Christmas 2004

Dear Friends:

May the blessings of Christmas be with you and your loved ones.

During this Christmas season, we give thanks to God for the gift of President George W. Bush’s re-election as President of the United States. As pointed out in our newsletter of July 2004, voting for pro-life leaders who promote God’s gifts of liberty, responsibility, and the sanctity of life and marriage cannot help but benefit the underground Roman Catholic Church in China. Having such leaders enables the Cardinal Kung Foundation to have its own moral voice heard more successfully and to advance its own mission for the sake of the underground Roman Catholic Church in China. As a penniless immigrant to the United States almost fifty years ago (no other country offered me a haven when I was most in need as a refugee in Hong Kong without a home and without one single relative), having benefited from the freedom, education system, and the helping hand that this country has offered to me, I am perhaps more aware of and thankful for the generosity, core beliefs, and the greatness of this country than most of those who are native-born. I cannot even begin to describe how ecstatic I was after learning that President Bush had been re-elected. May God continue to guide and bless President Bush for the next four years, so that he will not only lead us to but also establish a solid foundation for a much better pro-life, just, and peaceful world for a long time to come.

Petition to Initiate Cause for Cardinal Kung’s Canonization

I have sent a letter of petition on August 4, 2004 to Bishop William E. Lori, the Bishop of Bridgeport in Connecticut, to open the cause for Cardinal Kung’s beatification and canonization on March 12, 2005. I wrote: “Inasmuch as Cardinal Kung died in Stamford, which is within the territory of your diocese, I believe that you are the only bishop who can initiate the cause of Cardinal Kung’s canonization unless dictated otherwise by the Sacred Congregation….. Approximately seven months from now, March 12 of 2005 shall mark the fifth anniversary of the death of Ignatius Cardinal Kung in your diocese. I understand that the cause of canonization can be advanced after the fifth anniversary of the death of the Servant of God. This means that the cause of canonization for Cardinal Kung can be officially commenced immediately after March 12, 2005…..May I request your permission…..that when the fifth anniversary of the death of Cardinal Kung arrives on March 12, 2005, we can start the official cause immediately without further delay?” As of the printing of this newsletter, my letter has been acknowledged only by the diocese’s Vicar General. I urge you to send a letter (with a copy to me) directly to Bishop Lori to testify to your praying to Cardinal Kung and to your supporting my petition, stating your reasons for doing so. His address is: His Excellency Bishop William E. Lori, Bishop of Bridgeport, 238 Jewett Avenue, Bridgeport CT, 06606-2892.

There will be a Mass to commemorate the 5th anniversary of the death of Cardinal Kung on March 12, 2005 at 12:10 pm at St. John the Evangelist Church, 279 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. Refreshments will be served after the Mass. Further details are to be announced on our website or please call 203-329-9712. You are all invited.

Prayers Answered: Recovery of Cancer Believed Through the Intercession of Cardinal Kung

With the permission of the author, a supporter of the Foundation, we publish below her letter describing her experience of being cured of cancer. She believes, through her praying to Cardinal Kung, even though she was receiving experimental medicine. She wrote: “You sent me a prayer card with your beloved uncle’s picture which included a relic. I said that prayer everyday of October and touched the relic. I was diagnosed on Sept 8, 2003… the melanoma… has metastasized to the lungs… (the CAT scan showed so many white dots that one would think of a snowstorm), the back, the scalp, the left armpit lymph node and the liver…. By December 2003, the scans showed an improvement… My doctors were thrilled. By February or so, the cancer in the liver was gone….”
New Vatican Guidelines for China
A seemingly inadvertent and partial response to my March 2000 Open Letter: 
Patriotic Association said to have characteristic of being “in schism”

Even though my Open Letter to the Vatican’s hierarchy of more than four years ago (March 28, 2000) was never answered, the China guidelines (henceforth called 2004 guidelines) recently issued to the Roman Catholic bishops in China by a Vatican representative in Hong Kong, Msgr. Eugene Nugent, coincidentally answered some of the issues that I raised, as I shall indicate further on. These 2004 guidelines, written in Chinese only, have already been widely circulated in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Because of the importance of these 2004 guidelines and of our belief that it was not distributed to all the world’s bishops (otherwise, their would be an official English or other language version), we have reprinted the English translation of these 2004 guidelines (page 9) together with the related guidelines issued in 1988 (henceforth called 1988 guidelines) (page 6) in this newsletter. You may also read the details of the original texts by visiting our website www.cardinalkungfoundation.org. There are 9 points in the 2004 guidelines explaining in detail how reconciliation should take place if a religious of the Patriotic Association, otherwise known as the open or official Church in China (hereafter CPA), indicates his/her desire to be reconciled with the loyal Roman Catholic Church in China, otherwise known as the underground Church in China. Most importantly, the new 2004 guidelines confirm the validity of the often ignored and violated previous China guidelines issued by the Vatican to the world’s bishops in September 1988.

At the beginning of the 2004 guidelines, Msgr. Nugent calls upon Roman Catholics in China to be honest and good citizens of their country, but also exhorts the Roman Catholic bishops in China to join together and firmly demand more religious freedom. The larger portion of his guidelines is concerned with relations between the Roman Catholic Church in China and the CPA. Essentially, Msgr. Nugent reminds the bishops in China that, while Pope John Paul II has called upon them to seek unity and reconciliation with the CPA, this cannot be at the cost of any compromise in Catholic faith and doctrine.

In my Open Letter of March 2000 to the Vatican, I had raised the question, “Is the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association a schismatic Church?” and had argued, on the basis of Catholic doctrine, Canon Law, and Papal pronouncements, that it was indeed in schism. Probably because of the Vatican’s remaining very quiet on this subject, many members of the Catholic hierarchy claimed that there was no schism in China. Maryknoll Father Superior Leo B. Shea wrote: “Catholics are united. There is no schismatic Church in China.” In fact, I wrote in my Open Letter: “the Holy See has never formally declared the CPA is in schism, albeit the CPA has refused for the last 42 years to submit to the Roman Pontiff and has also refused for the last 42 years to be in communion with the members of the Church subject to him…. Why has the Holy See not declared the CPA to be in schism?”

