



arcvoice

A Report from Australian Reforming Catholics Inc.

June 2019

Issue No. 73

The Ongoing Evolution of Catholicism

When conditions change, evolution results ultimately in the decline and possible extinction of species that do not adapt, and their replacement by species that do adapt. The Catholic Church has a long history of making major changes to accommodate changes in the social environment. The notion of an unchanging Church faithfully continuing the behaviour of the past is a myth propagated by reactionary forces within the Church. The continuing survival of the Church attests to its previous responses to the forces of change.

Evolution commenced very early in the Church. The initial experiments with a continuation of the regulations of Judaism and adoption of voluntary communism were quickly dropped, and active expansion beyond Israel was commenced. The gender egalitarianism preached by Paul was dropped in the next generation and the patriarchal household rules of the Greeks and Romans adopted. Paul's female Christian community leaders were replaced by an exclusively male leadership. The prohibition of the eating of blood was quietly dropped.

After the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Empire, the Church moved into the secular political environment, superseding Jesus' instruction to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. By the Middle Ages, the Pope was just another monarch vying for money and land with his contemporary kings and princes. The appointment of bishops, which was originally decided by clergy of the diocese, evolved from early times to include local bishops and local secular rulers, and now the process is controlled fully by the Vatican. Celibacy of the priesthood was initially optional, but corruption within the clergy became a defining factor in the adoption of compulsory celibacy for clergy in the Western Church in the Middle Ages.

Slavery was a contentious issue for much of the Church's history. Paul's epistle to Philemon did not condemn slavery, and through the years popes allowed "just" slavery when placed under political pressure (indeed, some popes owned slaves). It was not until the late 19th century that Pope Leo XIII unambiguously condemned all forms of slavery, and Vatican II reaffirmed this in *Gaudium et Spes*.

Antisemitism has been an integral part of the Church until recent times. The necessity for baptism to obtain salvation resulted in the invention of limbo to accommodate the sinless unbaptised. This has

continued over

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial ... 1-2

Letters to the Editor ... 2-3

Gideon Goosen ... *Clericalism—some more examples* ... 3-4

Bernard Thorogood: *Reformation Hopes* ... 5

Peter Mumane OP: *To Those Who Think George Pell's Verdict Was Wrong* ... 6-8

Announcing! ARRC Conference ... 8

William Grimm MM: *Schoolyard bullies in the sacristy* ... 9-10

Keith Suter: *What is the Future of the Catholic Church in Australia?* ... 10

Eric Hodgens: *Catholic Governance – A Challenge for Improvement* ... 11

Noelene Uren: *Frocks and Funny Hats* ... 12-13

Alan Holroyd: *Manly Clericalism?* ... 13-14

New Book: *In the Closets of the Vatican* by Frédéric Martel ... 14

Review by Michael Whelan SM: *Love your Enemies* by Arthur C Brooks ... 15

Review by Brian Bright: *Saving Catholics* by Gideon Goosen ... 15

ARC Illustrator: Alan Holroyd

only recently been changed. Indeed, the belief in the grave difficulty for anyone other than Catholics to be saved persisted well into the 20th century.

The advent of Protestantism precipitated a number of changes, one of which was the decision that it was no longer a sin to charge interest on a loan. The Enlightenment and subsequent progress of science caused the Church to make some profound changes. The Bible was no longer the arbiter of reality: the Universe was accepted as being heliocentric not geocentric, the biblical creation story was accepted as myth, not historical fact, and it was accepted that humanity evolved from earlier forms of life. However, Pope Pius X initiated a vicious attack on “Modernism”, and it was not until 1942 that Catholic scholars were permitted to study the Bible in its original Hebrew and Greek.

The declining secular power of the pope with the unification of Italy influenced the decision by the Vatican I Council to proclaim the pope’s infallibility when speaking *ex cathedra* – a change from the previous situation. The Church now seems to have

become trapped in an age of monarchs, authoritarianism and inequality.

