

ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT
to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (AUGUST:576–602)

How Culture Mattered at Vatican II: Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations

Melissa J. Wilde
Indiana University

I obtained Caporale's transcripts with Joseph Komonchak's help, who also deserves thanks for alerting me to Caporale's study. When asked, Caporale readily agreed to allow me access to them. The originals are now publicly available at Catholic University of America's Vatican II Archive. Using the voting data, I compared Caporale's sample to the bishops at the Council as a whole.¹ I found that while his sample is representative of conservatives, he seems to have over-sampled progressives and under-sampled moderates. There is almost double the proportion of progressives and half the proportion of

moderates in his sample as there are among the bishops as a whole (see Table 1).

His over-sampling of progressives in general is an understandable result of his focus on "leaders," given the environment during the beginning of the Council when he conducted his interviews. Elsewhere, I demonstrate that once the Council began, the majority of Council observers and participants grew excited about the possibilities for change (Wilde forthcoming). Progressives were understandably more likely to be seen as leaders of change initiatives than moderates or conservatives. Considering this, that Caporale interviewed any leaders of the *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* (International Group of Fathers, henceforward CIP) is remarkable, especially since they were not yet an organization when he

¹ Full details about the voting data, the way in which I coded the votes as progressive or conservative, and the trends found within them can be found in Wilde et al. 2003.

Table 1. Ideological Distribution of Caporale's Sample

	Caporale's Sample, n (%)	All Voters, n (%)
Percentage of Progressive Votes		
Mean	69	63
Less than 30	9 (15)	310 (13)
30-80	22 (32)	1389 (57)
80-100	36 (53)	731 (30)
Total	67 (100)	2430 (100)

Note: Distribution is according to the percentage of progressive votes on seven of the most contentious council votes. Only bishops who voted on at least three of the seven votes are included, thus, only 67 of the 72 bishops Caporale interviewed.

conducted most of his interviews. Because of his over-sampling of progressives, 13 of the 22 members of the *Domus Mariae* (House of Mary; henceforward DM) were interviewed by Caporale, and even more (19 of 22) made it into the general pool of leaders recommended as potential interviewees. The DM's presence in Caporale's sample does not seem to be simply an artifact of his snowball sampling technique. The number of DM members recommended to Caporale as respondents remains constant even if

only the recommendations by bishops who were not themselves DM members are counted. Only one-third of those whom DM members recommended were also DM members.

MEMBERS OF THE DM

The DM was also called the "Conference of Twenty-Two" and the "Inter-conference" (c.f. Noël 1997:97 n.1). Table 2 presents the bishops whom I have identified as core leaders and their primary episcopal conference.²

² Not listed in Table 2 as core members though they did attend some DM meetings (an asterisk notes they were interviewed by Caporale): Roger Etchegaray* (France) who was the DM secretary, John K. Amissah (Ghana), Arrieta (Costa Rica), William Brasseur (Philippines), Alberto Castelli (Italy), William Conway (Ireland), Eugene D'Souza* (India), D. Herliby (Ireland), Marc Lallier (France), Léo Lemay (Malaysia), Stanisals Lokuang (China), Joseph Malula (Congo), Petrus Moors (Holland), Jérôme Pillai (Ceylon), Nicolas Verhoeven (Indonesia), Karol Wojtyla (Poland), Dieudonné Yougbare (Upper Volta). Sources: Etchegaray to Primeau, January 4, 1963, PC; and DM Minutes (PC): 1:1 November 9, 1962; 2:1 November 13, 1962; 4:1 November 27, 1962; 1:2 October 4, 1963; 2:2 October 11, 1963; 3:2 October 18, 1963; Noël 1997: 99-100 n. 8.

Table 2. Twenty-two Members of the Domus Mariae

Africa	Asia	Europe	North America	CELAM
Joseph Blomjous (Tanganyika)	Victor Bazin (Burma)	George Beck* (England)	Maurice Baudoux (Canada)	Helder Pessoa Camara* (Brazil)
Jean B. Zoa*~ (Cameroon)	Thomas B. Cooray (Ceylan)	Pedro Cantero Cuadrado (Spain)	Ernest Primeau* (United States)	Miguel Miranda y Gomez* (Mexico)
	Michael Doumith (Lebanon)	Joseph Hoeffner* (Germany)		Emmanuel Larrain* (Chile)
<u>Oceania</u>	Neofitos Edelby (Syria)	I. Marijan Oblak (Yugoslavia)		Marcos McGrath* (Panama)
Victor Foley (Fiji Islands)	Angelo Fernandes* (India)	Pierre Veuillot (France)		
	Alejandro Olalia* (Philippines)			
	Lorenzo S. Nagae* (Japan)			
	Pierre Ngo-dihn-Thuc (Vietnam)			

Note: CELAM = *Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano* (Latin American Episcopal Conference); FACE = Federation of African Episcopal Conferences.

