

The Conflict over Father Kentenich - Attempt at a Comprehensive Vision

Joachim Schmiedl

The publication of discoveries from the archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (formerly the Holy Office), recently opened concerning the pontificate of Pope Pius XII, has created a lively debate inside and outside the Schoenstatt Movement about what really happened about 70 years ago. However, for all the goodwill towards openness and transparency, it quickly becomes apparent that the publication of some letters is not enough. In the archives of the Schoenstatt communities, the Pallottines, the German diocese archives (especially Trier and Limburg), and Roman archives, there are thousands of pages of material, for which extensive studies are necessary. On the following pages, an attempt is made to draw some lines to clarify the context. There are overlapping phases to be distinguished, the focus of which is undoubtedly the two visitations of the Sisters of Mary from 1949 and 1951-1953, but each with a pre- and a post-history.

1934-1940: A Theological Controversy

In the 1930s, the first writings of the Schoenstatt Movement were published. The negotiation for the episcopal "imprimatur" from the competent authorities in Limburg and Trier was consistently difficult.

The first problems were revealed in 1934 in the publication "The Tree of Life as a Symbol of the Apostolic Movement." The Bishop of Limburg, Antonius Hilfrich, criticized the "originality" of Schoenstatt's "unique ideas." An essential reason: they were a "damage to the Catholic Action", they endangered the "homogeneity of The Catholic Action."¹ Against the background of the struggles to restrict Catholic associations and associations against National Socialism, such a justification is quite understandable. But when Fr. Kentenich replied that it was "just our always high-level ideal to build the movement only on the tried and tested foundations of the plain, simple spirit of faith by relying exclusively on a healthy dogma, to illustrate to the modern world, the vitality and formal power of the Catholic truths for today's conditions,"² the differences arose precisely in a different understanding of doctrine. While the censors and theological experts of the Trier Seminary and the theological college of St. Georgen built their arguments on the prescribed neo scholastic theology of that time, and therefore did not want to allow charismatic peculiarities even in terminology, Kentenich wanted to create connecting points for a personal and communal updated reception of the truths of faith. The reviewers warned "against the use and dissemination of an unusual linguistic expression."³

The theological assessments continued through the second half of the 1930s and related, next to shorter writings such as the "Contributions to a Critical Appreciation of Schoenstatt" (1935), to

¹Letter of Bishop Hilfrich (Limburg) to Bishop Bornewasser (Trier), February 27, 1935.

² Father Kentenich to Bishop Bornewasser, April 26, 1935.

³ Expert Opinion Pappert, April 3, 1937.

the "Educational Doctrine of Schoenstatt as exemplified in Joseph Engling" (1936 from the pen of Alexander Menningen), "Everyday Sanctity" (1937 by Annette Nailis), the dissertation by Ferdinand Kastner, and their publication in the book "The Marian Formation of the World in Christ," and "Organic Asceticism" by Hermann Schmidt. The complaints went down to the last detail, often referring to particular expressions. It also happened with the necessary episcopal permission to print prayer and song books. At the beginning of the Second World War, the Schoenstatt Movement was no longer a blank sheet for the bishops of Trier and Limburg as well as for the Bamberg auxiliary bishop Arthur Michael Landgraf, a specialist in the dogmatics of Carolingian early scholastic period.

1943-1949: The Level of the Episcopal Conference

The following cross-section can be briefly treated. I refer to my article⁴ published in this magazine. The starting point was the sentence in the evaluation of Archbishop Gröber of Freiburg in 1943: "The 'Schoenstatters who work intensely in the pastoral area form a kind of state within the state of the diocese with separate headquarters and organization and their own 'organic' asceticism and dogmatics." Since no further steps could be taken during the war, especially since the founder was imprisoned in the Dachau concentration camp, efforts to discipline the movement were only resumed afterward. In that context, the proposal was repeatedly brought up to forward the Schoenstatt case to the Holy Office. But the bishops could not (yet) decide to do so. They wrote "norms", which they adopted in the summer of 1948, which did, however, not reach the movement until a year later. In between, the Episcopal Visitation of the Sisters of Mary took place.