In the last generation, world society has changed more rapidly than at any other time in history, and Australian society is at the forefront. The Australian Catholic community has rejected restrictions on contraception. Married and female clergy are favoured. Remarried divorcees and homosexuals are accepted in the community, and the theological rationale for their acceptance has been proposed. The official Church has not yet caught up with the social evolution of the community, but has the opportunity to do so in the forthcoming Plenary Council. These issues must be debated, and the *sensus fidelium* passed on to the Vatican. We must rely on the Holy Spirit to oversee the evolution of the Church and so prevent it becoming yet another organism to suffer decline and extinction because of an inability to evolve.

Alan Clague

Letters to the Editor

Thanks once again for the excellent articles in the latest issue and I especially enjoyed yours. It brought to my mind an experience I had in my forties.

I had a very troublesome gynaecological history including two ectopic pregnancies and was told by my specialist that a hysterectomy was very necessary. When mentioning that I would need time off from my catechist duties while I recuperated, I was told by the co-ordinator that, before I went ahead with this procedure, it should first be discussed with the parish priest!! I was gob-smacked and, fortunately, was savvy enough to realise how ridiculous this was and did not follow her advice.

But what was the thinking behind this requirement? It still staggers me to think about it now that advice/permission from a priest was necessary for a medical matter about which they knew nothing; or was it for the good of my soul, to protect my spiritual life from an unacceptable form of birth control? As I say, I do think the treatment of women in our Church is another form of abuse which needs to be named and recognised.

Elizabeth Lonergan

On reading your article about the impact of clericalism on people's lives I was reminded of a story a friend told me about something that happened to her family when she was a young woman.

Jane was an Irishwoman who had moved to England to work and had married there. Her younger sister was getting married, so Jane and her husband returned to Ireland for the wedding. They were sitting in the congregation and, as the bride walked down the aisle behind the two friends she had chosen as bridesmaids, the parish priest who was officiating spotted Jane. He stopped the wedding procession, told the bridesmaids to sit down, summoned Jane to the altar and berated the bride for not asking her sister to be her witness at her wedding.

Of course they all obeyed because the priest refused to continue until they had done as they were told.

How’s that for bullying tactics!

Noelene Uren

I enjoyed your article on clericalism so much that it reminded me of a number of instances when we unabashedly believed everything uttered by priests.

My wife was raised as a Salvationist and converted just before we were married. She had three very close friends whom she asked to be her bridesmaids – none of whom were Catholics. Inevitably, when they were married, they asked her to reciprocate. In those days Catholics were banned from entering non-Catholic churches. My wife thought this was stupid and was honour-bound and wanted to be part of her dear friends' celebrations. I asked our Parish Priest for a dispensation to attend the wedding. He replied that it was not possible. Appreciating my (our) dilemma his advice was 'attend the wedding, then confess your sin in the next week's confession'.

A second instance occurred when my wife was pregnant and suffered severe bouts of morning sickness. We had moved to a small flat in Coogee. Her obstetrician recommended that she have a small quantity of food on waking in the morning. At that time we had to fast from midnight before receiving communion the following day. I asked the Parish Priest at our new parish for a dispensation. He refused, citing it was a privilege to receive communion and she would have to obey the church's commandment. I rang our old Parish Priest to ask him if it was possible, even though we were now not in his parish. This time he readily granted the dispensation which solved the problem.

I am often reminded of a quote from the German Theologian, Bernard Häring: 'I don't think the Church can dictate to God.'

John Collins

Clericalism

Some more examples

Gideon Goosen

Let me begin by stating what I am taking as 'clericalism'. Based on a work by George B. Wilson SJ, I can define it thus: **'Clericalism is a sense of privilege, entitlement and superiority, secrecy and pre-occupation with status on the part of the ordained. However, being an attitude, it can be held by anyone, be they lay or ordained.'** This attitude pervades the Catholic Church across the lay/ordained boundary. It is not an anti-clergy war fought by the laity. I was brought up in this church and am as guilty of clericalism as the next person. It is like being in a room filled with polluted air that we all inhaled. Hopefully I am rejecting it now.

Now let me give some personal examples.

