



AMERICAN CATHOLIC COUNCIL-LOOKING AHEAD

Since I wrote my early summer President's Column urging that ARCC members and the other American Catholic reform organizations seriously take up the idea of an American Catholic Council, the bare beginnings of planning discussions have been launched. A number of informally representative persons from American Catholic organizations will, after a small flurry of conference phone calls and the beginning of an online discussion, meet in Washington, September 19-20 to begin to plan for it.

From its beginning twenty-eight years ago, ARCC has been all about the education, in the broadest sense, of American Catholics. There has been talk over the years, for instance, of forcing beneficial change in the governance of the Catholic Church through the pocketbook. The pocketbook is indeed a mighty tool. However, it's a bit like Congress—which is also a powerful economic tool—the minds of those involved, whether Church or Congress, have to be persuaded to use it! I am convinced that the major priority we in ARCC—and the forthcoming American Catholic Council—have is to devise multiple ways of reaching and educating the minds of American Catholics.

As I see it, in planning for the forthcoming American Catholic Council, we have two major target groups:

- 1) the 65 million American Catholics still identifying themselves with the Church, and
- 2) the 30 million former American Catholics (according to the recent Pew survey)!

I strongly suspect that most of the latter are better educated and more critically-thinking than a large portion of the former. Hence, a significant portion of number two should be part of our more precise aim. Those in number one who are analogous to number two, that is, those who are better educated and more critically-thinking, should also be part of our more precise aim.

Why? Because they are the most likely agents of change!

We have to convince them that the American Catholic Church, or at least the part of it available to them, is capable of being a shared-responsibility, spirit-nourishing, neighbor-loving community that they want to be a part of. Many of group two have probably already found some portion of a shared-responsibility, spirit-nourishing, neighbor-loving community elsewhere, but perhaps they also miss the best of the Catholic tradition with its stress on reason and intellect, as well as the beauty of the senses, and a long tradition of reaching out to neighbor, climaxing in various Liberation Theologies.

However, it is the lack of serious shared-responsibility that was so gloriously promised at Vatican II that is so dismally missing. It is the attainment of that vision that the American Catholic Council must first reach for—and ARCC can help lead the way. Write and urge everyone you can to reach toward this end!

Leonard Swidler

EDITORIAL

Forgive my confusion but are we in 2008 or 1908 - or 1708? I'm not sure because I just finished watching a gathering of a quarter million young people and two hundred or so clerics pandering to a little old man in white in words that suited the Age of Kings (substitute Successor to the Caesars or to Louis XIV for Successor to Peter) but it was broadcast from the other side of this planet and I watched it on a 21st century TV set.

I'm not sure those were Catholic Masses I saw either. There were no lay people serving as lectors, there were huge candlesticks on the altar making it hard to see, sometimes they would switch to Latin, and when it was time for Communion, they brought out a kneeler, put it between the altar and the congregation, and the celebrant stood behind the kneeler. People came up one by one, knelt on the kneeler and stuck out their tongues like babies; the celebrant put a host on their tongues, they got up and went back down the stairs, then another came up, and so on. At the end of one Mass, after a Cardinal and some others told the Pope how wonderful he was, and he stood up after each speech and raised his arms like a victorious boxer, the Pope said the Angelus in Latin. Almost no one knew the responses, but he just frowned and continued - in Latin. Of course, everyone in Heaven understands Latin, but is the prayer supposed to be for their benefit or for ours?

And then there is the meeting and Mass with four abuse survivors we learned of after the fact. Some might feel that was almost as useful as prayers in Latin: with "Towards Healing," the group founded by Bishop Geoffrey Robinson and the Australian Conference of Bishops to work with survivors of clerical sexual abuse right there in Sydney, and the father of two survivors asking to speak to the Pope, Benedict's handlers (or Pell & Co.?) hand-picked their own four survivors - presumably grateful, non-demanding ones.