1942-1953: The New Type of Secular Institute - the Sisters of Mary

On October 1, 1926, the Schoenstatt Sisters of Mary were founded. They saw themselves as a family-based community, based on the so-called "father or parent principle." The founder, Fr. Joseph Kentenich, and the Superior General, Sister Anna Pries, jointly presided over the community in analogous application of the structure of a family, which is why there were no term limits of office at the beginning. In the early years of the community, Fr. Kentenich established intensive pastoral relationships with many sisters who entrusted themselves to him and whose spiritual life he accompanied through intensive personal and written contacts. Just as the covenant of love with the Mother Thrice Admirable deepened into the spirit of total self-surrender in the 1930s (Blank Check and Inscriptio), a specific custom also developed in the relationship between founder and sisters. This custom was expressed in prayer forms known from the religious orders, combined with certain postures (kneeling, deep inclination, prostration), and in the "child's exam."⁵ The community kept these personal spiritual highlights as a special treasure.

⁴ Joachim Schmiedl, Die Schönstatt-Bewegung in den Verhandlungen der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz 1943-1960, in: *Regnum* 53 (2019), 80-88.

⁵ See: Joachim Schmiedl, Das „Kindesexamen.“ Zu den Vorwürfen gegen Pater Joseph Kentenich, in: *Herder-Korrespondenz* 74 (2020), Nr. 9, 13-15.

With the arrest of Fr. Kentenich on September 20, 1941 and his transportation to the Dachau concentration camp in March 1942, personal and written contact with individual sisters was no longer possible. The leadership of the community took place through smuggled letters to the responsible sisters and through the instructions written in verse form in the so-called "Shepherd's Mirror." This also changed the relationship between the sisters and the founder:

"Our older generation was individually educated. This had to be because it was important for me to detect God's intention for the individual and the community, primarily observing the Sisters' spiritual life. And in this way, to create an overall atmosphere that corresponded to the healthy needs of each soul. After this objective was achieved, the individual experience had to cede to the community, as was the case in the younger courses. This created a tension between the older and younger generation that has not yet been overcome. It is not difficult for the younger generation to use the word 'father' in poems, prayers, and letters, and sometimes in personal interaction, while the older one prefers to carry such expressions in the depth of their heart and not verbalize them."⁶

After 1945, Father Kentenich spent most of his time abroad. Between March 1947 and January 1950, he was only in Germany and Schoenstatt for two weeks. He accompanied the process of the ecclesial recognition of the Sisters of Mary as a Secular Institute from South America, South Africa, and the USA. Despite the lively contact with letters, the sisters were largely on their own. Therefore, exaggerations could develop that contradicted the intentions of the founder. On November 13, 1948, Kentenich wrote to the sisters' leadership:

"Just before I left for Valparaíso, I ordered my letters a little and among them I found a child's act, which is said to have been made in the shrine on October 24, 1948. It starts with the song: "Holy Land ..." Then there is a prayer that is prayed by everyone. It begins: 'Father, you are like a thriving pillar...' I cannot say who participated in the act. But I suppose that it was initiated by the sisters going to mission countries. Sister Anna may please inquire about it. What is written in the prayer is absolutely unhealthy, sounds like idolization of a human being and it is difficult to imagine anything more exaggerated. I ask Sister Anna to look for the text and immediately destroy all copies, including in the chronicle, without allowing anyone else to read it. If possible, please do it inconspicuously. The author obviously meant it well but was very ill-advised. It will be good if prayers of this kind are first subjected to sound control."⁷

At the urging of several bishops and because sisters and former sisters had accused Kentenich in Trier, a visitation of the Sisters of Mary was carried out by Auxiliary Bishop Bernhard Stein from February 19-28, 1949. At this occasion, the entire movement in its complex and complicated structure was evaluated in discussions with the responsible Pallottine Fathers. Stein's final judgment drew a preliminary conclusion to the controversies of the 1930s:

⁶ Kentenich to Stein, March 14, 1949.

⁷ Kentenich to the Leaders' Circle, November 13, 1948.

"The correctness of Schoenstatt's theological world of thought and its ecclesiastical meaning are wrongly questioned. The canonical visitation strengthened this conviction in me. ... Also, the designation of Schoenstatt as 'favorite creation' or 'favorite activity' of God and the Blessed Mother is not erroneous in itself. However, because it can cause misunderstandings, I propose that it be used sparingly and only in contexts that exclude any misinterpretations."⁸