I start by emphasising that clericalism occurs between the laity as well as between laity and ordained. I was brought up in a clerical church and my behaviours towards ordained and laity reflect that attitude. The only trouble is that I seldom reflect on how clerical my behaviour was. So when I say to another parishioner: 'We must ask Father about that ...' I might well be guilty of promoting clericalism if the issue is not one where father needs

to know or where he does not have expertise. I hope others today will point this out to me and allow me to do the same to them. I also hope that pastors will point out clerical behaviour to fellow pastors when it occurs. Combatting clericalism is not a lay versus ordained issue. Clericalism is found throughout the church at all levels.

When a fellow parishioner says 'We cannot have a bible study group without father's permission', he or she is promoting clericalism. One parishioner asked me recently 'if father knows' about a dinner a group of us parishioners was having in a restaurant. Why should father know? There are many other examples I am sure. If we are to make progress in eliminating clericalism we must point out these occasions of clericalism in a direct but polite way. Now to move onto examples of the lay/ordained relationship.

I recall asking a PP for permission to use the parish hall for a meeting of a reform group. He agreed quickly and then said: 'Can you put that in writing'. I did this by email and then got a reply saying he had considered the request but he could not agree to it. I wrote back asking for the reason for the refusal. The PP replied, saying he would not enter into any discussion of his decision. I regard this as clericalism and an example of a lack of transparency. We should know the reason for the refusal. Who after all paid for the hall in the first place? The parishioners, and it was parishioners who wanted to use it.

Another example. The parish had built up many good ministries and a lay person had gone through the

process of interviewing all ministry leaders to find out how things were going and to see if there were any problems. Along comes the PP and decides (without any consultation) to rearrange the ministries, to sack some paid ministry leaders, and ignore all the feedback from the interviews. This shows arrogance and a sense of superiority. 'I know best'.

The following example comes from the liturgy. I had prepared a communion reflection with slides with the agreement of the PP. When we came to that point in the mass when the slides would be used, the PP decided to set them aside and end the mass as the unlegislated 60-minute-time-limit for a mass has been reached. I gave the PP some straight feedback along the lines of the time and effort I had put into it! This shows a lack of respect for the laity in their role in the liturgy, especially as in this case, the reflection had been agreed upon. Clericalism says people are not equal. We say all should be equally respected, be they ordained or lay.

Here is another one from the liturgy in the post Vatican II era. A certain PP was giving out communion by himself to a church full of people on a Sunday morning. I went up and asked him if I could give a hand in giving out communion. He gave me a bewildered look and momentarily lost his ability to speak. Finally he came out with: 'and what are you?' (not '*nbo* are you?'). Thinking back on the incident, I should have said 'I am a baptised Christian like you'.

In a new parish many years ago, but in the Post Vatican II era, I was keen to see if I could join the liturgy committee. I was sent to a certain lay person's home to enquire. When I finally found the person concerned and asked if there was a liturgy committee, he said 'No there is not. If there are any decisions to be made, father makes them'.

In the same parish, the rule as laid down by the PP was that no-one was allowed to raise money for any church-related purpose including for the primary school (which needed to improve some of its amenities, like toilets). So all the money was in the hands of the PP who had his eye on a new mega church to the glory of God, and, no doubt, his too. No one among the parishioners challenged this absurd position. This was a form of absolutism that many a medieval pope would have envied! In those days few would have called it clericalism.

Over the years many parishioners had given much time and attention to ministries. Some of the ministries had become well known in the area. When a new PP arrived and promptly shut down some of these ministries without any explanation or consultation, the parishioners were absolutely stunned and deeply hurt. Here is another example of the PP knowing better and

showing a complete lack of transparency. In short time the PP moved on and left the parish to lick its wounds.

My experience with the change of PPs is not something to rejoice in. Many times I have seen ministries built up over some years and then, when a new PP comes along, he knows best and shuts down some without discussion and starts his own. (The *I-know-best* model.) This shows a complete lack of respect for the parishioners and their mission. When the PP is moved on, or chooses to move on, the whole upsetting process is repeated.

I can also recall a certain new PP who initially kept on saying 'It is your parish'. But soon, when he appointed his own parish pastoral council and dismissed the liturgy council (without even telling them!—he just appointed a new one), it was clear to all whose parish it was!!