Alas! In its 2004 China guidelines, without being semantic, the Vatican has now de facto acknowledged that the CPA has been in schism, because, as Msgr. Nugent puts it, “Obviously, the Patriotic Association has the characteristic of being in schism.” For the first time that I can recall, a directive authorized by an official Vatican representative uses the word “schism” to describe the CPA! This is a milestone!

Inasmuch as the Vatican has now declared through its representative in Hong Kong that the CPA has the characteristic of being in schism, how could Cardinal Tomko make the statement three years ago in the United States that the “two groups in the Church in China (the underground Roman Catholic Church and the Patriotic Association) are not two Churches because we are all one Church?” (CKF newsletter July 2001) How could the CPA with the “characteristic of being in schism” be the same Church as the Roman Catholic Church? How wrong was Cardinal Law when he wrote to me to express his “disappointment” when I pointed out the mistake Cardinal Tomko made when he declared the above statement? (CKF newsletter Christmas 2001) How could Mr. Gerald F. Powers, Director of the U. S. Bishops’ Office of International Justice and Peace, have stated that the U. S. Catholic Conference “does not share the view that the bishops, priests, and faithful of the ‘open’ Church are ….. in schism?” (CKF newsletter July 2001). As did the 1988 China guidelines, so do the 2004 guidelines make very clear and prove that these high ranking Vatican officials and religious superiors were very wrong when they proclaimed that the two groups in the Church in China are the same Church and that there is no schism in the “open” Church in China. I therefore hope that Msgr. Nugent’s guideline that “the Patriotic Association has the characteristic of being in schism” effectively puts the above erroneous statements by Cardinal Tomko, Mr. Powers, Cardinal Law and others to rest and that hopefully they will correct their statements.

Msgr. Nugent lays out nine points in his 2004 guidelines that should govern relations between the Roman Catholic Church in China and the CPA. The following, in bold print, is a sample of his nine points in his 2004 guidelines, each of which I follow with a reference to my Open Letter (published in our newsletter of June 2000).
The first point of the 2004 guidelines deals with the “8-point” China guidelines issued by the Vatican in September 1988 and approved by the Holy Father. The 2004 guidelines emphasize that the 1988 guidelines are still in effect. I am very happy that finally, sixteen years later, the Vatican confirmed that these very important 1988 guidelines are not outdated, and are still in effect, because, as I pointed in my Open Letter, these 1988 guidelines “have...practically been ignored by the rank and file of the Church’s own officials and have not been enforced.” In fact, in one of my encounters with a very high Vatican official, I indicated to him my indignation at the widespread ignorance and violation of these 1988 guidelines by the Church hierarchy. He said that the 1988 guidelines were outdated, because “time has changed.” The 2004 guidelines have proved how wrong he was. As you read the following paragraphs, you will also realize how wrong were many Cardinals, archbishops and other Church officials in granting public priestly faculties to the CPA priests in the United States.

The second point of the 2004 guidelines deals with liturgical celebrations. All legitimate priests and deacons should obey the “8-point” directive (1988 guidelines), and will therefore not have “communicatio in sacris” either with illegitimate bishops and religious or with those religious under the Patriotic Association. (Please refer to the 5th point in the “8-point” 1988 guidelines). The 5th point of the Vatican’s 8-point 1988 guidelines to which Msgr. Nugent refers stipulates: “Another rather delicate point is the question of the liturgical celebrations. In fact all ‘communicatio in sacris’ is to be avoided. The ‘patriotic’ bishops and priests are not to be invited or even allowed to celebrate religious functions in public, either in the churches or in the oratories of the various religious institutes.”

Based on the 1988 guideline above, I asked, in my Open Letter in the year 2003 and again in my July 2003 newsletter, how could the Ordinaries of many dioceses in the United States such as New York, Boston, San Francisco and others grant priestly faculties to priests of the CPA, allowing them to offer Holy Masses publicly and to administer other sacraments openly in their Roman Catholic churches, when the guideline above specifically said that “all communicatio in sacris is to be avoided...” thereby openly violating again and again this vital Vatican guideline as stated in the paragraph above? In my Open Letter I wrote: “It gives the appearance and consequently the wrong message to the Chinese communist government that the [CPA] has been accepted by the universal Church in spite of the government’s agenda (independence from the Pope), its policy (continuous persecution of the underground Church) and its programs (“one child, one family” and its forced abortion policy to achieve this program).” With this wrong message, how could one expect the Chinese government to negotiate seriously with the Vatican?

I have written letters to three bishops about the issue mentioned above. Archbishop Levada of San Francisco replied: “...I would like to invite the Foundation to be more accurate in its statements concerning the Church in China and in particular concerning the priests from China who have been welcomed by the dioceses of this country. The program of their formation and of their apostolic ministry is being carried out according to directives received from the Holy See...” While the archbishop did not specify to which directives he refers, it is very clear that the 5th point of the 1988 guidelines (quoted above) issued by His Eminence Tomko explicitly forbids it. Bishop Sheridan of New York City wrote: “Your letter...has saddened us...What right you have to offer such advice to the Cardinal-Archbishop of New York that he (the late Cardinal O’Connor) step out beyond his own jurisdiction and responsibility of call upon...Chinese (Patriotic Association) priests in the United States to serve a ministry at Transfiguration in Chinatown which you consider to be flawed?” Bishop Sheridan never offered us a reason for granting priestly faculties to CPA priests in relation to the guidelines mentioned above. He appeared to be totally ignorant of these guidelines. Cardinal Egan of New York never even replied to my letter to him regarding his recent appointment of a CPA priest to St Joseph Church in New York Chinatown.

These ordinaries have openly pledged their loyalty, obedience and adherence to Magisterium when they were ordained. The fulfillment of these pledges has to be proved by deeds, not merely by words. These deeds undoubtedly consist of adhering to numerous Catholic dogmas, canon laws, Papal pronouncements, and numerous directives and guidelines, including the 1988 China guidelines officially issued by the Vatican. By openly violating or ignoring the extremely important and explicit 1988 China guidelines mentioned above (“all communicatio in sacris is to be avoided...”) these ordinaries allowing CPA priests to celebrate religious functions in public in their churches appears to be flexing the rules of the Magisterium for reasons unknown to us. When changing or disregarding at will the Vatican’s China guidelines, the hierarchy of the Church causes gross confusion among the public and has done a serious disservice to the underground Roman Catholic Church in China. This is not fair and may have serious consequences. For example, what would prevent the Catholic faithful from concluding that they too can change or disregard at will any other Vatican guidelines without any fear of reprisal because some bishops and other ranking religious are doing it?

I believe that the examples mentioned above amply illustrate that the Vatican has had a China policy which was and is still so confusing that it unnecessarily prolonged the suffering of the underground Roman Catholic Church in China.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh points of the 2004 guidelines deal with the reconciliation of the Patriotic Association religious with the underground Church in China. In order to avoid further divisiveness, Patriotic Association priests
and deacons can be reconciled only after the entire body of clergy reaches a consensus establishing unequivocal terms and conditions for the acceptance of the Patriotic Association clergy and religious....Priests and deacons requesting to be accepted by the loyal and legitimate bishops and to join their diocese must pass a period of discernment, and fulfill the terms as stipulated in the paragraph 8, sections A, B, C, G, and H of this document before they can be accepted and supported....Extreme care must be taken to explain the situations as described in paragraphs 5 and 6 above to the faithful in order to avoid potential confusion and divisiveness.

These 2004 guidelines are related to the 4th item of the Vatican’s 1988 China guidelines: “In the course of various encounters, care must be taken to avoid attitudes which could wound the sensibility of the ‘silent’ majority of those Catholics who have suffered and are suffering for their fidelity to the Holy Father.” These directives are related to each other because they both point to the different ways in which the failure to obey these directives has wounded the underground Roman Catholic Church in China — either by improper relations with CPA clergy and religious in China or by improper relations with CPA seminarians, clergy, and religious outside of China. The latter impropriety is precisely the wound chronically caused by Maryknoll’s and diocesan ordinaries’ sponsorship and support of approximately fifty CPA seminarians and priests to study for free in Roman Catholic seminaries each year across the United States since the early-1990s. Underground Roman Catholic Church seminarians and priests are deliberately excluded in this Maryknoll/diocese-sponsored program. This program was carried out in so much secrecy that we were not even aware of its existence until the late 1990s. We did not understand why this program should be limited to the CPA personnel and why it was carried out so secretly. We asked the question in our Open Letter and commented: “A policy or practice by any organization or community within the universal Church that aims at educating only CPA seminarians unquestionably wounds the suffering underground Roman Catholic Church in China — spiritually, psychologically, and financially.”

Now, the above mentioned 2004 guidelines clearly establish certain rules in order to avoid such a divisive Maryknoll/diocean project and “extreme care” must be taken to avoid such confusion and divisiveness created by Maryknoll. I hope that because of these 2004 guidelines, projects such as that of Maryknoll will never occur again, thereby avoiding attitudes that could wound the sensibility of the underground Roman Catholic Church in China.

(4) In my Open Letter to the Vatican in 2000, I also questioned the legitimacy of the requirement in the United States for granting priestly faculties to CPA priests. The requirement was that each Patriotic Association priest had only to recite once and in private the Profession of Faith as proof of his allegiance to the Pope. I asked after I elaborated extensively the fallacy of this requirement: “Should not the Holy See revise the approach to reconciling CPA priests with the Roman Catholic Church?” I commented that “reciting the Profession of Faith once by the CPA priests in private without their explicitly acknowledging the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff and in the meantime still reporting to the schismatic CPA bishops can hardly be construed as the faith demanded by the Pope when he said ‘unity (which) springs from conversion of the heart and from sincere acceptance of the unchanging principles laid down by Christ for His Church.’”

Msgr. Nugent’s eighth directive in his 2004 China guidelines has answered my question and observation in the paragraph above. He has corrected a very important requirement. He lays down very specific instructions for reconciling CPA deacons and priests with the Roman Catholic Church in China. Among them we find: Before the acceptance, he must profess his obedience and respect to the legitimate bishop in front of two or more loyal priests. He must read the “professio fidei,” and promise never to speak or do anything damaging the reconciliation. He must also clearly declare that he opposes the Patriotic Association and its “three autonomies” principle. He must publicly reject the principles of the Patriotic Association. He must publicly declare that he no longer belongs to the Patriotic Association. He must declare that he will not have any further relationship with the Patriotic Association in the future, nor he will support it. He must declare that he obeys the “8-point” directive (1988 guidelines), and that he will not have any “communicatio in sacris” with any illegal bishops or religious belonging to the Patriotic Association. Finally, he must sign a document to prove his position. The original statement must be kept in the diocesan files while a duplicate is to be sent to the representative of the Holy Father.

I pray that all those ordinaries who have accepted CPA priests and other religious in their dioceses follow the very clear 1988 and 2004 China guidelines for officially converting those CPA priests and religious to the universal Roman Catholic Church or else deny them “communicatio in sacris” in the event that these CPA priests and religious refuse to follow item 8 of Msgr. Nugent’s China guidelines.

In short, Msgr. Nugent’s 2004 China guidelines are an unambiguous and forthright upholding of the Vatican’s 1988 China guidelines. This is precisely what I was requesting in my Open Letter. In the seventh section of my Open Letter, I wrote: “As noted in many of the questions above, this (1988 China guidelines) has been ignored. Have other directives been issued by the Holy See that render this particular directive obsolete? If so, the faithful, especially those in China, have the right to know. If this particular directive has not been rescinded, why has the Holy See not enforced it among members of the hierarchy?” Msgr. Nugent has now clarified this issue.
Please Help Us Financially to Support the Underground Catholic Church in China

We continue to finance the education of underground religious inside and outside China. We now have approximately 75 underground religious studying in Europe and receiving our financial assistance. Each priest in Europe receives daily Mass stipends amounting to approximately US$3,000 per year; the seminarians and sisters in Europe each receive an annual subsidy of US$1,200 per year. In addition, we support a large number of underground seminarians' education in China at US$600 per year. God has blessed China with abundant vocations. Unfortunately, during the last fiscal year, we were only able to assist some 20 seminarians in China, a figure that is far below the request of the underground bishops as there is simply insufficient funding. In addition, we continue to send thousands of Mass stipends directly to underground bishops and priests in China, and to fund the orphanage for handicapped children, convents and many projects in the underground dioceses. We continue many other projects as we have reported in details in our Easter 2003 newsletter. When you add all these expenses together, they are far less than what we received from the public. We had to depend on deficit financing in order to maintain these vitally important programs. In the fiscal year that ended in June 2004, with the exception of a restricted gift of approximately $50,000, which we are not allowed to spend on general projects according to the wish of the donor, we received approximately (not yet independently audited) $262,000 in general contributions, while our project expenses are $266,000 and administrative & general expenses $38,000, totaling $309,000, and thereby incurring a deficit of $47,000. We thank you for your generous support in the past. Please remember the many urgent needs of the underground Church during this Christmas season.

2004 Annual Masses for Underground Church in China

I am happy to report that on October 3, 2004 approximately 200 Masses were offered around the world for the persecuted Roman Catholic Church in China. A church in Alexandria, Virginia offered all its 7 Masses on October 3 for the persecuted Church in China with approximately 3,000 people attending. Thank you all for offering these Masses. The annual Mass for 2005 will be on October 2.

Cardinal Kung Foundation Testified at the Congressional-Executive Commission on China

I was invited to testify at a hearing of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China on November 18. The hearing was called to examine the current situation with respect to the Chinese government repression of religious believers and religious practice. Among other things, on behalf of an underground Roman Catholic Church bishop in China, I requested that the Commission convey its plea to the administration that, while negotiating with China for religious freedom, the United States government proposes that many prisoners, both living and dead, be officially and posthumously exonerated of so-called crimes of which the Chinese government falsely accused them five decades ago. In doing so the reputation of these living and dead religious prisoners of conscience can be restored in China. Those who are still living can at least once again enjoy equal treatment in the society. For details, please visit our website. I also responded to questions from the panel.

The Board of Directors joins me in wishing you and your family blessings during this Holy Season.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

Joseph Kung

Prayers for the Cure of Cancer Answered: Believed Through Cardinal Kung’s Intercession

A Testimony From A Lady of Faith

September 16, 2004

Dear Joseph

Perhaps my name is familiar to you. Perhaps it isn’t. Every year I have a Mass said in my parish (St. Hedwig, Floral Park, New York) for the persecuted underground Roman Catholic Church in China. I usually mail the Church bulletin to you. I send a check now and then for $20 dollars or so. I wish that I could afford more but I am a widow living on Social Security and a small pension. Last fall I was diagnosed with Stage 4 advanced metastatic melanoma at Memorial Sloan Kettering Hospital. I was sent there by North Shore Hospital with the same diagnosis. I was put in a clinical trial which is experimental and the drugs that are used are not FDA approved for general use. I spoke to you right after I had been diagnosed and discussed with you that I was going to see a Dr. Jen-Wen Hwu and asked you if you thought she was Chinese (She is Taiwanese). You said that she may be. You sent me a prayer card with your beloved Uncle’s picture which included a relic. I said that prayer every day and touched the relic. I know that he is a Saint. He just hasn’t been canonized yet. I feel that he is my intercessor (or one of them, at least).

Update: I was diagnosed on Sept. 8th, 2003. I noticed on the prayer card that Ignatius Cardinal Kung Pin-Mei was “taken prisoner for Christ” on the same date in 1955. I thought that was interesting that I further “bonded” me to him. And so I started the chemotherapy in October 2003. Now the melanoma, which started in my left eye necessitated the removal of the eye in March of 2003, had metastasized to the lungs (multiple tumors, the CAT scan showed so many white dots that one
would think of a snowstorm), the back, the scalp, the left armpit lymph node and the liver. By December of 2003 the scans showed an improvement. Less tumors in the lungs and some shrinkage. The tumors in the scalp and lymph node and back were actually gone. My doctors were thrilled. Seventy percent of people with my condition do not survive. I told them about prayer. I showed Dr. Hwu your Uncle’s picture. By February or so, the cancer in the liver was gone. I continued taking the chemo and the lungs continued to show improvement. By July of 2004 the Doctors weren’t sure if what they saw on the scans were scars where the tumors has been or very tiny tumors.

On September 8th of 2004, the feast of Our Blessed Mother’s Nativity and the 49th anniversary of your beloved Uncle’s imprisonment, I was told that I no longer had to be on chemotherapy. It was exactly one year from my first CAT scan that was so frightening. I went to St. Hedwig’s to give Thanksgiving. It was a Wednesday and we have Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament which ends with a Novena to Our Lady of Perpetual Help at 7:30 p.m. It starts at 9 a.m. after Mass and ends at 8 p.m. or so. At the 3 o’clock hour there is the Chaplet of the Divine Mercy which is so lovely. At the end of the Chaplet, the priest announced that a priest that I had great respect for and who I usually used as my confessor had gone to his eternal life that morning at 10 a.m.

So September 8th has great meaning for me and always will. I will continue to pray for those brave and holy Chinese the persecuted priests and laity who have such love for the faith that they risk their lives for it daily. I pray for you, that you will see in your lifetime, your dear Uncle recognized by the world and the Catholic Church and realize (99% of people do not, and these are Catholics (!), sad to say), that China does not have freedom of religion and that priests, bishops and lay people are being imprisoned and even killed for trying to practice their faith.