From the conversations with Kentenich's closest collaborators, the auxiliary bishop concluded that the person of the founder was too much in the foreground, even claiming a certain "infallibility." He referred in particular to the letter of January 20, 1949 and the acts of allegiance to the founder reported and recommended therein, in order to understand his course of action of January 20, 1942 and the subsequent decision for the detention in the concentration camp. At that time, Kentenich had written from prison that his actions were to be understood from the belief in the reality of supernature and the interwovenness of fate of the Schoenstatt family. Stein's conclusion from the conversations with the Fathers:

All of Fr. K's. closest collaborators have an extraordinary common reverence for the 'Teacher', which also prevents them from openly expressing any personal concerns to him. The fear of falling out of favor with him probably also plays a role."⁹

For the discussions with the Sisters of Mary, Stein had jotted down a few questions that had arisen from reading the literature and from the account of a former Sister of Mary from 1940. These questions referred to the understanding of January 20, 1942, the practice of "acts of allegiance" and their relationship to perfect obedience, and the relationship with Fr. Kentenich, who had been absent from Schoenstatt for a long time. The General Leadership stressed the importance of the acts and their symbolic nature but admitted that the accumulation was difficult and now was the time to live them. The educators of the novitiate and tertianships also admitted that there may have been too many "acts", as well as derailments and exaggerations. Allegations directed directly against the person of Fr. Kentenich were made in several conversations during the visitation. They came from the ranks of the sisters with responsibilities in the movement. The indications that these were sisters whose character weaknesses had long been apparent, however, had to be understood as a maneuver of discharge. Sister Anna, the Superior General, expressed her concern that "since Dachau, Fr. Kentenich had been too involved in the childlike acts of the sisters, thus fostering exaggerations and derailments. She would not like this at all, because she was a very realistic woman. But as far as Fr. Kentenich's intactness is concerned, he would be completely intact."¹⁰ This was also confirmed by the sisters, who expressed reservations about Kentenich. Sister Agnes, who had a relationship of trust with Auxiliary Bishop Stein before the visitation, "emphasized that

⁸ Stein, Report about the Canonical Visitation of the Apostolic Movement of Schoenstatt from Feb 19.-28, 1949, 6.

⁹ Stein, Report about the Canonical Visitation of the Apostolic Movement of Schoenstatt from Feb 19.-28, 1949, 13.

¹⁰ Stein, Report about the Canonical Visitation of the Apostolic Movement of Schoenstatt from Feb 19.-28, 1949, 19.

the 'confessional methods' of Fr. Kentenich were in themselves unobjectionable. She knew nothing of coercion. She never found anything objectionable about these things. This clear testimony dispelled the last concerns in this regard against the person of Fr. Kentenich, because Sr. Agnes has retained the clear view of reality among all the sisters and through her unconditional sincerity has made a significant contribution for me to succeed in penetrating the 'spiritual enclosure.' If one adds that Sr. Beatrix also expressly emphasized that she rejects such methods not for reasons of purity, but for feminine dignity, and that even Sr. Pallotta is convinced that Fr. Kentenich does not think anything evil in this [when he applies these methods], then nothing directly incriminating remains. After all, such methods are very risky and, without a doubt, should not be generalized."¹¹

Stein concluded that the theological thinking of Kentenich and his followers was absolutely orthodox, but that there were some dangerous points. These are "the danger of the lack of independence in thought and will," "the danger of a certain rigidity," the danger that the reserve of the community could foster "a certain fear of surveillance and denouncing," the insufficient evaluation of the Church towards one's own family. Stein suggested that more priests should be made available as confessors, and to think about whether or not the sisters should be given another general director instead of Fr. Kentenich, and that in the formation special emphasis should be placed on the authority of the Church over the Schoenstatt Work.

Father Kentenich's reactions to the visitation were immediate. Before receiving the official version of the visitation report from Archbishop Bornewasser on April 27, 1949, he had already written thirteen letters to the visitor. These pointed out in a broader context the results that Kentenich had learned through letters from the Sisters and the Fathers. These letters were only the prelude to the great answer that Kentenich began on May 31, 1949 from Santiago de Chile and which he ended two months later with the fifth part. This "Epistola perlonga" went into detail about "Schoenstatt as a pedagogical problem" and stated: "After reviewing the 'report', it is not difficult for the expert to broaden the subject and to see Schoenstatt as a symbol *par excellence* of the pedagogical problem of the Instituta saecularia. If they want to become viable and fruitful, they need both: their own law and educational system. The latter maybe even more than the former. We believe that we have a mission in this regard, so we are happy to put our system up for public discussion. Anyone who has an insight into the pedagogical situation of today and knows its connection with the catastrophe of the West, whoever is familiar with the attempts to save it, instinctively stretches the framework further and would consider Schoenstatt as a symbol of the pedagogical problems of the entire West."¹²

1950-1953: The Apostolic Visitation

Fr. Kentenich maintained this perspective for the following decade. At different times he addressed the objections raised during the Episcopal Visitation. In the "Quarten Talks" of February

¹¹ Stein, Report about the Canonical Visitation of the Apostolic Movement of Schoenstatt from Feb 19.-28, 1949, 19.