* Denotes Caporale's respondents.

- Denotes FACE leader.

+ Denotes leader of CELAM

Melissa Wilde

"How Culture Mattered at Vatican II:

Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations"

Table 3. Frequency of Episcopal Conference Meetings during the Council

	Members	
	n	%
Weekly Meetings/DM Representative		
CELAM	550	21.0
FACE	320	12.0
USA	216	8.0
France	130	5.0
Canada	90	3.0
India	80	3.0
Oceania ^a	70	3.0
Eastern Orthodox	65	0.5
Germany ^b	59	2.0
Poland	51	2.0
Philippines	40	2.0
Great Britain	35	1.0
Ireland ^c	32	1.0
Belgium ^d	30	1.0
Vietnam ^e	26	1.0
Japan	18	0.7
Austria	17	0.7
Netherlands	12	0.5
Switzerland	12	0.5
Burma	8	0.3
Ceylon	6	0.2
Total Effective	1877	72.0
Infrequent/Ineffective	367	14.0
Italy	117	5.0
China	89	3.0
Spain	28	1.0
Portugal	28	1.0
Yugoslavia	16	0.6
Hungary		
Total Ineffective	644	25.0
Total NA	73	3.0
Total Ineffective or NA	717	28.0

Note: Total number of bishops = 2594. CELAM = *Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano* (Latin American Episcopal Conference); FACE = Federation of African Episcopal Conferences.

^a Includes 39 bishops from Australia, 10 from New Guinea, 9 from Polynesia, 5 from New Zealand, 4 from Melanesia, 3 from Micronesia.

^b Includes 54 bishops from both East and West Germany, 1 from Luxembourg, 1 from Iceland, 2 from Sweden, and 1 from Finland.

^c Includes Northern Ireland.

^d Includes 26 Belgians, 3 bishops from Norway and 1 from Denmark.

^e Includes 17 Vietnamese bishops (both North and South), 1 Cambodian, 2 Laotians and 6 bishops from Thailand.

DETAILS ON THE EPISCOPAL CONFERENCES AT THE COUNCIL

Table 3 provides a list of the major episcopal conferences which I could verify met weekly and effectively (for the DM's purposes).³ All country names are taken directly from the *Acta* (1960-1961) and therefore reflect countries or groups of countries as they existed in the early 1960s.

ECs counted as effective are only those whose members told Caporale they met effectively at least once a week and had a DM representative. Vietnam, Ceylon, and Burma are included in Table 3 (and Figure 1 in the *ASR* article that accompanies this Web supplement), though I could not confirm the frequency of their meetings because they had an official representative to the DM. I included all bishops from countries dominated by the Eastern Orthodox⁴ Catholic Church (whose bishops did vote at the Council), because despite the rather small number of bishops from these countries, they had two core representatives at the DM during all four sessions (Dumith for the Maronite Church and Edelby from the Melkite Church). Such representation seemed to make it plausible that they were well informed of the DM's goals and concerns.

CELAM AND FACE MEMBERSHIP

All countries included within the umbrella-organizations of the *Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano* (Latin American Episcopal

³ The numbers in Table 3 represent the number of bishops in each country at the start of the Council and are therefore only an approximation of actual votes (which varied from vote to vote and session to session). Sources: regarding meeting frequency, Caporale's interview data; regarding the number of potential votes for each EC, *Acta* (Series I, Index, 1960-61:209-406).

⁴ These 75 bishops consist of 2 from the Arabian Peninsula, 4 from Iran, 12 from Iraq, 1 from Jordan, 26 from Lebanon, 10 from Pakistan, 4 from Palestine, 15 from Syria, and 1 from Turkey.

Conference; CELAM) and the Federation of African Episcopal Conferences (FACE) are presented in Table 4.