I just needed to let you know my story. Faith and prayer are so important. I am so blessed! And I am so glad for the day that I picked up a Catholic magazine and read your Uncle’s unbelievable and wonderful story for the first time. I will continue to tell people about the situation in China and pass out the pamphlets. Most Catholics do not know about the underground Church in China. It would really help if the Bishops let the American Catholic populace know what is really happening.

I am writing to my Bishop tomorrow. And I will continue to pray. God Bless You.

Respectfully
Colleen

China 1988 Guidelines
By
Josef Cardinal Tomko

SACRA CONGREGATIO
PRO GENTIUM EVANGELIZATIONE
SEU DE PROPAGANDA FIDE
Prot. 3314/88

During the last few years the attention of Catholics and international opinion has been drawn by the news of the complex reality of the Catholic Church in China.

Furthermore, the visits of various delegations of ‘patriotic’ Chinese Catholics to Europe, Canada and the United States have induced the Episcopal Conferences of the Countries concerned to address the Holy See for clarifications and directives.

This Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, in accord with the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church, considers it its duty to bring to your knowledge some data, as well as various indications which could be useful.

As you are aware, when in 1949 communism gained power in Continental China, the Catholic Church had around three million faithful distributed in 144 ecclesiastical circumscriptions, forty of which were entrusted to Chinese Bishops, priests numbered 5800, of whom 2700 Chinese, and religious sisters 6753; numerous were the educational, health, and welfare institutions.

As soon as Mao Tse Tung assumed full control of the entire continental territory, the non Chinese Bishops and all the missionaries were imprisoned and then expelled.

Many Bishops, priests and laity of Chinese origin were arrested, condemned to long penal detention or sent to camps of re-education. Not a few died in prison.

The situation of the Church grew worse during the following years when the regime of Peking promoted the rise of the ‘movement of the three autonomies’ (1951), whose principles of self-government, self-propagation, and self-financing inspired during the subsequent years (1957) the constitution of the ‘Patriotic Association of Chinese Catholics’, with the declared intention of giving life to a “Catholic Church” without links with the supreme Pontiff and the Holy See, under the full control of the governing authority.
With this aim in view, the Association promoted the nomination and Episcopal ordination of new Bishops who had neither been chosen nor confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff.

A few recent positions taken up by certain leaders of the Patriotic Association seem to indicate some changes in attitude and the assumption on the part of the Patriotic Association of a more political role, as an organ of communication between the Catholic Church in China and the Government. Nevertheless, official declarations of representatives of the Patriotic Association and the fact that the Association still guides the choice and ordination of Bishops in each diocese and maintains control over the activities of the various diocesan communities, still demonstrate that the same difficulties are continuing.

Actually, after the dolorous period of the cultural revolution, the situation of the Catholic Church in China presents complex forms, which are not always clear.

On the one hand, there exists an ‘official’ Church, recognized by the Government which, being founded on the ‘autonomous’ process promoted by the governing authorities, has some fifty Bishops, numerous churches open to the cult and various regional and diocesan seminaries inaugurated during these last years.

On the other hand, there exists and is actively operating a ‘faithful’ Church, which some are calling an ‘underground’ Church, and which remains faithful to its ties of full communion and hierarchical belonging to the Roman Pontiff: a religious bond which is an essential part of the Catholic Faith. The majority of the Chinese Catholics belong to this second group.

And then there exist in the interior of the first group priests and faithful who are promoters of an intermediate way: they conserve in their hearts as unrelievable their bonds of communion with the Holy Father, as well as accepting the religious policy imposed by the Authorities.

At present, the Authorities of Peking do not permit the Holy See to have rapport with the ‘faithful’ Church and not even with the ‘official’ Church.

As the contacts among members of the Episcopate, priests and faithful, with exponents of the Catholic Church in China are becoming ever more frequent, this Dicastery, in accord with the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church, considers it opportune to give the Episcopal Conferences the following indications:

1. The contacts in question could be a good occasion to reaffirm with clarity the Catholic Doctrine on the communion which must unite the Bishops with the Successor of Peter and, through him, among themselves (I. G. 14 & 18). In this regard, one could have recourse to the doctrinal principles of the Vatican Councils I and II.

2. In the light of the Vatican Council II one could also explain to them how the Church realizes in her own life self-government, self-propagation and self-financing: it is normal today that Bishops be chosen from among the local clergy; evangelization is, in the first place, to be realized by the local churches, even if in many cases the collaboration of the missionaries still remains necessary, but in a subordinate position; that it is evident that the Church be financially supported by the offerings of the faithful in the locality.

3. Mention could also be made to them of the various forms of collegiality which are being developed in the Church, particularly since Vatican Council II, both on the national and regional levels through the Episcopal Conferences, and on the universal level through the presence and collaboration of the Episcopates of the various countries in the central government of the Church, as, for example, their presence in the Roman Dicasteries, and their collaboration in the Synod of Bishops.

4. In the course of various encounters, care must be taken to avoid attitudes which could wound the sensibility of the ‘silent’ majority of those Catholics who have suffered and are suffering for their fidelity to the Holy Father.

There is also need of avoiding that the visits in question do not become instrumental in obtaining recognition and the legitimization of a position which cannot in any way be acceptable either on the doctrinal level or disciplinary and canonical levels.

5. Another rather delicate point is the question of the liturgical celebrations. In fact all ‘communicatio in sacris’ is to be avoided. The ‘patriotic’ bishops and priests are not to be invited or even allowed to celebrate religious functions in public, either in the churches or in the oratories of the various religious institutes.

6. The necessary clarity regarding the ecclesial aspects of the visits and the attitude to be adopted, which must be respected by all, do not imply that there is to be a lack of fraternal charity, which should be expressed in the cordiality of the welcome given to the guests and in the manner in which they are treated.