¹² Kentenich, Josef, "Epistola perlonga" Part I. (Moriah Patris 9/I), Mount Moriah 1994, 24-25.

1950, he explained the background and practice of the so-called "child's exam." On February 2, 1950 he wrote to Archbishop Bornewasser of Trier:

"I ask His Excellency not to regard my frank clarity and unwavering firmness as a lack of respect; but rather, as it did in the greatest periods of flourishing in the Church, as an expression of a serious co-responsibility. I know how much gratitude my followers and I owe to His Excellence and your immediate advisers and collaborators. With extraordinary generosity, you have let our sisters experiment for 20 years unchallenged, at a time when canon law has given you the power to intervene. After the publication of the apostolic judicial framework, Your Excellency has successfully advocated not only in noble generosity for the approval of the sisters, but also for the justification of the entire Work before the German episcopate. These valuable and memorable deeds will remain indelibly recorded in the book of our family and German church history. Since Dachau, however, I believe that I have a duty to change my former tactics of silence and maintain an attitude of prudent empathy and restraint and (as I have so often said in my official letters) to now appear before the public forum of the church with unconditional frankness, so as not to be complicit in the great catastrophe that is imminent for the West. Perhaps Your Excellence may see such an attitude as conceit and arrogance but may also understand that it is at least subjectively the foundation of my actions and therefore deserves if not recognition, at least tolerance. Your advanced age and meritorious life give you the right to have the gates of eternity opened for you soon. When you contemplate there in the divine light the eternal truth and taste eternal love, may you implore the grace for all of us to be saved from misunderstandings and deviations of the heart, and never to confuse selfish desires with God's desire and will."¹³

At that time, the archbishop of Trier had already asked in Rome to postpone the recognitions of the other Schoenstatt communities as secular institutes. On May 27, 1950, Bornewasser asked the Congregation for the Congregation of the Religious to re-examine the Sisters of Mary with regard to the parent principle and the resignation of Sister Anna as Superior General, seconded by two opinions of his Auxiliary Bishop Stein. Furthermore, he demanded that Fr. Kentenich should no longer be the spiritual leader and that a general chapter should elect a new leadership. However, it was not the Congregation of the Religious that acted, but the matter was passed on to the Holy Office, the Supreme Authority of the Curia, which on March 15, 1951 appointed by an official decree the Dutch Fr. Sebastian Tromp SJ Apostolic Visitor to the Apostolic Movement of Schoenstatt. The first negotiations with Fr. Kentenich, who was called to Rome, began on April 24, 1951. The result was that Fr. Kentenich was not willing to resign from his offices.

On July 31, 1951, Kentenich was relieved of his duties as Director General of the Sisters of Mary. In a supplementary decree (August 10, 1951), the sisters were given concrete instructions regarding the use of language and phrases as well as the suppression of Schoenstatt literature. Fr.

¹³ Kentenich to Bornewasser, February 02, 1950.

Josef Friedrich was appointed as the new assistant. The sisters were freed from any attachment of conscience to Fr. Kentenich.

The course of the Apostolic Visitation cannot yet be accurately reconstructed. In any case, it ended in August 1953 with the recognition of a "General Statute" for the Schoenstatt Work and the enactment of new statutes for the Sisters of Mary. Father Kentenich had to remain at his place of exile in Milwaukee.

1945 and following years: Schoenstatt Priests as a Secular Institute?

In the meantime, other problems had arisen. Since the beginning of the 1920s, many diocesan priests had joined the Schoenstatt Movement. When the possibility of the Secular Institutes arose, the core circle of this priestly community also wanted to take this path. They wanted to form a Secular Institute without giving up the bond with the bishop.

After Father Kentenich returned to Germany in March 1950, he visited twelve German bishops or general vicars. He wanted to explain that intention and gain their approval for a Secular Institute for priests. The reactions were very restrained, partly because Trier insisted on it.