FACE membership was difficult to pin down. There was a plethora of African organizations and sub-organizations, with FACE being the largest, including an organization of French-speaking Africa, or West Africa, as well as an organization of English-speaking, or East Africa (Inter Territorial Episcopal

Board of East Africa [ITEBEA]). Caporale's respondents told him that between 12 and 15 countries participated in the African Episcopal conferences, which seem to have had some overlap of members (Blomjous and Scalais CIC 2). I have been able to verify that the following African countries were connected to the DM: Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Gabon, Nigeria, Nyassaland, Republic of Central Africa, Rhodesia, South Africa, Tanganyika, Uganda, (Blomjous, McCann, Scalais, and Zoa CIC 2).

Table 4. Membership Bases of CELAM and FACE

CELAM	Members, n	Bishops, %	FACE	Members, n	Bishops, %
Argentina	50	1.90	Algeria	5	0.20
Bahamas	1	0.04	Angola	5	0.20
Bermuda	1	0.04	Cameroon	8	0.30
Bolivia	21	0.80	Cape Verde	1	0.04
Brazil	167	6.40	Congo	40	1.50
British Virgin Islands	6	0.20	Egypt	13	0.50
Chile	25	1.00	Eritrea	3	0.10
Columbia	54	2.10	Ethiopia	4	0.20
Costa Rica	5	0.20	Gambia	1	0.04
Cuba	8	0.30	Ghana	7	0.30
Curacao	1	0.04	Guinea ^a	5	0.20
Dominican Republic	7	0.30	Indonesia	31	1.20
Ecuador	22	0.80	Kenya	9	0.30
El Salvador	6	0.20	Liberia	2	0.08
Falkland Islands	1	0.04	Libya	3	0.10
Guatemala	12	0.50	Madagascar	13	0.50
Guadeloupe & Martinique	3	0.10	Morocco	2	0.08
Guyana	3	0.10	Mauritius	1	0.04
Haiti	8	0.30	Mozambique	6	0.20
Honduras	6	0.20	Nigeria	19	0.70
Honduras (British)	1	0.04	Nyassaland	7	0.30
Mexico	53	2.00	Reunion	1	0.04
Nicaragua	6	0.20	Rhodesia	14	0.50
Panama	4	0.20	Ruanda-Urundi	7	0.30
Paraguay	10	0.40	Seychelles	1	0.04
Peru	36	1.40	Sierra Leone	2	0.08
Puerto Rico	2	0.08	Somalia	2	0.08
Uruguay	7	0.30	South Africa	28	1.10
Venezuela	24	0.90	Sudan	7	0.30
			South-West Africa	3	0.10
			Tanganyika	21	0.80
			Togo	2	0.08
			Tunisia	1	0.04
			Uganda	7	0.30
			Equatorial Africa ^b	11	0.40
			Occidental Africa ^c	28	1.10
Total CELAM	550	21.20	Total FACE	320	12.30

Note: Total number of bishops = 2594. CELAM = *Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano* (Latin American Episcopal Conference); FACE = Federation of African Episcopal Conferences.

^a Includes bishops from both Portuguese and Spanish Guinea.

^b This category includes the modern Central African Republic, Chad, The Republic of Congo and Gabon.

^c This category includes Benin, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Mali and Senegal.

Melissa Wilde

"How Culture Mattered at Vatican II:
Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations"

Table 5. Nationality of CIP Sympathizers Who Signed CIP Communism Petition

Country or Country of Origin	Signers, n (%) ^a	Country's bishops, %
Italy	77 (19)	21*
Moved from Italy	33 (8)	24
Spain	16 (4)	22
Moved from Spain	23 (5)	34*
Moved from France	22 (5)	20
Columbia	17 (3)	43*
India	10 (3)	20
Brazil	15 (3)	11
France	10 (3)	8
Moved from US	10 (3)	13
Moved from Canada	9 (3)	31*
Mexico	11 (3)	19
Total	253 (58)	9

Note: Data shown for all countries that constituted at least two percent of signers. CIP = *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* (International Group of Fathers).

* Pearson chi-square test indicates that this country's bishops were significantly ($p < .05$) different from all other bishops. Because of the number and conservatism of Italian bishops, each country was tested both including and excluding them. The only difference between the two tests demonstrated that while French bishops were significantly less likely than all other bishops to sign when Italian bishops are included, they were not significantly different from all other bishops once Italians were excluded.

^a Values for signers show number with percent of total in parentheses.

CIP SYMPATHIZERS

Tables 5 through 7 provide additional information about CIP sympathizers. Table 5 presents the nationalities of the CIP's sympathizers (who signed the petition asking the Pope to condemn communism).