It is hoped that all this will assist them in understanding, in the light of the Spirit, the incoherence of their position and induce them to a change of attitude.
7. Care must also be taken that those who are responsible for the organization of the visits of the above-mentioned delegations be persons of sound doctrine, faithful to the Magisterium of the Church and capable of acting with great prudence.

8. It is to be foreseen that such events will not fail to arouse reactions in the local and international press. It will be necessary, therefore, to foresee how to assist the means of social communication, utilizing the orientations mentioned above, which clarify the position of the Church and may foster the comprehension of the diverse and complex problems closely connected with this position.

I am enclosing hereewith the text of the ‘directives on some of the problems of the Church in Continental China’, prepared at the request of the Holy Father and approved by him.

The document in question represents the reply to some requests which Chinese Bishops have repeatedly made to the Holy See. However, it may be opportunely used also for what concerns the relationships with the ecclesiastics of Continental China who go on visits abroad, as well as the ecclesiastics of the various countries who more frequently visit that Nation.

This letter has been drafted by the competent Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples in accord with the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church. Its contents, as well as the contents of the enclosed “directives”, could be made known to the Bishops of that Nation and, through them, to the priests, both diocesan and religious, more directly concerned. Nevertheless, given the delicate nature of the matter, use should be made of them in a discreet and reserved manner.

In view of the great interest with which the Holy See follows the situation of the Church in China, the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples would be pleased if, subsequently, your Episcopate could forward any possible useful information it might have in its regard.

With sentiments of personal esteem and every best wish, I remain,

Yours sincerely in Our Lord,
Josef Card. Tomko
Pref. (Signed)

Directives On Some Of The Problems Of The Church In Continental China
By Josef Cardinal Tomko
(Reference --- Prot. 3314/88 September 3, 1988)

1. The Catholic Doctrine clearly affirms that only those are fully incorporated into the society of the Church who “accept her entire system and all means of salvation given to her, and through union with her visible structure are joined to Christ, who rules her through the Supreme Pontiff and the Bishops. This joining is effected by the bonds of professed faith, of the sacraments, of ecclesiastical government and of communion.” (L. G. n.14)

Since the Roman Pontiff in the Catholic Church is “a permanent and visible principle and foundation of unity of Faith and fellowship” (L. G. n.18) those who don’t profess or don’t preserve the communion with the Pope, cannot consider themselves to be Catholic. Communion with the Pope is not only a question of discipline but of Catholic faith.

For this reason, the Holy See keeps in deep esteem and admiration the Bishops, priests, religious and lay people who in the course of time and in all the regions of the world have always maintained the integrity of their Faith, including their fidelity to the Roman Pontiff. And it encourages them to continue and to grow in the same Faith.

2. In so far as China is concerned, history records in 1957 the constitution of the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association whose expressed intent was to renounce to the fundamental bonds with the Roman Pontiff and the Holy See and to place the community of the Faithful under the direct control of the civic authority.

Although more recently some of the representatives of the Patriotic Association have taken positions which seem to indicate a certain change of attitude and the tendency on the part of the same Association to assume a role that is more political than religious as a channel of communication between the Church and the Government, nonetheless the constitutive documents as well as the official declarations of the Representatives of the Association do confirm its initial intention.

Furthermore, it is a fact that the Patriotic Association tries to control until now the election and ordination of the Bishops in every diocese and the activities of the various diocesan communities.
In accordance with the doctrinal principles exposed above, the Catholics cannot accept in conscience the principles of an Association which demands the rejection of a fundamental element of their faith, namely the indispensable communion with the Roman Pontiff, visible head of the Church and of the College of Catholic Bishops which cannot exist without him as head.

3. Since 1958, by the initiative of the Patriotic Association, numerous Episcopal ordinations have taken place without the necessary consent of the Roman Pontiff (mandato apostolico).

In accordance with the Doctrine of the Church and the canonical discipline, such ordinations are to be considered gravously illicit; those who receive the ordination and those who confer it, incur in the excommunication "latae sententiae", reserved to the Holy See. (cfr. Decree of the Holy Office of April 9, 1951 and Canon 1382 in the codex of Canon Law)

Judging from the information at our disposal, it seems that in these ordinations no such elements are present as to make them per se invalid. Naturally in such situations no definitive judgment is possible until each case is carefully and duly examined under all aspects.

4. With regard to the sacraments administered by priests ordained by Bishops not recognized by the Roman Pontiff, the presumption is in favor of the validity of their ordination and therefore also of the sacraments they administer.

With regard to the question whether or not is licit to assist at their Masses and receive their sacraments, the Catholics must look for faithful priests, i.e. in communion with the Pope.

However, for the sake of their spiritual welfare, they may have recourse also to the other priest, provided that they avoid the occasion of scandal and the danger to thus jeopardize the exact notion of the Catholic faith, which, as has been already recalled, demands the full communion with the Roman Pontiff.

5. The Church has the right and the duty, even in China, of having her own seminary for the training of her clergy.

But, if this is forbidden and if it is not possible to give even privately an adequate formation to the candidates for the priesthood, then, these can be sent to the seminaries that are opened under the control of the Patriotic Association. But only under the condition that the general orientation and formation imparted there, follow the teaching and directives of the Church.

This possibility is to be evaluated according to the local circumstances and keeping in mind also the persons in charge of such formation centers.

6. The religious books, liturgical texts, catechisms and other religious materials (printed by the Patriotic Association) can be used only and to the extent that they faithfully convey the doctrine of the Church.

7. Subsidies must be directed towards initiatives which serve to the maintenance of the right doctrine and of the spirit of faith of the Catholic Church. For subsidies to persons or initiatives which do not offer such guarantees each individual case must be examined in the light of the moral principles about cooperation. — The End —

China 2004 Guidelines
by Monsignor Eugene M. Nugent
Translation edited by Cardinal Kung Foundation

To : All Legitimately Appointed Bishops of the Catholic Dioceses in China

Subject: Several Basic Problems Concerning Reconciliation and Communion inside the Church.