With these plans, the Schoenstatt priests stirred yet another "hornet's nest." The Sisters of Mary were even as a Secular Institute still closely linked to the Pallottine Society. This was also evident in the abbreviation "SAC" (Societas Apostolatus Catholici) behind their name. The diocesan priests, on the other hand, had already made efforts in their ranks since the 1920s to see themselves as "pars motrix et centralis" (moving and central part) of the movement and to compete with the Pallottines. Although Father Kentenich held firm until 1956 that the Pallottines had the leading role in looking after and taking responsibility for the movement, this tension became another point of controversy, which manifested itself especially in the second half of the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s.

1952-1964: The Pallottine Community

While Fr. Kentenich increasingly found an ally in the Superior General of the Pallottine, Fr. Adalbert Turowski, who supported him and defended him wherever possible, precisely his home province moved away from him. The Provincial Heinrich Schulte, with whom he had initiated a "marriage" between the Society and Movement in Dachau, which was then taken up by the General Chapter in 1947, distanced himself from Kentenich in a letter of January 25, 1952 to Turowski:

Without a doubt, "the noble and honest attitude of fidelity, belief in our mission and obedience, and ecclesial attitude should remain. However, it should also be made clear that there is a different

view on the correct way to proceed and how to apply it in practice, in particular, also in relation to the ecclesial authority."¹⁴

In the preparation of the General Chapter in 1953, the differing views on the coexistence of Schoenstatt and Pallottines became increasingly clear. Because the possible majority of the chapter members would probably have been in favor of Turowski's re-election, the Benedictine Ulrich Beste was sent to the chapter as commissioner of the Holy Office. Beste excluded the non-favorable topics and candidates and announced the result after the election: Fr. Wilhelm Möhler became the new Superior General. Since the General Statute came into force shortly afterward, Möhler also took over as chairman of the General Presidium. In the following years, tensions increased over whether Schoenstatt should be regarded as an independent foundation or as a spin-off of Vincent Pallotti's Work. The "issue about this model" had to be decided. It had an effect in the Schoenstatt communities in a new partisanship for the exiled founder, but also led to resignations and new approaches, which led to the establishment of a priestly community apart from the Pallottines.

Despite the official termination of the Apostolic Visitation, the Holy Office continued to intervene, and it influenced the German bishops, especially the chairman of the Episcopal Conference, Cardinal Frings of Cologne, to discipline the Schoenstatt lay communities, which Frings obediently continued to practice in 1960. Three years later, at the Council, Frings publicly denounced what he did in 1960 in his speech on the methods of the Holy Office.

1962-1966: The Council untangles the Knots

The Second Vatican Council provided the platform on which the outstanding individual questions related to Schoenstatt could be addressed. In the meantime, several bishops from Germany and the universal Church had spoken out in favor of a solution. Three points had to be resolved:

- Schoenstatt had to be removed from the remit of the Holy Office. A presentation by Cardinals Frings, Döpfner, Silva, and Rugambwa to John XXIII led to the handing over of the Schoenstatt question to the Congregation of the Religious on January 2, 1963, a few days before the canonization of Vincent Pallotti, with the exception of a possible return of the founder to the Congregation of the Religious.
- On 3 December 1963, the Bishop of Munster, Hoffer was appointed moderator et custos of the Schoenstatt Work by a letter from Cardinal Antoniutti, and prelate Wilhelm Wissing as his vicar. At the same time, a new visitation was announced, which was to be carried out by the Dominican Provincial of Ecuador, Hilarius Albers. In February 1964, the German Episcopal Conference recommended the separation of Schoenstatt from the Pallottines, the creation of a new General Statute and the appointment of a German bishop as responsible for Schoenstatt.

¹⁴ Schulte to Turowski, January 25, 1952.

Although the German Pallottines manifested their opposition in several letters, the autonomy of Schoenstatt was decreed of October 6, 1964.