On this point: Many years ago a certain PP was appointed to our parish. I remember it well. On a Sunday morning, at the time of the homily, the new PP proclaimed how excited he was to have 'his' parish and how pleased his mother was that at last he had been given 'his' parish. He could hardly contain himself for joy. He then informed us, that he would be taking his three weeks holiday in the snowfields immediately, but would catch up with us on his return. Those in the congregation who could not afford a holiday in the snow were left to ponder their misfortune. This is a good example of entitlements. Something is wrong with the training of young pastors if they cannot wait to get their own parish as a kind of prize. Missing is any sense of 'servant of the people'.

Another liturgy incident comes to mind. The PP was in the habit of checking the prayers of the faithful some time before the mass. He did this by putting a red line through those prayers he disliked or those whose grammar was defective. On a particular occasion I saw this happened just before mass and confronted the PP pointing out that, as the prayers came from sincere people, those prayers should be respected and not cancelled out in a superior way, with a red pen because he did not like them, or because he thought they got it wrong, or because the grammar was wrong. This was a clear example of a feeling of superiority.

Through stories like the above, I hope is that we will all help each other to recognise and reject clerical behaviours as we move towards a church that is a community of equals.

GIDEON GOOSEN is a Sydney theologian whose most recent book is *Saving Catholics*, Melbourne: Morningstar Publishing, 2019. See Review p15.

Reformation Hopes

Bernard Thorogood

As an old ecumenist and Uniting Church minister I read *ARCVoice* with admiration for the steadfast and heartfelt longing for reform at a time of testing for all the churches. We are all together in the exposure of past abuses; we all have failures in care; we all pray for those hurt, and we all know our credibility as bearers of the light of Christ is shaken. For Catholics it must be particularly painful, with the drawn-out parade of guilt. Sisters and brothers in Christ, may we support and encourage one another in this challenging time.

So press on with the quest which is essential for the church to be fit for the service of Christ. Relying on the inheritance will not do. Those in senior office usually have too much to defend, so become institution guardians, and tend to see that as their calling. So it may be that the laity have to claim the church as the ‘people of God’, and keep up the pressure for reform.

From my experience of work alongside the Catholic church in sixty years of ministry I have thought that the primary reform needed is to take seriously the ‘people of God’ and so to empower the laity to share in all aspects of leadership – in worship, in theology, mission, administration, governance and communications. If the church moves along that line then the priest/pastor is able to concentrate on the key leadership of pastor, for the Good Shepherd is the only model of leadership we have. The call of Jesus to Peter was ‘Feed my sheep’, not ‘Define the incarnation’ or ‘Dictate the rules about contraceptives’.

We are aware of the theme that the priest is there at the altar as a model of Christ, but my experience is that there are always people in the congregation who are far better models of Christ than I am. The gift that I have prayed for is being able to lead others to the spiritual reality of grace, the awareness of the presence of God. But then I was picked to be a church administrator at a desk in London for 12 years – but even that can become a pastoral calling, dealing with the ministers and their families in difficulties or congregations troubled by a divisive spirit.

It is critical that we learn to deal well with power and refuse all the examples of power that are

celebrated today. Status, limelight, wealth, political influence, sinecures – all the temptations in the wilderness are still with us, so we have to be ready with the clear ‘No’ that we read was the reply of Jesus. The church of God is a fellowship of the spirit, supported by a framework of order, constantly renewed by hearing the Gospel, driven to serve by all the pains and tears of life, united in devotion to Christ and bearing the marks of love.

I am troubled by any power in any church to silence the surprising, unorthodox, adventurous voices. Of course the liberation theologians, like Leonardo Boff, could be accused of socialist or communist sympathies, yet the heart of what they were saying has been sustained and is now accepted – that Christ came to free us not as souls from damnation but as people from despair and oppression, sick dreams and the fear of death, divided minds and broken relationships. We need the fresh light that comes with the disturbing voice for we are conditioned to bottle the Spirit within the Creeds and the Tradition.

The call to reform is perennial. It is about the journey, for there is no end in sight. We cannot rest on Luther or Calvin or John Paul II or Origen or Augustine – all the great minds that have shared in the story of the church, for all were shaped by their time and place, all were constrained by their partial understanding of the world. They bring us riches which we receive with thanksgiving, but we have to move on, as humanity moves. I am puzzled that so many senior church people do not take the historical process seriously. We cannot believe in the same manner or with the same words as the church did in the reign of Constantine. The place of women in society has been the great social revolution of my lifetime. If it does not penetrate the church then we are doomed to a kind of half-life. I can testify that, after a hundred years of the ordination of women in my communion, with all the arguments long buried, we have been enriched and blessed.

So I read *ARCVoice* with great sympathy and hope. I may not see any radical reform in Rome, but I think my grandchildren will. We journey on together.

BERNARD THOROGOOD is a retired Uniting Church minister and a long-time member of ARC.

To Those Who Think George Pell's Verdict Was Wrong

Peter Murnane OP

Below is the *substance* of a homily I gave at St Dominic's, Camberwell, on Sunday 3rd March 2019. After giving it, I was told that the Vicar General of Melbourne Archdiocese had issued a letter instructing us how to deal with this topic: Cardinal Pell's conviction for the rape of two choir boys.

The Vicar General's letter made nine points. The first told us *not* to give a personal opinion of Pell's guilt or innocence, although many eminent Catholics have done so publicly. The fifth point instructed us to *'inform your people that Cardinal Pell maintains his innocence'*.

The seventh point told us to *'be mindful of all victims of sexual abuse in any form. Acknowledge with respect those who have had the courage in coming forward...'*

This sequence does not necessarily indicate the *relative importance* of the points being made, but why – after a legal verdict – are church leaders still putting Pell's claim above that of his accuser? This was the main reason for my giving that homily.

Since then I have found that Helen Last, employed by archbishop Pell until 1997, received a letter from his vicar general, Denis Hart, warning that she was to be sacked for daring to enquire into the many complaints about Doveton parish priest, Peter Searson.

The Homily

The conviction of Cardinal George Pell for sexual offences has brought us to a unique point in the history of the Catholic Church, and raises huge questions for every Catholic Christian.

Perhaps Jesus has something to tell us through this gospel that we read today, about how we can each cope with this difficult situation. He says here that the quality of each person is known by their fruit. What applies to persons must be said of institutions, such as our Catholic church. This weekend Archbishop Coleridge of Brisbane sent his people a letter reassuring them about the good work that our church has done and is doing every day... fruits that show what we are as a church.

All that is very true. But Jesus warns us, quite strongly, that we are quite skilled at noticing the splinter in the eye of another person, while we do not notice the plank in our own. Let's dare to look for that plank. It is true that the Church is not *now* walking away from

its responsibilities in uncovering sexual abuse, but we are doing this only after a five year *Royal Commission* has *forced* us to. This is what the *Royal Commission* uncovered: I am quoting directly from its *Report*, and I apologise that this can be hard to listen to.

In the 36 years from 1980-2015, Catholic authorities in Australia received complaints of sexual abuse from 4,444 persons. Of those who abused them:

32 % were religious brothers; 5 % were sisters

30 % were priests; 29 % were lay people.

Through 60 years (1950 – 2010) 7% of all Catholic priests in the survey were alleged to be perpetrators.

Many senior church officials, over many decades, knew about allegations of abuse but failed to take effective action, catastrophically failed to help children and caused much suffering to them, their families and communities. Church authorities acted in *their own interests* rather than the interests of children. Survivors were often disbelieved, ignored or punished, and sometimes further abused. This happened mainly because Catholics wanted to avoid public scandal, to maintain the Church's reputation, and be 'loyal' to priests and religious.

Countless complaints were *not* reported to police. Reporting could have prevented further sexual abuse. Sometimes police also failed to act, for the reasons given. Some alleged perpetrators were allowed to continue in ministry in the same position for long periods; others were moved to new positions, where they continued to abuse children. Sometimes lies were told about why the abuser had gone; or no warning was given to the new place about the risk they posed. Some of the above can be excused because we lacked knowledge: for example leaders hoped that psychological therapy or counselling could 'cure' alleged perpetrators; or that abusers could be controlled by imposing restrictions on their ministry. Nevertheless, there is much that is worthy of serious blame.

Nearly four and half thousand abused children, over many decades! And now we have a cardinal convicted of abusing, and in jail. He is suffering. He is our brother. He urgently needs our prayers. Is he guilty? Or was his conviction unjust, still another terrible wrong? The Catholic community is divided on this. Some journalists and lawyers – including Jesuit Frank Brennan – claim he must be innocent. But if we say this, do we have a plank in our eye? Do we still think that church leaders can do no wrong?

Cardinal Pell has done much good in his life, and I respect him for that. But I attended eight days of his trial, and have no difficulty respecting the jury's verdict of guilty. Those who still claim his innocence

say that he was condemned by only one witness who claims that Pell raped him when he was 13 years old. There were actually two boys, on choir scholarships which paid their school fees at St Kevins. They loved going to choir... but suddenly stopped loving it, and wanted to quit. They did not tell their parents why. Most victims don't tell, at least for many years afterwards. If it took them a year to leave the choir, it was because they could not reveal the reason. To leave would mean that they would lose the choir scholarships, and their families would not be able to afford school fees. But the boys *did* leave, and by about 16 years of age both were taking heroin. One eventually died of an overdose.

If the survivor's story is true, can we imagine what he must have suffered? If his story was *not* true, why would he come forward 22 years later, with such an outlandish story, to take on the might and wealth of the Catholic church and the highest-paid lawyers in the state? Could he have been trying to save his sanity by coming out with the truth at last; to get justice? How many victims we have re-abused by not listening.

The QC, Robert Richter, grilled him thoroughly and challenged his story. The court was closed for the two and a half days of his evidence, so *no one* except the jury knows how genuine the young man appears, nor all the details of his case. Not me, not the journalists; not Fr Frank Brennan. If we Catholics expect that the appeal *must* declare that the jury was wrong, are we making another enormous mistake?

If you doubt his story, I suggest that you read the book by Louise Milligan, who listened to him at length. I have met Louise Milligan and she impresses me as a truthful woman, not at all sensationalist. She assures me that the young man is also genuine and truthful. Richter QC brought out small inconsistencies in his story, but do we expect a traumatised thirteen-year-old to have perfect recall after 22 years?

Pell's supporters claim that the crime could not have been committed in the cathedral sacristy after High Mass because there were too many people around. We heard from many witnesses: two choir masters, the organist, sacristan, master of ceremonies and former choir boys. But they all had to speak in *probabilities*: 'people were coming and going; people had jobs to do; the archbishop *always* followed this routine'. But they could not rule out exceptions. No one could swear to seeing the archbishop all the time. After every Mass, in the cathedral as in any church, people eventually drift away. There are moments of quiet. The sacristy is empty. No one noticed two choir boys missing from their places, but

that doesn't mean that they *never* went missing to trespass naughtily in the room where, it is claimed, Pell found them pinching the altar wine.

Please forgive me this distasteful detail: those who think Pell is innocent make much of this argument. I was astonished that Richter spent so much time trying to prove that a bishop, dressed in a full length cassock with an alb over it, could not possibly expose himself for the purpose of rape. It is a stupid argument. In my 53 years as a priest, if I wish to answer a call of nature when vested for Mass, it is a simple matter to lift the hem of the multiple garments or vestments I am wearing. End of story. It is astonishing that Fr Brennan is still spreading this foolish argument.

The defence QC also claimed that priests who abuse boys must first groom them over a time, winning their trust, and boasted that Pell did *not* do this. But grooming is only one way to abuse. There is another kind, practised by Jimmy Saville of the BBC, and Rolf Harris—powerful and wealthy men who mixed with royalty and Prime Ministers. No one would dare challenge them. They would abuse suddenly and recklessly; hit and run, even with other people present. Jimmy Saville would abuse children in their hospital bed. He abused an 11-year-old girl in the sacristy during Mass. When such revered public figures were eventually accused, many could not believe *them* guilty.