Silliness aside, it would seem that Pope Benedict XVI is accelerating his "correction" of Vatican II. He is clearly following through on the re-introduction of the Latin Mass he spoke of in the 2003 letter quoted in the Jan-Mar 2008 issue of *ARCC Light*. What is even more disturbing is the increasingly strong atmosphere of "Rome is watching" Benedict and his minions foster and the headline personnel he is appointing to head Roman dicasteries. Probably the clearest sign of what lies ahead is the naming of Archbishop Raymond Burke of St. Louis to head both the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura and the Congregation for the Clergy. Burke freely uses excommunication and interdict for coercion and recently (the day before the end of his tenure as Archbishop) placed a nun under interdict for attending the ordination of two women in St. Louis. Not long before that, he removed Father Thomas Doyle, the respected canon lawyer, as counsel for St. Stanislaus and put him under interdict for missing an appointment (because of illness in his family) and for failing to fill out a form properly. One (!) cannot help wondering if the

capitulation and "reconciliation to the Church" of three excommunicated members of the St. Stanislaus Board of Directors at the end of June was the "success" that clinched Burke's Roman rewards. With Levada, who was Benedict's favorite student, running the CDF, Burke, who reversed every annulment presented to him when he was on the Signatura, and Pope Benedict carefully pacing himself as he has been doing to protect his health, and keeping the Electoral College full of his kind of Cardinals, we could be in for a long stretch of increasingly grim rulings from Rome.

But, Rome is not the Church. Pope Benedict is not the Church. As Vatican II taught, the Church is the People of God, and many interesting and important things are happening among the People of God. "Catholic" means universal and James Joyce defined the Catholic Church as "here comes everybody!" The same amazing technology that allows us to watch the Pope in Australia on TV or subscribe free to Zenit to read his latest pronouncement, also allows us to use the internet at home or at the neighborhood library to learn what thousands of other Catholics are thinking and doing.

Small faith communities of all kinds are forming and calling forth their own ministers. Some of these ministers are married priests and what really scares the hierarchy is that some are women. Three Catholic bishops have ordained at least one woman bishop for North America, Patricia Fresen, and she is ordaining women priests every year. One can see videos of these ordinations on the net. In those videos one sees male ordained priests and bishops participating, laying hands on the ordinands to pass on their ministries. Father Roy Bourgeois, the well-known peace and justice Maryknoller, preached the homily and concelebrated Mass at a Massachusetts ordination last month. Rome and local bishops immediately declare these women and all those assisting at these ceremonies excommunicated and the ordinations invalid but they seem to be expending a lot of time, energy, and money on "invalid" ordinations and especially on finding the three Roman Catholic bishops who ordained Patricia Fresen. Rome is worried because they know the ordinations are valid, as valid as theirs. Their monopoly has been broken and their huffing and puffing isn't changing that. Roman Catholic Women Priests (RCWP) has ordained over 30 women priests just in the US and they are serving all over the country. There are also ten RCWP deacons in the US and Canada who will presumably be ordained next year and a dozen more in formation.

"Problematic" Roman Catholics who prefer male priests but who don't quite fit into the parish paradigm can go to Rent-A-Priest on the web and contact one of the many married priests who happily minister when asked.

Catholics who want to meet and exchange ideas and support with other freethinking Catholics can find discussion groups on the web that link people from all over the world. For example, CatholicAustralia is a progressive and very interesting daily journal and forum from - surprise - Australia. There are also numerous fascinating and informative blogs. Again, for example, www.harryjbyrne.blogspot.com is written by a retired canon lawyer and former Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New York.

One of the best sources of information on the several sides of Catholicism today is the weekly *National Catholic*

Reporter. This newspaper is published on the web as well as on paper and much of it does not require a subscription. You can have Joan Chittister, OSB's and John Allen's columns delivered to your computer for free, as well as Bishop Thomas Gumbleton's weekly homilies from his parish in Detroit.

As I mentioned earlier, Pope Benedict and his curia are trying hard to convince all the bishops that Rome is watching them very carefully all the time. They certainly have assistants within the various national conferences of bishops who are only too happy to supply information, but there are also bishops who are living, speaking, and writing the Truth even if Rome is watching. Some of them are better known than others: Archbishop John Quinn's *Reform of the Papacy* created quite a stir in 1999: it is eloquent and challenging. Pope John Paul II was not pleased - even though he had requested the feedback. The year before Auxiliary Bishop John Heaps had published *A Love That Dares to Question* in Australia. It was simple, direct and effective but Bishop Heaps died in 2004. Bishop Fritz Lobinger, a German who went to South Africa as a Missionary, has been writing about ordaining "viri probati" (proven local men) for southern Africa since 1998. He just published a second book, *Priests for Tomorrow*, in 2004. And of course there is the most scholarly, challenging and complete book by a Catholic bishop in some years, *Confronting Power and Sex in the Catholic Church - Reclaiming the Spirit of Jesus* by Bishop Geoffrey Robinson to which we devoted much of the last issue of *ARCC Light*. The Vatican, and, by extension, many bishops, seem very much afraid of Bishop Robinson's ideas and have already tried to prevent his traveling to speak on his book. He quietly ignored them and over 4,000 Americans and Canadians flocked to hear him in May and June of this year.