The CIP's interest in having the Council condemn communism is complicated. Italian support was most likely a result of the Christian Democratic Party's fight against the Communist Party, but Table 5 demonstrates that the relationship between communism and the Church in many countries needs further examination. Bishops from Spain and Colombia were significantly more likely to sign the CIP petition and bishops from the United States less likely. For more

on the issue of communism at the Council see Wiltgen ([1967]1985:272-79) and Rynne (1968:476-77).

Table 6 presents more details on the nationalities of another group of CIP sympathizers, the bishops who voted against the most progressive statement on collegiality.

Finally, Table 7 presents a cross-tabulation of the signers of both the Communism and Mary CIP petitions. The version of the Mary petition I obtained from the *Instituto Per Le Scienze Religiose* (ISR) has some problems. It is handwritten and not titled, however, it seems to be a draft of that petition, if a slightly incomplete draft (researchers report that 510 bishops eventually signed the petition, my version had 450 signatures). I cross-checked it with the personal correspondence surviving in Sigaud's archive at the ISR. All of the bishops who wrote to Sigaud about signing the petition, whose letters were in his archive, had legible signatures on the petition ($n = 5/5$). Furthermore, it is definitely not an earlier draft of the communism petition (which was typed and summarized by country and continent), as only 27 percent of those who signed the communism petition also signed the handwritten petition. Therefore, because Mary was the other major petition disseminated by the group, I feel confident that the list of signers I have is indeed a version of that petition.

None of the members of Sigaud's "Pro-consecration committee" list (ISR FSig 3.28) however, were included in the petition, including Sigaud himself (most likely because they felt they were visible supporters by their presence on the committee, or because I do indeed have an incomplete draft). Therefore, I added to the petition the 11 members of the "Pro-consecration Committee" (ISR FSig 3.14 and 3.28) who were not on the handwritten list, and I use the combined lists in analysis. Doing so brings the total number of signatures on the handwritten petition to 461, which is only 10 percent less than the highest estimates of 510 signers (Wiltgen [1967]1985:241).

Melissa Wilde

"How Culture Mattered at Vatican II:
Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations"

Table 6. Voting Patterns on the Fourth Point on Collegiality

Country or Country of Origin	Col. (1) Conservative Votes (n)	Col. (1) as % of All Conservative Votes	% of All Country's Votes
Italy	146	39	54 *
Moved from Italy	39	11	42 *
United States	24	7	17
Spain	23	6	39 *
Brazil	22	6	19
Moved from Spain	14	4	31 *
Argentina	11	3	28
Moved from Ireland	7	2	18
Moved from United States	8	2	14
Total	294	80	14

Note: Data shown for all countries that constituted at least two percent of conservative voters.

*Pearson chi-square test indicates that this country's bishops were significantly ($p < .05$) different all other bishops. For all countries except Italy, the results were the same whether that group included or excluded Italian bishops.

Table 7. Cross-Tabulation of CIP Petitions

Communism Petition	BVM Petition		
	Did Not Sign	Signed	Total
Did Not Sign, n	2,196	248	2,444
Row, %	90	10	100
Column, %	88	67	85
Signed, n	311	123	434
Row, %	72	28	100
Column, %	12	33	15
Total, n	2507	371	2,878
Row, %	87	13	100
Column, %	100	100	100

Note: BVM = Blessed Virgin Mary; CIP = *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* (International Group of Fathers).

REFERENCES

Acta et documenta Concilio oecumenico Vaticano II apparando: Series prima (antepreparatoria). 1960–61. Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis (Vatican Press).

Noël, Pierre C. 1997. "Gli incontri delle conferenze episcopali durante il Concilio. Il <<gruppo della

Domus Mariae.>>" Pp 94–133 in *L'evento e le decisioni: Studi sulle dinamiche del concilio Vaticano II*, edited by Maria Teresa Fattori e Alberto Melloni. Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.

Rynne, Xavier. 1968. *Vatican Council II*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Wilde, Melissa. Forthcoming. *Contesting Catholicism: A Sociological Analysis of Vatican II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wilde, Melissa J., Kristin Geraty, Shelley Nelson, Emily Bowman, and Grace Yukich. 2003. "What Makes a Progressive Religious Leader? National and Theological Factors Behind Bishops' Votes at the Second Vatican Council." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Society for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Norfolk, VA.

Wiltgen, Ralph M. [1967]1985. *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber: A History of Vatican II*. Rockford, IL: TAN Books.

Melissa Wilde

"How Culture Mattered at Vatican II:
Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations"