolbe.

According to Polish television 390 new churches are under construction in Poland, which represents an enormous increase in the permits given to the Church. Between 1971-81, for instance, only 1,072 permits were given, mainly to reconstruct or extend the existing churches or chapels, while hardly any new Catholic churches were allowed to be built.

On 23 February Kazimierz Świtton, the founder of the Silesian Free Trade Unions, was detained inside the church by the police in Katowice during a service for the victims of martial law. This is regarded in Poland as an unprecedented transgression of church autonomy. Lech Wałęsa, who was to attend the service, was prevented from coming.

On 23-24 December, in a communiqué issued after a two-day plenary conference, the Polish bishops said: "Society expects that at least some of the urgent social problems of our country will be settled before the [Pope's] visit. An amnesty is generally expected for those sentenced after the imposition of martial law. Full social justice for all citizens is also expected."

The 8th National Congress of the "Oasis" renewal movement took place from 25-28 February in the Jasna Góra Monastery at Częstochowa. Cardinal\* Glemp sent a letter to Fr Franciszek Blachnicki, the founder of the movement, blessing the participants. The movement and Fr Blachnicki himself have come under strong attack from the authorities. To counteract this the conference of the Polish Episcopate expressed its support for "Oasis".

On 21 March Henryk Jabłoński, Chairman of the Council of State, formally invited Pope John Paul II to visit Poland from 16 to 22 June. Two days later details of the papal visit were announced: the Pope will visit Warsaw, Niepokalanów, Częstochowa, Poznań, St Anna's Mountain, Wrocław, Piękary Śląskie and Kraków. Leaders of the underground Solidarity movement have said they would not organise any demonstrations during the Pope's visit.

TADEUSZ KADENACY

---

\*Archbishop Glemp was created Cardinal on 5 January: see p. 205 — Ed.

## New Cardinals in Eastern Europe

*On 5 January this year 18 new cardinals from various countries were nominated by Pope John Paul II. Four of them were from Eastern Europe: Józef Glemp (whose*

*appointment was not unexpected), Joachim Meisner of East Germany, Franjo Kuharić of Yugoslavia, and most surprisingly, Julijāns Vaivods of Latvia.*

*Józef Glemp*

Mgr Józef Glemp's nomination as the 28th Polish Cardinal was the natural culmination of his nomination by Cardinal Wyszyński to be his successor as Primate of Poland in 1981. At 54, he is one of the younger nominees and also, among the four East Europeans, the one burdened with the most daunting immediate tasks. The example set by his great predecessor is both challenging and inspiring.

Glemp's closeness to Wyszyński over the years (he compared their relationship to that of father and son) should stand him in good stead to "take up his inheritance and increase it" as the Pope urged him to do on the occasion of his receiving his Cardinal's red biretta in February. One such "increase" already indicated is Glemp's move towards ecumenical cooperation by meeting members of the Polish Ecumenical Council, a step never taken by Wyszyński. Having worked as Wyszyński's personal secretary from 1967 (only 11 years after his own ordination) Glemp had a unique opportunity to acquaint himself with the Cardinal's skills in handling the immense problems of church-state relations in Poland. He shared Wyszyński's interest in the 19th-century history of the Polish Church and the intricate connection between patriotism and Catholicism which contributes largely to the extent of the Church's influence, and therefore its responsibility, in Poland at the present time. Now, after more than a year of martial law, he still faces the difficult task of channelling the energies of popular nationalism into the service of the Church. He has spoken many times in his sermons against the use of violence and although frequently emphasising the need for dialogue between Church and State, has also expressed his intention of avoiding political confrontation with the regime. His attitude is not merely negative, however, as can be seen from many statements made to the Polish press and from his sermons. "The mission of the Church is to wield indirect influence on society through presenting true values. . . the Church will try to show what is objectively good and objectively true, so that man, who is the child of God, would seek primarily the superior good." (*Zycie Warszawy*, 10 July 1981). He has had strong words for the injustices committed under martial law and the restrictions it has placed on human rights and freedoms.

After receiving his red biretta in February in the Polish Church of St Stanislas in Rome, Cardinal Glemp spoke of the spiritual freedom which the Church in Poland must be seen to offer: the Church wanted to bring people closer to Christ and to give them inner freedom.\*

*Joachim Meisner*

Some comparisons can be drawn between Cardinal Glemp and the new Cardinal in the German Democratic Republic, Joachim Meisner. Of similar age (Meisner was born in 1933), both belong to the generation of priests who have served entirely under communist regimes. Meisner's vocation, however, was a later one; he worked in banking for some years before entering a seminary, and was ordained at Erfurt in 1962. His subsequent rise to the rank of Cardinal was rapid; by 1966 he was director of the Church's social work in the diocese, and in 1973 he was consecrated its suffragan bishop. He was appointed Bishop of Berlin on the death of Cardinal Bengsch in 1980.

The new East German Cardinal's approach, like that of Cardinal Glemp, can be viewed in the light of his predecessor's work. Under Bengsch the Catholic Church in East Germany made a studied and continuous effort to eschew involvement in political discussion or activity and to avoid doing or saying anything that would imply that the GDR Catholics could be drawn into the sphere of influence of the Party. They even refrained from making pronouncements on social issues such as the growing peace movement. Until very recently, although Roman Catholics as individuals had been involved in the unofficial peace movement alongside Protestants, no representative of the church hierarchy had made a public statement of their position on the issue. However, the bishops' pastoral letter of January of this year represented a significant change in the Catholic attitude, indicating a more definite stance.† It advocated controlled disarmament and an official alternative to army service for conscientious objectors and objected to military training in schools.

It is not yet clear whether this new approach is connected with the leadership of Cardinal Meisner and whether increased outspokenness will extend to other issues.

\*See *RCL* Vol. 9, Nos. 3-4, pp. 99-100 for a portrait of Archbishop Glemp — *Ed.*

†The text of the pastoral letter is given on pp. 214-7 — *Ed.*

### *Franjo Kuharić*

The new Cardinal in Yugoslavia, Franjo Kuharić (born in 1919) was ordained in 1945 and thus belongs to the generation of Yugoslav priests who began their ministry just as the Tito government took over and never had the opportunity to study abroad. Appointed to a parish as soon as he had finished his training at the theological seminary in Zagreb, his experience was exclusively as a parish priest, and it is for his eloquent preaching and pastoral skills that he is best known and loved. In 1964 he was appointed one of the assistant bishops of Zagreb and in 1970 became Archbishop of Zagreb and president of the Bishops' Conference in succession to the late Cardinal Šeper.

One of Kuharić's most difficult tasks has been, and will be, to sustain the unity of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia. He has been surrounded by a group of theologians and philosophers whose thinking is considerably more "progressive" than his own but has until recently sheltered them and defended their right to speak and publish. Recently there was a sharp quarrel between this group (who formed themselves into an officially-registered "self-managing" theological association called Contemporary Christianity) and the Bishops' Conference who feared they were escaping from episcopal control.\* Such issues are grist to the mill of the authorities, who have in the past attempted to isolate Kuharić by painting him as a representative of a "conservative" or "militant" faction in the clergy. One cause of this has been his impassioned defence of the late Cardinal Stepinac (who was imprisoned after the war after a show-trial for alleged collaboration with the fascist *ustas̄a* government); every year Kuharić celebrates a special mass on the anniversary of the death of Stepinac and in 1981 he made an impassioned plea for his rehabilitation and a re-examination of the case.† For many months this issue was the basis of bitter confrontation between the Church and the authorities. It has not been the only point of friction between Kuharić and the government leaders, who were angered, for example, when in his Christmas sermon in 1980 the Archbishop indirectly endorsed a petition for the release

of eleven political prisoners which had been signed by more than forty Zagreb intellectuals, including three well-known priests. In 1982 Kuharić declined to attend the traditional New Year reception given by the President of the Croatian Parliament.

In the eyes of the Yugoslav authorities Kuharić was not the preferred candidate for Cardinal, and it is reliably reported that they made it clear to the Vatican that they would prefer either Archbishop Turk of Belgrade, a Slovene who has spent almost all his career in the Orthodox parts of the country, or Archbishop Šuštar of Ljubljana, also a Slovene, who was studying outside the country in 1945 and made his career in Switzerland and was secretary of the European Bishops' conference. It is not difficult to see why Šuštar and Turk appealed to the authorities: Turk is close at hand in Belgrade and detached from Croatian nationalism, and Šuštar's horizons are European. There is no doubt, however, that Kuharić is more representative of Yugoslav Catholicism than either of them. Although official response to the appointment, as expressed in a Yugoslav daily, claimed that under him the Roman Catholic Church has remained in essence "ideologically conservative, turned towards the past and clerically militant", it also admits that the Archbishop of Zagreb has made a considerable contribution to good relations between Church and State in Yugoslavia.

### *Julijāns Vaivods*

The most surprising of the four East European nominations was that of Julijāns Vaivods, Apostolic Administrator of Rīga and Liepāja dioceses in Latvia. He is not only the first-ever Latvian Cardinal, but also the first Soviet citizen ever to reach this rank in the Catholic Church. Since Vaivods is 87 years old, his appointment is honorary, as Cardinals are entitled to vote only up to the age of eighty. Nevertheless his appointment is not only a personal tribute, but an acknowledgement by the Vatican of the tenacity of the Latvian Catholic Church, the credit for which is due in no small part to Vaivods himself.

Immediately before the 1917 revolution, Vaivods studied at the St Petersburg seminary, which was closed under Stalin in the 1920s. When he was ordained parish priest of the main Latvian Marian shrine at Aglona in 1918, there were about half a million Catholics in Latvia. During the pre-

\*The controversy is described on pp. 200-2 — Ed.

†See *RCL* Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 87-8 — Ed.

war years, while Latvia remained an independent country, Vaivods wrote several theological works and gained a reputation as a compelling preacher. (Despite his age he still draws large crowds to the annual pilgrimage to Aglona — last year seventy thousand people went to the shrine.) In 1940 Vaivods was appointed Vicar-General of the diocese of Liepāja, and by 1947 he was one of the highest-ranking clergymen left in Latvia; three bishops had been forced to leave with the retreating Germans, Bishop Springovičs was old and ill, and an auxiliary bishop Dulbinskis consecrated by Springovičs in 1947 was imprisoned in 1948. Vaivods was therefore one of those responsible for holding the Catholic Church together in Latvia during the 1940s and 1950s, until he was himself imprisoned in 1958, for disseminating unofficial religious literature. After his release in 1961, he was appointed rector of the Cathedral in Riga, and a year later became Vicar-General of Riga diocese. In 1964 he was able to travel to Rome to be consecrated bishop and Apostolic Administrator of both dioceses. In practice his position was equivalent to that of Archbishop.

Vaivods has been remarkably successful in preserving the numbers of Catholic churches and believers in Latvia, while avoiding both unprincipled cooperation with the Soviet authorities and outright conflict. Despite confiscation of churches and

erosion of numbers, the Catholic Church has had fewer losses in Latvia than the former majority denomination, the Latvian Lutheran Church: 173 of the 200 Catholic churches which existed before the war are still open.

What makes Vaivod's nomination surprising is that the Pope might have been expected to choose a representative of the Catholic hierarchy in Lithuania, where Catholicism is the majority denomination. Two factors have prevented this. The first is the strong bond linking Catholicism with Lithuanian patriotism, which has always made it a target of the Soviet authorities. Secondly, the obvious candidate for Cardinal is Archbishop Steponavičius, who is still unable to carry out his duties as bishop since his appointment in 1955 has never been recognised by the Soviet authorities. (It is widely believed that the Pope has appointed Steponavičius Cardinal "in pectore".) To appoint a Lithuanian Cardinal, therefore, would mean apparently attempting to provoke the Soviet government, and thus jeopardising the already difficult situation of Catholics in Lithuania. The Pope's choice of a Latvian Cardinal, therefore, is a tribute to the tenacity under exceptionally difficult circumstances of Catholics in the Baltic region.

CAROLYN BURCH

## An Interview with the new Latvian Cardinal

*Last February, Mgr Julijāns Vaivods became the first-ever Latvian Cardinal (see above for background). The Soviet authorities allowed him to visit Rome to be invested as cardinal, and while there he gave the following interview to a journalist, Gianni Varani. It was published in 30 giorni, No. 1, March 1983, and a Russian translation appeared in Religiya i Ateizm v SSSR, May 1983.*

Q. Your Eminence! Your elevation to the post of Cardinal undoubtedly means a great deal to the Church in Latvia and the Soviet Union. In your opinion, could it change the position of believers in your country to any extent?

A. In my opinion the legal status has not changed in any way. I was and still remain Apostolic Administrator of the Riga diocese. However, my elevation to Cardi-

nal has great meaning for my small country: since the establishment of the Church in Latvia we have never had a Cardinal and this important fact may make our government respect the Catholic community more. It is clear that so far practically nothing has changed. Much will depend on our behaviour, as I have already said.

Q. But surely now Catholics in the Soviet Union have someone to look up to and unite around?

A. I think that it will especially serve to unite Latvians, going beyond denominational barriers. Perhaps you know that the head of the Latvian Lutheran Church in exile has thanked the Pope for appointing me.

Q. Could you tell us about the most difficult and the happiest times in your life?

A. The most difficult was undoubtedly