So what does all of this mean? Pope Ratzinger and his supporters would want us to think that Fortress Catholicism lives on. Its walls are strong; anyone who dares to disagree with Rome's creeping infallibility has been cast out to where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth.

But the walls of Fortress Catholicism are full of cracks that are spreading all the time. Bishops are beginning to speak out, women priests are taking their rightful places, news is being passed along on the web quickly - and most of all, Catholics are learning that what Rome and its flunkies are telling them is not always the entire truth. Being told by an overzealous or overambitious cleric or hierarch that you are excommunicated because, for example, you attended the ordination of a woman priest, is only true if you accept it. The hierarchical structure of the Church and the power that goes with it is not dogma, it is canon law which is a human creation. Canon law is written by a small number of experts within the very small percentage of the Church that is the self co-opting hierarchy. It can be changed. Some would even argue that there are circumstances in which conscience overrides canon law and demands disobedience. No less a theologian than Thomas Aquinas said that it is better to die excommunicate than to violate one's conscience. Oh, there's another crack in the wall!

Christine M. Roussel



EXCERPTS FROM BISHOP ROBINSON'S LECTURE
TAKEN FROM HIS FINAL, REVISED TEXT
(http://bishopgeoffrobinson.org/usa_lecture.htm)

For the nine years from 1994 to 2003 I was a member and then chairman of the committee established by the Australian bishops to coordinate a national response to these revelations, in the hope that the whole church in that country might speak and act as one. I spoke with hundreds of victims, both individually and in groups. I met with offenders and I worked with bishops and religious leaders. For nine years it completely dominated my life. There were



Bishop Geoff Robinson and Leonard Swidler

many failures, but also a number of successes. It was an experience that changed me in so many ways that, even if I wanted to, I could not now go back to being the person I was before.

Out of this came the conviction that, if we are ever to look to the future

with a clear conscience, there must first be profound change within the church.

Firstly, there must be a study of the more immediate causes of abuse, and there I have suggested that we need to study carefully three elements: unhealthy psychology, unhealthy ideas concerning both power and sex, and unhealthy environment or living conditions. I suggest that it is when these three things come together that the murky world out of which abuse arises is most likely to be created. We must in a particular way look at all institutional factors in the church that may contribute to a lack of health in any of these three areas, and we must be ready to make radical changes wherever they are needed.

Secondly, in addition to looking at abuse, we also need to look with equal seriousness at the inadequate response to abuse, for this created as much scandal as the abuse itself. I do not believe that it is enough to blame bishops, implying that they are all either incompetent or malicious. We must rather look at why so many decent, good and intelligent leaders did not act as we might have hoped or expected, and in doing that we must once again look at the institutional factors that led to the poor response.

Thirdly, it is my belief that these two areas of inquiry will inevitably lead to a study of all aspects of the two subjects of power and sex within the church. Sexual abuse is all about power and sex, so to counter abuse, we must be free to ask serious questions about power and sex in the institution of the church.

The pope is extremely important in the Catholic Church, so imagine that twenty years ago, in 1988, Pope John Paul II had said one Sunday morning to the crowd in St. Peter's Square, "I have just received a report concerning sexual abuse by priests and religious. Priests sexually abusing innocent children!! I have never heard of anything so horrendous. So let us respond as Jesus would have

responded, with humility, honesty and compassion. Let us reach out to victims and put them before the good name of the church. Let our response be a model to others. I ask, and in the name of Jesus I demand, that all bishops give me their fullest support me in this." With this leadership the whole response of the church would have been different. The very loyalty of the bishops to the pope would have worked in favour of victims, not against them. Instead bishops were asked to be loyal to a profound silence.

How Do We Bring About Change?

Because I have written this book, people are constantly saying to me, "This is all very well, but how do we bring about the changes you speak of?" Allow me to give an answer in four parts.

The first is that change will be most difficult, for we are trying to change a culture, and the defences of that culture are a thousand years old and rock solid. Simplistic ideas will achieve little.

The second is that we need to combine confrontation with conversation. ... Since we will need the support of the bishops in this, I suggest that we must not limit ourselves to confrontation and must seek conversation wherever and whenever it is possible. It will be a lengthy process in which we engage bishops in conversation, gradually show them that there are problems in the culture they have been living in and that the new culture we would like to introduce to them has a real beauty and freedom in it. The title of my book is "Confronting Power and Sex...", but it is a confrontation of issues, not of people, that I speak of there.

The third part of my answer is that we need to have this conversation, not just with leaders, but as widely as possible among all the members of the church. ... And the church I wish to see is a church of conversation, not confrontation, so that is the church we must be now.



Charles McMahan and Harry Halloran

The final part of my answer is that I believe that the best way to engage reluctant leaders in conversation is precisely through the issue of sexual abuse, for the scandal of abuse has been so great that it is arguably the one issue that has the energy to do something as powerful as change a culture. ... Provided it is done in a spirit of conversation rather than confrontation, may I suggest some of the issues that can be raised:

"We have been so profoundly shocked by the revelations of sexual abuse that our faith in the church itself has been seriously damaged. In addition, as parents we are concerned for the protection of our children and we feel that as yet not nearly enough has been done to ensure their safety into the future.

"We believe that Pope John Paul II should have handled the two cases of Cardinal Groer and Father Degollado promptly and openly. Indeed, we expected a far stronger lead from the same pope at the very beginning of the crisis. He gave such strong leadership in so many other fields that the absence of adequate leadership in a field that affected us deeply left us confused.

"Despite the welcome statements made recently in the United States by Pope Benedict, we believe that there is still a need for a public and formal apology directly to victims, made by the pope in St. Peter's Basilica surrounded by the Cardinals. This apology should 1) assure victims that they were not guilty of any fault because they were victims of more powerful persons who abused the spiritual power the church had given them, 2) apologise for any ways in which teachings, laws, structures or attitudes within the church may have contributed, and 3) assure them that the church will investigate all aspects of the matter in order to eradicate anything that might contribute to abuse.

"We are by no means satisfied, however, that the church is in fact doing everything possible to uncover the causes of abuse and to eradicate them. We believe that, as a first step, there is a need to study all the ways in which church teachings, attitudes, laws and practices contribute to unhealthy psychology, unhealthy ideas and unhealthy living conditions of priests and religious.

"We know that celibacy is not the sole cause of abuse, but we also know that it is impossible to say that it has made no contribution. We wish to see a particular study of this matter, especially of the ways in which an unwanted, unaccepted and unassimilated celibacy, so common among priests, including many of the best of them, can contribute to unhealthy psychology (e.g. severe depression), unhealthy ideas (e.g. misogyny) and unhealthy living conditions (e.g. loneliness and lack of support).

"We believe that it is so obvious that obligatory celibacy cannot be simply excluded as a possible contributing factor that it has become a symbol of the church's response, in the sense that we will know that the church is serious about confronting abuse when it puts obligatory celibacy on the table for discussion of its role, and we will know that it is not yet truly serious for as long as it does not allow discussion of this issue.

"Looking beyond these immediate issues, we believe that no study will be adequate unless it looks at all matters relating to power and sex within the church, e.g. the idea of priests and religious being "taken up", the need to protect the good name of the church at all costs, the inability to look at issues surrounding abuse in a fresh light because of the fear that any questions raised might harm papal authority, the idea that abuse was primarily a direct sexual offence against God rather than offensive to God because of the harm caused to innocent children, the need to distinguish between forgiveness of past wrong and prevention of future wrong.

"We have been most unhappy with the overall response to abuse by church authorities at every level and ask for an investigation of why this was so. In particular, we ask for a study of any and all institutional factors that may have contributed to the inadequacy of the response and to such practices as the moving of offending priests from one parish to another.

"We believe that part of the problem was that each diocese and each religious order responded separately, so that the overall response was most uneven and the whole country inevitably ended up being judged by its worst cases. We believe that the means must exist whereby the whole country can respond as one in times of crisis.

"One single good and holy man, Pope John Paul II, was unable, for whatever reasons, to respond adequately to this crisis, and the whole church suffered as a result. We believe that the ideas of collegiality and the *sensus fidei* of the whole church, both solemnly proclaimed by the Vatican Council must, as a matter of urgency, be given concrete form in specific structures that, had they existed, would have enabled a coordinated and far better response to abuse by the whole church.

"We know that there are very large numbers of sincere and devout Catholics who have serious problems with many church teachings concerning power and sex. We feel that these Catholics are so many and so sincere that they deserve honest conversation on these topics rather than simply the imposition of authority or condemnation."

Despite some of the reactions there have been to my book, it is emphatically not an attack on the church or a desire to cause it harm. On the contrary, it comes out of an intense desire to see a better church, a church in which everything that is humanly possible has been done to abolish all forms of abuse, a church that encourages growth through freedom, a church in which there is conversation rather than confrontation, a church in which all, women as much as men, laity as much as clergy, share equally in the full life of the church and can grow to become all they are capable of being. By reclaiming the Spirit of Jesus, I want to see a new church for a new millennium.

Selected by Ingrid Shafer

LIFE IN PARADOX: THE STORY OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST
BY PAUL MURRAY (O BOOKS, 2008).

Father Paul Murray, PhD, is a priest-anthropologist of the Archdiocese of Washington D.C. He is a long-time member of ARCC, committed to the openness, honesty and justice for which it stands. He has just published a very interesting memoir which might ruffle more than a few Catholic feathers because he reveals to the world what he has long since revealed to those who know him - that he is a gay priest and is happy and proud to be both.

Father Murray's book is very well-written and searing in its honesty. He explains that he realized in childhood that he was different: he liked to play with girls' toys and he

liked to be with boys so long as they weren't rough, and somehow that was bad - he had to hide it. By adolescence he realized that the only way he could fit into an overwhelmingly heterosexual world was by stifling his sexual identity and concentrating on his "acceptable" interests - study, writing and religion. He went to Bard College and became involved with conservative politics while developing religiously. Born Episcopalian, he was increasingly drawn to "high church" Anglo-Catholicism and finally converted to Roman Catholicism in 1968. As a Catholic he was, as the French say, "plus Catholique que le pape," i.e., "more Catholic than the pope." This might be part of what drew him to the charismatic movement and why, within a few months of converting, he entered Christ the King Seminary to study for the priesthood. His intellectual excellence led to his being sent to Rome to complete his studies and he was ordained by Pope Paul VI in 1975.

All of this had, however, been quite rapid, since he had been excused from the usual five-year wait between entering the Church and applying to the seminary, and the new Father Murray found rectory and parish life both intellectually and emotionally cold and unsatisfying. This loneliness led him to explore his homosexual tendencies and the gay subculture in Washington DC, including Dignity, the national organization of gay and lesbian Catholics. Finally, as Fr. Murray puts it himself:

Now I began to see myself for the first time as "gay," part of a community of persons, persons like myself! I was not alone! Walking inside GT's (a gay club) did not miraculously release me from years of internalized homophobia and self-hatred, but it was a beginning. (94) ... But I found myself, therefore, negotiating life between two worlds: institutional Catholicism and the gay community. (101)

He longed to serve the gay and lesbian community more directly, but, although "I yearned for freedom and wholeness, but [I] was not ready to let go of the closet's comforts." (108) This growth toward wholeness was to take years and Fr. Murray describes it with great candor. It was a bumpy road, dotted with love affairs, illness, ever more painful ecclesiastical politics and the acquisition of a doctorate in anthropology at Catholic University. This section of the book, which includes his period at St. Matthew's Cathedral and his doctoral research in Rome, has particularly interesting analyses of the Church, its hierarchs and its undiscovered saints.

But, by 1994, as much as he loved being a priest, Fr. Murray was seriously questioning if parish work was the best use of his talents, education and interests. He became involved in "Among Friends," a house to assist gays in Washington in need of temporary housing and helpful counseling to restart their lives. He also began to think of taking a leave from the Archdiocese to find a job more in keeping with his interests. But when word of the Among Friends project reached Archdiocesan officials and an article in *The Blade*, Washington's gay publication, identified him as gay, a long, drawn-out struggle and then negotiation with the Archdiocese began.

Although Fr. Murray details these travails into 1996, when there seems to be a truce of sorts with the Archdiocese allowing him to work with Among Friends, he

ends the book then, with a moving scene in which he ministers to a wonderful gay man dying of AIDS. There is then an Appendix consisting of a 2004 exchange of four letters between the rather nasty vicar general of Washington who accuses Fr. Murray of heresy and other sorts of malfeasance, such as being listed with Rent-A-Priest, and the accused's measured responses. We learn from the correspondence that Fr. Murray was given a leave of absence from the Archdiocese of Washington to teach at Bard College in 1998. It is in my opinion unfortunate that there is no bridge between 1996 and the date of this correspondence, or at least to 1998, to understand Fr. Murray's departure from Washington. Presumably it was more of the same painful impasse.

As should be clear from the above, this is a very interesting book, and in many ways it is unique. However, it is not for everyone. Although there is nothing that could be considered improper in it, some may find any detailed discussion of the gay lifestyle offensive. Some may also find Fr. Murray's criticism of the Church's hierarchy and administrative methods too bitter or emotional. This memoir is highly self-revelatory and probably cathartic: the author spares no one, including himself.

Most of all, this is a book that needed to be written, for it addresses one of the most critical questions facing the Church today, openly, honestly, without pulling any punches. Hopefully, it will reach those who need to hear it.

Christine M. Roussel

MAY 17TH SYMPOSIUM ON REBUILDING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Following Bishop Robinson's inspiring lecture Friday night, Saturday's all-day symposium—in addition to panel discussions as well as a chance for audience involvement and further conversation with Bishop Robinson—featured presentations by Joseph O'Callaghan (Why Not Elect Our Bishops?), David Efrogmson (History: What Went Wrong and Why?), Christine Schenk (Women of the Word: Women's Leadership in the Early Church), Paul Stanosz (Formation and the Priesthood of Jesus Christ: Transforming Ordained - Lay Relationships), Leonard Swidler (Constitutional Catholicism), and Robert Blair Kaiser (How We Can Take Back Our Church). Below are slightly edited versions of the introductions to their presentations submitted by the speakers as part of the printed program.

Why Not Elect our Bishops?

Joseph F. O'Callaghan

Professor Emeritus, Fordham University



Joseph F. O'Callaghan

Today people are accustomed to the idea that the pope appoints our bishops. That principle was first stated explicitly in the Code of Canon Law in 1917 and repeated in the revised Code of 1983.

The ancient tradition of the Church, however, acknowledged that the clergy and people of the diocese should elect their bishop. The fifth-century Popes Celestine I and Leo I were emphatic in insisting that

the consent of the clergy and people was essential and that the bishop should be elected by everyone.

Church councils, both provincial and ecumenical, laid down rules governing the qualifications of candidates for the episcopacy, and also affirmed that the bishop was elected to serve a particular community and therefore should not transfer to another see. Liturgical texts stressed the role of the clergy and people in choosing their bishop and reminded him of his obligation to be faithful to them.

In the course of time, however, emperors and kings began to intrude into the electoral process. Although the principle of popular election continued to be confirmed during the medieval centuries, the right of election came into the hands of cathedral canons, who often chose the person nominated by the king. In the modern era concordats concluded by the papacy with various European states often recognized the ruler's right to nominate the candidate, subject to papal confirmation. In other instances, the pope nominated the candidate, subject to the approval of the state.

Since Vatican II various proposals have been made to allow for greater, but still limited, local input into the process of selecting bishops. However, election by a provincial synod, consisting of bishops, priests, and representatives of the laity, and presided over by the archbishop, would restore the ancient tradition of the Church and reaffirm the baptismal right of all the faithful to participate fully in the life of the Church.

Authority and Leadership in the Catholic Community: What Went Wrong?

David P. Efroymsen

Professor Emeritus La Salle University

In order to understand more adequately "what went wrong," it is essential to take history seriously, and not as an inevitable (and "providential") development leading to the current situation. It demands attention to: The original root of papal/Roman authority; Increasing Roman claims, and some of their causes: investiture and the princes; "reform"; Resistance to papal claims; Conciliarism; Gallicanism; Trent; Vatican I, II, and beyond.



Bishop Tom Gumbleton and David P. Efroymsen

So "What's wrong" goes beyond some predatory, sick priests, and even beyond some inadequate bishops. "As Bishop Robinson pointed out, there's A Culture, An Ethos, and A System, all in need of repair, of reform, of rebuilding."

As evidence, Professor Efroymsen offered examples of papal pronouncements, such as the following: According to Leo XIII "It is always true and manifest to all that there are in the Church two grades . . . ; the shepherds and the flock,

i.e. the rulers and the people. It is the function of the first order, to teach, to govern, to guide people . . . , to impose rules; the second has the duty to be submissive to the first, to obey, to carry out orders, to render honor." According to Pius X, "This church is in its essence unequal, i.e. it is a society comprising two categories: pastors and flock, those who occupy the ranks of hierarchy, and the multitude of the faithful. . . . In the pastoral group alone reside the right and authority necessary to promote and direct all the members to the goal of the society; as for the multitude of the faithful, they have no other duty than to allow themselves to be led and, like a docile flock, to follow their shepherds." According to Pius XII: "Because they think the human race has reached a certain 'maturity' . . . some proud, modern spirits . . . are not willing to be, like children, under guardians and stewards (Gal 4:2). They want to be treated as adults who are in full possession of their rights" According to Paul VI: "The Church of the West cannot weaken her faithful observance of her own tradition. And it is unthinkable that for centuries she has followed a path which, instead of favoring the spiritual richness . . . of the People of God, has in some way compromised it, or that she has with arbitrary juridical prescriptions stifled the free expression of the most profound realities of nature and grace."

Formation and the Priesthood of Jesus Christ: Transforming Ordained - Lay Relationships

Rev. Paul Stanosz

Pastor, St. James Catholic Church, Franklin, Wisconsin

Studies of social stratification address inequalities in the distribution of resources and benefits among groups of people. It is a sociological axiom that social bodies, including Christian churches in which all are said to be baptized into Jesus Christ, are composed of groups and persons with differing roles and statuses. The result is an unequal distribution of power within Roman Catholicism, hierarchically establishing clergy over laity.

This lecture addresses the drawing of boundaries between clergy and laity, based primarily on a single multi-faceted variable, sexuality. Celibacy has long been a hallmark of the ordained priesthood, linking the life of Christ, the church's administrative structures, and sacramental system. Examined across centuries in this presentation, formation for the priesthood has resulted in the internalization of a "clerical difference" or boundary between clergy and laity. Across



Christine Schenk, CSJ and Paul Stanosz

time, Catholicism's sexual ethic, including the valorization of continence and celibacy, has been the primary source of its boundaries between itself and the world and between clergy and laity. Changes in the governance structure of the church, that is, its political body, are unlikely unless there are epochal changes in Church beliefs and practices regarding sexuality, including mandatory celibacy.

Women of the Word: Women's Leadership in the Early Church

Sister Christine Schenk, CSJ
Future Church

The presentation, illustrated with PowerPoint images, reviewed contemporary scholarship about biblical and historical women leaders of early Christianity (1st-12th century), many of whose stories have been left untold, deleted, or made optional in lectionary readings for Mass. The painstaking work of contemporary scholars has discovered compelling evidence that women held leadership and ministerial roles in many early Christian communities equivalent to those held by men. Inscriptions and images found on papyri, tombstones, frescos, and mosaics show early Christian women held the titles of apostle, prophet, teacher of theology, priest, deacon, steward, enrolled widow, and bishop. Although these early titles cannot be equated to 21st century understandings of these roles, there is significant evidence that from the 1st to 12th centuries, at least, they were equivalent to ministerial titles held by male church leaders.

Constitutional Catholicism

Leonard Swidler
Professor of Catholic Thought and Interreligious Dialogue
Temple University

The Pope called for a Constitution of the Catholic Church! (Paul VI in 1965). He then set up a Commission to draft a Constitution, which worked intensely for 14 years. When Karol Wojtyla became Pope John Paul II he dismissed the Constitution Commission!

The Reform of the Catholic Church in the spirit of Vatican Council II—"All [Catholics] are led to... wherever necessary, undertake with vigor the task of renewal and reform"—must come from below by two major efforts:

- Encourage parishes to call parishioners to draft a Parish Constitution, install it liturgically, live by it, "evangelize" other parishes to do likewise, form a network of Constitutional Parishes.
- Without delay, work to hold a National Catholic Council (continuing the tradition of the national Councils of Baltimore (initiated by Bishop John England).

How We Can Take Back Our Church

Robert Blair Kaiser
Phoenix, Az



Robert B. Kaiser and Bishop Tom Gumbleton

The post-conciliar Church failed to follow through on the charter of Vatican II – to give the Church back to the people. It failed because Rome insisted on maintaining a top down governance in a bottom-up kind of world. It is likely that Rome will continue to keep the entire Church in thrall with its par-

titular brand of feudalism and clericalism, unless and until local churches can create a new kind of Church polity according to an ancient model. Like the Melkites and the Maronites and Chaldeans, Catholics in every part of the world could fashion autochthonous (home-grown) communities with their own patriarchs, their own clergy (some married, some not) their own liturgies, and their own language and culture. The American Church could become a home-grown American Catholic Church by giving everyone a voice, a vote, and citizenship. How? Robert Blair Kaiser has imagined how with a piece of Utopian fiction called *Cardinal Mahony: A Novel*. And he is the co-founder of an organization dedicated to making it happen www.takebackourchurch.org.

Ingrid Shafer

Minutes of the ARCC Board of Directors Meeting May 18, 2008, in Philadelphia, PA.

Robert Schutzius,
Secretary



Richard Lebrun and Caridad Inda, CHM

Present: Caridad Inda, Richard Lebrun, Earlene Mara, Sonya Quitslund, Robert Schutzius, Ingrid Shafer, Leonard Swidler. Absent: Bill D'Antonio, Tom Doyle, Pat Edgar, Charles McMahon, Pam Monaco, Hugh O'Regan, Gerard

Sloyan. (Pam Monaco and Hugh O'Regan resigned from the board).

Sunday Morning: At 9:00 a.m. the meeting began with a prayer by Bob Schutzius.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Nominations of Richard Lebrun and Charles McMahon to serve on the board were approved.

Weather prevented Pat Edgar, nominee to the board, from attending. He will be invited to attend the next meeting.

Len will contact Pam Monaco about the disposition of ARCC materials she is storing.

Bob will contact Mary Lou Hartman about her efforts to establish an ARCC archive at Notre Dame U.

Revised by-laws were approved. The legal advice of Guy Schmitz gave assurance that the revisions were in conformity with the ARCC's 501c3 status. Sonya will draft and propose an amendment to provide for term limits of officers and transition procedure for the office of president. Earlene will send copies of the approved revised by-laws to board members.

Discussion followed on the previous day's Symposium. All thought it went well. It was suggested that more time



Robert Schutzius and Sonia Quitslund

should have been provided for the open forum at the end, as it was a most lively discussion.

Len will ask Charles McMahon for an account of the monies involved in the Symposium since ARCC was a co-sponsor of the event.

Ingrid will write a report on the Symposium for *ARCC Light*. All were encouraged to contribute articles to Christine Roussel, our most capable and dependable editor of AL along with Ingrid, our publisher. Ingrid will also add Symposium presentations to our web page in due time.

Richard will attend and represent ARCC at the Fall '08 COR meeting in Milwaukee.

Future Board meeting dates and locations were established:

Fall 2008 – October 24-26 at Washington Theological Union (WTU) in DC area

Spring 2009 – Dates were established but later changed to April 24-26 at WTU.

Bob will contact WTU to make the arrangements.

This abbreviated meeting ended at 11:15 a.m.



Photographs by Ingrid Shafer



Bishop Gumbleton, Ingrid Shafer, Bishop Robinson

ARCC Light is published by the Association for the Rights of Catholics in the Church. For membership information, contact ARCC, 3150 Newgate Drive, Florissant, MO 63033, send email to arcc@arccsites.org, or visit our website, <http://arccsites.org/>. Suggested donations are \$25.00 per year. Editors: Christine M. Roussel, PhD, rsvpcmr@juno.com Ingrid H. Shafer, PhD, Email: ihs@ionet.net