Cardinal Pell is convicted of a violent act of sheer power. He has admitted that he has a strong temper. The young delinquent boys were powerless. Pell's actions might have been very risky, but he felt confident he could not be caught; even if the boys dared to accuse him, no one would believe them.

Pell's defenders claim that the action was completely out of character. Was it? Sadly, the archbishop does *not* have a clean record. On at least three other occasions he has had to face accusations by individuals or groups. A judge once accepted that an accuser was telling the truth, but that so many decades had passed there was not sufficient evidence to bring the matter to court. The same happened recently with several men who said that, as a young priest, Pell had often abused them in the swimming pool at Ballarat. The case was about to go to trial, but was dropped last week because once again, after four decades, the evidence was legally inadequate.

And how has Pell treated those *complaining* of sexual abuse? Chrissy and Anthony Foster's two little daughters were raped by their Oakleigh parish priest. If you read the Fosters' excellent book you will be saddened to see that Archbishop Pell treated them abominably. So too was John Ellis, the Sydney abuse

survivor whom Pell almost destroyed by legal trickery, which has now been reversed. During the *Royal Commission* I watched Cardinal Pell give evidence by video link from Rome. Like the Commissioners themselves, I could not believe him when he claimed *not to know* about several cases of abuse. He and his supporters boast of his *Melbourne Response* to abuse. But it is a plan designed to *limit* compensation and tended to gag those who accepted its small pay-outs. It was *not* a wonderful, original initiative, but was launched in haste before the other Australian bishops could finish their combined plan.

Bishops and cardinals *can* do wrong. Three eminent cardinals of Philadelphia lied, in succession, to grand juries about the huge amount of abuse in that diocese. Just last week Cardinal McCarrick of Washington was reduced to the lay state – stripped of his priesthood – for committing sexual abuse.

Cardinals are called ‘princes of the church’. A psalm that we sing in the Prayer of the Church says: *God pours contempt on princes... They diminish, are reduced to nothing... But God raises the needy – the suffering – from distress.* Was it a bad mistake, way back in our church’s history, to have allowed such rankings to become part

of our church? Did Jesus tell us to use titles and privileges, bishops’ palaces and elaborate vestments? He positively forbade them! In today’s gospel he tells us: the disciple is *not greater than the master...* who died penniless, murdered for defending others.

Our church today is sick. Was it the structure of our church—the non-sharing of power; the clericalism that puts the clergy before others—which is a main reason why all this has happened? Some of our church’s fruit is rotten. We need urgently to pray for a renewed church. It needs deep reform. Jesus has not left us; the risen Christ in our hearts, in our Eucharist. Many agree that it is the *form*, the structure of the church that went astray, centuries ago. How to change it is a huge question. Possible solutions will be discussed at the coming *Plenary Council*. Don’t miss your opportunity to speak to it.

PETER MURNANE is a Dominican Friar on the Dominican Preaching Team around Aotearoa (New Zealand) and Australia

Announcing! ARRCC Conference

November 8-10 2019

ARRCC has a unique role in Australia in bringing together diverse people of faith to engage in the transformative action needed to protect the earth’s capacity for life into the future.

We invite you, our valued supporters, to our first national Conference on Friday 8 November to Sunday 10 November in Canberra. The conference will be held at the **Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture, Barton, ACT.**

The theme of the conference is: ***How we can take action based on our faith to tackle the climate emergency.*** This will be an opportunity to build solidarity with like-minded people from diverse communities and to be empowered. The conference will be especially mindful of Aboriginal spirituality and their struggles for justice.

We will be focusing on:

- Developing more effective political organising capacity
- How to build more active local groups
- Becoming more educated about and motivated to act on the climate emergency

Empowering people of diverse faiths acting together on ARRCC goals.

Guest speakers will include academics, skilled community organising trainers and fellow ARRCC activists from different faiths who will present on their successful actions and learnings from these. We will also be conducting workshops on to mobilise members of our communities to organise more effective campaigning.