Respectful bishops and priests:

May the peace of Christ be with you all!

At the present moment, the Church in China is in a critical period of difficulty and persecution. Many bishops and priests are still imprisoned and have not been released. Every aspect of the life of the Church in China is under the government's widespread and systematic control. In this situation, I encourage that we all firmly maintain the principle of faith and full communion. This is very important in order to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

As you already know, the Holy Father explicitly asked us to seek unity and reconciliation in the Church in China; but, this must be carried out in the principle of truth, clearly stating the principle of reconciliation, but rejecting the so-called "three autonomies" principle. At the same time, this must be carried out with charity in order to promote friendly relationships and
mutual trust. The Holy Father or the Holy See will never force the loyal/underground Church community to make concessions on the question of principles.

Like Catholics everywhere, the Catholics in China should be honest and good citizens. They love their country, but should not be forced to make compromises on their faith or be forced to join an organization which usurps the authority of the Holy Father and the lawful authority of the bishops. All the bishops in China should now unite together, clearly and firmly demanding the total freedom to minister to the Church without any government interference.

Obviously, the Patriotic Association has the characteristic of being in schism. It is the source of confusion and divisiveness. The Patriotic Association claims that it can assume the role that belongs only to the bishops in order to minister to the Church under the principle of maintaining the faith. But, in past years, the Patriotic Association uneasingly placed heavy pressure on bishops and priests to a degree that has become unbearable. Bishops and priests can never accept the principles underlying the Patriotic Association.

In recent months, I have received many letters from bishops and apostolic administrators, asking for a directive on such questions concerning “communicatio in sacris,” reconciliation with priests of the Patriotic Association, and the acceptance of Patriotic Association priests by the loyal and lawful bishops. Accordingly, I wish to state the following points to you, the contents of which have already been communicated to several bishops.

1) The “8-point” directive issued in March 1988 and approved by the Holy Father is still in effect.

2) All legitimate priests and deacons should obey the “8-point” directive, and will therefore not have “communicatio in sacris” either with illegitimate bishops and religious or with those religious under the Patriotic Association. (Please refer to the 5th point in the “8-point” directive).

3) Even in situations in which concelebration has been permitted, a priest may still have the freedom to choose whether or not to concelebrate. He should not be forced to concelebrate if he is not willing. (Canon 902)

4) A bishop ordaining a priest or deacon from another diocese without a dimissorial letter from the proper ordinary is ipso facto suspended. (Canon 1383) He does not belong to that diocese. The bishop who ordains him is responsible for him.

5) In order to avoid further divisiveness, Patriotic Association priests and deacons can be reconciled only after the entire body of clergy reaches a consensus establishing unequivocal terms and conditions for the acceptance of the Patriotic Association clergy and religious.

6) Priests and deacons requesting to be accepted by the loyal and legitimate bishops and to join their dioceses must pass a period of discernment, and fulfill the terms as stipulated in the paragraph 8, sections A, B, C, G, and H of this document before they can be accepted and supported.

7) Extreme care must be taken to explain the situations as described in paragraphs 5 and 6 above to the faithful in order to avoid potential confusion and divisiveness.

8) For the sake of prudence, when reconciling with the Patriotic Association’s priests and deacons, or when accepting into the diocese these priests and deacons who were ordained without a dimissorial letter from their proper ordinary, the following procedures must be observed.

A) The bishop must seek the opinion of and obtain agreement from the priests' council.

B) Those priests and deacons of the Patriotic Association seeking acceptance must be recognized by the loyal and legitimate priests as fervent priests or deacons in good standing. They ought to be those respected by the faithful.

C) Before the acceptance, he must profess his obedience and respect to the legitimate bishop in front of two or more loyal priests. He must read the “professio fidelis” and promise never to speak or do anything damaging the reconciliation. He must also clearly declare that he opposes the Patriotic Association and its “three autonomies” principles.

D) He must publicly reject the principles of the Patriotic Association.

E) He must publicly declare that he no longer belongs to the Patriotic Association.

F) He must declare that he will not have any further relationship with the Patriotic Association in the future, nor he will support it.

G) He must declare that he obeys the “8-point” directives, and that he will not have any “communicatio in sacris” with any illegal bishops or religious belonging to the Patriotic Association. (Please refer to the 5th point of the “8-point” directive)
H) Finally, he must sign a document to prove his position. The original statement must be kept in the diocesan files while a duplicate is to be sent to the representative of the Holy Father.

9) In order to maintain communion among the priests, when a lawful bishop wishes to ordain a seminarian trained in a Patriotic Association seminary, besides passing a period of discernment, he must abide by the terms stipulated in paragraph 8, sections A, B, C, G and H of this document.

I hope that the above 9 points may be helpful to facilitate mutual cooperation between bishops and religious, thereby promoting increased harmony and reconciliation in your community and the whole church in China.

May our Lord, the Eternal Priest, bless your episcopate!

May our Lady of China be with each one of you!

Yours sincerely in Christ
Eugene M. Nugent
July 3, 2004

Press Release by The Cardinal Kung Foundation — August 16, 2004

Arrest of Eight Underground Roman Catholic Priests and Two Seminarians

Stamford, Connecticut, U.S.A. — Eight underground Roman Catholic priests and two underground Roman Catholic seminarians were arrested on August 6 at approximately 6 PM in the Sujiazhuang Village of Quyang County in Hebei Province while they were attending a religious retreat. Among those arrested are Father HUO Junlong, the administrator of Baoding Diocese in Hebei, Fathers ZHANG Zhenquan, QIAO Juwei, QIN Yingxian, AN Jianzhao, LI Yongshun, MA Wuyong of Baoding, Father HUANG Chunshou of Sujiazhuang Village, and seminarian LI Jinhui of Baoding. The name of one more seminarians arrested is unknown. Approximately twenty police vehicles and a large number of security policemen surrounded Sujiazhuang Village and conducted a house to house search in order to arrest these priests and seminarians. Because of the remote location of Sujiazhuang Village, plus the fact that most villagers stayed in the house during the raid, it appears that no one even realized that the target of the police raid was for underground religious. The whole operation was carried out so swiftly that few villagers even knew the names of those arrested. They are now detained in the Baoding Security Bureau.

Nine out of ten religious arrested this time belong to the Baoding diocese. Baoding and its neighboring villages have a rich tradition of strong faith, courage and martyrdom. It is the home of more than 40 of the 120 new martyr-saints canonized by Pope John Paul II on October 1, 2000. Bishop SU Zhi-Ming, the underground Roman Catholic Bishop of Baoding, was arrested by the Chinese government almost seven years ago on October 8, 1997. He was seen only once when he was accidentally discovered on November 15, 2003 while he was hospitalized in a Baoding hospital. Once discovered, he was taken away again without a trace. We do not know if he is now dead or alive. Bishop AN Shuxin, the Auxiliary Bishop of Baoding, was also arrested by the government more than eight years ago in March 1996. He also has not been seen since then. We also do not know his whereabouts and his condition or if he is dead or alive. In addition, eight other Baoding priests arrested previously are still in jail. Including the nine that were arrested this time, there are at least nineteen underground religious in various jails at this time in the Baoding diocese alone.

No account of the persecution of the underground Roman Catholic Baoding diocese is complete without reminding the public about the complete destruction of the Marian shrine in Dong Lu, which is a tiny village in the Baoding diocese, and which has a history of continuous pilgrimage from all over China for more than a hundred years. More than eight years ago in April 1996, shortly before the annual pilgrimage was to begin in May, 5,000 Chinese soldiers, supported by dozens of armed cars and helicopters, sealed off this tiny village called Dong Lu. The soldiers completely destroyed this Shrine and confiscated the statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary. At the same time, they arrested Bishops SU Zhimin and AN Shuxin mentioned above. They also arrested the pastor of this Shrine. After approximately eight years in jail, the pastor was exiled overseas.

Joseph Kung, the President of the Cardinal Kung Foundation, said, “While the whole world is in awe at the performance and the spirit of the Olympic Games, the Chinese government, who will be hosting the 2008 Olympic Games, failed to respect such Olympic spirits and violated its own constitution guaranteeing religious freedom by raiding and jailing these innocent religious personnel. This assault on Baoding Diocese is a strong example of the Chinese government’s determination to destroy the underground Roman Catholic Church in China as instructed in its many internal secret documents to their local governments. Some of these documents have been posted on our website. We appeal to the international community and to the Olympic International Committee to reassess whether a country like China with such a dismal record of human rights should be awarded the honor of hosting the Olympic Games while such atrocities go on.”

The End
Press Release by Asia News — September 11, 2004

Holy See Calls For Beijing To Free Detained Priests, Bishops and Seminarians

Press Office Director Announces The Death of Bishop Gao Kexian, Bishop of Yantai, In Prison Since 1999

Vatican City (AsiaNews) - Joaquin Navarro-Valls, director of the Vatican Press Office, took issue once again with the "serious violation of religious freedom" taking place in China against Catholic communities. In particular the Holy See is condemning the arrest of 8 priests and 2 seminarians in Hebei, plus 3 priests and 1 seminarian in Fuzhou. According to AsiaNews sources in China, it is clear, by now, that the government has launched a campaign to eliminate or isolate the leaders of underground churches. The Vatican, in affirming that religious freedom is "a fundamental human right," calls for the release of those arrested "so that they may return...to their pastoral undertakings at the service of their respective Catholic communities." Among those whose release is being called for are Bishop James Su Zhimin and his auxiliary Bishop Francis An Shuxin who disappeared in September 1997 and March 1996 respectively and are being held without trial and whose whereabouts is unknown. Navarro Valls also gave the news of the death in prison of Bishop Gao Kexian, Bishop of Yantai. "The Bishop's body, Navarro Valls said, was handed over by police to his relatives. Bishop Gao had been imprisoned since the end of the 1990s and there had been no news of him for some time."

Here is the full text of the statement (AsiaNews translation): "The Holy See has just come to learn of the arrest, last August, of Catholic priests and members of the faithful in the People's Republic of China. In the first week of August, the Rev. Fr. Paul Huo Junlong, Vicar General of the Diocese of Baoding (Hebei province) was taken into custody by police, along with 7 other priests and 2 seminarians. The priests Paul An Jianzhao and John Baptist Zhang Zhenquan were condemned to a period of re-education through forced labour. It appears that the others are being detained in Qyang (Baoding), with the exception of three who do not belong to the above-mentioned diocese. According to our information, as of September 6, 2004, there are 23 members of the Baoding diocese clergy in detention or deprived of freedom. Among these are Bishop Msgr James Su Zhimin and his Auxiliary Bishop Francis An Shuxin, who disappeared September 1997 and March 1996 respectively. They are being detained without trial and their whereabouts is unknown. Subsequently, the diocesan administrator of the Archdiocese of Fuzhou was arrested, along with 2 priests and 1 seminarian. There is currently no indication that either has been released. The Holy See is unaware of any reason for such repressive measures.

If this latest news were to be true, this would be, once again, a serious violation of religious freedom, which is a fundamental human right. The Holy See calls for the respect of this right which has been sanctioned by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and trusts that all the persons mentioned will be justly returned, as soon as possible, to freedom and to their pastoral undertakings at the service of their respective Catholic communities. Lastly, news has arrived of the death in prison, toward the end of August, of H.E. Bishop John Gao Kexian, Bishop of Yantai (Shandong province) at the age of 76. The Bishop's body was handed over by police to his relatives. Bishop Gao had been imprisoned since the end of the 1990s and there had been no news of him for some time."

May the Peace, Joy and Love Of the Christ Child
And His Holy Mother
Be yours this Christmas
And each day of the New Year