- The return of Father Kentenich from Milwaukee came in the summer of 1965. Called to Rome by a telegram, the origin of which still gives rise to mysteries, in the last session of Council, the fate of the founder was also decided. On 20 October 1965, the Kentenich case was handed over to the Congregation of the Religious: "Res remittatur ad S. Congregationem de Religiosis." In his diary, the Auxiliary Bishop of Münster, Tenhumberg, described the process: "At 10.30 a.m. [on October 23, 1965] I am back in the Holy Office. The audiences had ended. Surprisingly, however, an urgent meeting was called, in which Cardinal Ottaviani must attend. However, it takes place in the same building. Monsignor Agustoni¹⁵ brings out the cardinal, apparently by prior agreement, having already given me the most important results in broad outlines at the cardinal's request of the cardinal. Eminence Ottaviani then repeats – after initially apologizing for receiving me in the anteroom of a conference room, so to speak, standing foot – that the Holy Office had decided that if Fr. Kentenich wanted to leave the Pallottine society, he could do so. He should then look for an *Episcopus benevolus*. If he had it, he could become a diocesan priest. But all related questions would no longer have to be negotiated with the Holy Office, but with the Congregation for The Religious. This Congregation is now responsible for dealing with all these issues. I then ask whether this meant that the Holy Office had thus handed over the 'tota causa fundatoris' to the Congregation for Religious, and Eminence answered very clearly: 'Yes'. In the same context, I asked a similar question again a short time later, in order to be sure, and I received the same answer on the grounds that the entire Schoenstatt cause was at the Congregation of the Religious, then it would be appropriate that the *causa fundatoris* should also be dealt with there in the future. It was not good that two dicasteries dealt with issues so closely mixed. So, we could turn to the Congregation for The Religious, on all these issues. My further question, of how the *modus procedendi* would be the cardinal answered: The Holy Office will now make a decree in this regard to the Congregation of the Religious, and then that congregation would be in charge to regulate everything else."¹⁶

Fr. Kentenich was then given permission to leave the Pallottine Society. On his 80th birthday, he was admitted to the clergy of the Diocese of Münster. After the end of the Council, he was allowed to return to Germany over Christmas. An audience with Pope Paul VI was an outward sign of his newfound freedom of movement. In January 1966, Bishop Höffner informed the German bishops that it was a clarification of the relationship between Schoenstatt and Pallottines. "I do not see the Schoenstatt movement as endangering the doctrine of faith and morality of our Church. Certain crises in the understanding and proclamation of the doctrine of faith and morality of our Church lie elsewhere in the post-conciliar period."¹⁷ Cardinal Antoniutti's letter to Bishop Höffner dated March 16, 1966 the years of theological examination of Schoenstatt, the Episcopal and Apostolic Visitation, and the removal of the founder from his work came to an end: "Ex parte huius Sacrae Congregationis nihil obstat

¹⁵ Secretary of Cardinal Ottaviani.

¹⁶ Diary Tenhumberg, October 23, 1965.

¹⁷ Höffner to the German Bishops, January 24, 1966.

quominus, Father Kentenich suum exerceat apostolatum sub ductu et vigilantia Excellentiae Tuae, et confidit illum , ad concordiam fovendam inter Societatem Apostolatus Catholici et Institutum Saeculare schoenstattense, juxta indicationes ipsi suo tempore datas nomine et auctoritate Summi Pontificis."¹⁸

Many threads have to be untangled in order to be able to classify the processes around Father Kentenich. The above article wanted to make a small contribution to this task. Many events could only be hinted at and require a more detailed study. It should have become clear, however, that this requires more than a quick look at recently opened archives.

*This article was first published in REGNUM Schoenstatt International – Reflection and Dialogue, 55th year, issue No. 4 REGNUM is available from **Patris Verlag**, Schoenstatt, Vallendar: bestellen@patris-verlag.de
single issue: 7,50 €, annual subscription: 29,50 €.*

Information about REGNUM: www.regnum-im-netz.de

Contributions to a more comprehensive vision of the Causa Kentenich

**In cooperation with various people from the Schoenstatt movement, topics concerning Father Josef Kentenich, the founder of the movement, are dealt with on behalf of the General Presidium of the International Schoenstatt Works and which are currently in demand. This is done on the basis of the current state of knowledge resulting from the accessible documents and writings. The results of the research and discussions can be read in thematic articles. You can send your suggestions for topics of other articles to: mk@schoenstatt.de.
*PressOffice Schoenstatt International***

¹⁸ Antoniutti to Höffner, März 16, 1966. [*Nihil obstat* on the part of this Holy Congregation for Fr. Kentenich to carry out his apostolate under the guidance and vigilance of Your Excellency, and we trust that he will work in a prudent and fruitful manner to foster the concordance between the Society of Catholic Apostolate and the Schoenstatt Secular Institute, according to the indications he was given at the time in the name of the Supreme Pontiff.]