Please **save the date**

and more information will be made available over the next few months

Schoolyard bullies in the sacristy

Sexual abuse by clergy should be blamed on emotionally immature men, not homosexuality or celibacy

William Grimm MM

Half a century ago, the bishops' conference of the United States commissioned an interdisciplinary study of the priesthood in that country. Key parts of it were led by two priests who at the time were celebrities in the Catholic community, Andrew Greeley the sociologist and Eugene Kennedy the psychologist. (Disclosure: as a seminarian I was office assistant to Kennedy in the early stages of the study.)

The results of their work, especially the psychological part, showed a large majority of American priests to be dissatisfied as well as emotionally underdeveloped and therefore unable to develop healthy relationships. Their training and insertion into the clerical culture, which in many cases started as young as age 13, froze them into a perpetual adolescence.

Instead of taking the studies to heart and working to improve the situation, as one would hope, the bishops, as one would expect, ignored the results of their own study. Greeley, noted for his pugnacity, responded, 'Honesty compels me to say that I believe the present leadership in the Church to be morally, intellectually and religiously bankrupt.'

Now everyone realizes how right Greeley was, as abuse and cover-ups by bishops around the world become headlines. Behind those headlines is the situation of which the social scientists led by Greeley and Kennedy warned. And the entire Catholic Church is suffering because of bishops' failure to act then.

It is well attested that sexual and other forms of abuse are really about the misuse or abuse of power rather than sex. For a believer, that should be no surprise. When the devil tempted Jesus with power, the tempter declared that power was his and his to distribute. And Jesus did not dispute that.

When immature boys, no matter their age, abuse power, they often become bullies. And bullies usually victimize weaker boys. That, and not homosexuality, is probably what underlies the striking frequency of the abuse of boys by clergy. Research has shown that sexual abuse by clergy is not caused by homosexuality. Nor, for that matter, celibacy. The schoolyard moves into the sacristy when emotionally immature men are in charge there.

It is worth noting that since changes in priestly formation instituted after Vatican II, the cases of sexual abuse by priests and bishops have lessened. Most cases of abuse and cover-up, whether against children or

young adults such as seminarians, have been perpetrated by those trained before the council or in unreformed systems that have held on to 'the good old days'. So, though the recommendations of the researchers in the 1960s were not instituted fully, even their partial implementation has made a difference.

However, not all immature clergy abuse boys or girls or even young men. The bigger number, only recently getting the notice that the abuse of children has overshadowed, is the abuse of women by priests and bishops. That is not limited to clergy, of course. The #MeToo movement and its offshoots are making us aware that the abuse of women is the more common form of abuse among all kinds of immature males.

And females. Little boys grow up and too often merely become big boys. Little girls seem better able to grow up and become women. But not all do. In the context of the Church, the fuse that will lead to the explosion based in novitiates, convents and schools, orphanages and other institutions run by sisters is smouldering. The abuse of girls, other women and boys by sisters is the powder keg.

The first thing we learn from all this is that the current crisis for the Catholic Church is not going to end any time soon. It has only just begun. There are more and bigger explosive exposures ahead.

It will take generations for the dust of those explosions to settle and for the Church to recover. Those who have compared the current situation to the Reformation 500 years ago from which we are still recovering are right.

What are we to do? Well, an increasing number of people have decided to walk away from the Church. That number will grow with each exposé, and who can blame them?

What of those who decide to stay? Our responses to the situation must be the same actions that we perform in the sacrament of Penance: contrition, confession and conversion.

Contrition begins with sympathetic and humble honesty shown toward victims of the Church leadership's failure to protect them and even more in its inflicting immature predators upon them in the first place.

Confession consists in being proactive rather than reactive in rooting out the problem. Even now, the work of Church leaders is being performed by the media and legal systems. The more that happens, the worse things will be. This includes cooperating with civil requirements without being forced by threat of legal action or bad publicity.

Conversion will take the form of implementing significant changes in the shape of clerical and

religious life and involving more lay people as well as clergy and professionals in the actual running of the Church.

Then, over the course of the generations through which healing may take place, we must pray for the courage and faith to follow the medicinal guidance of the Holy Spirit with the conviction that, though the disease is critical, it need not be chronic.

William Grimm MM is a New York-born priest active in Tokyo. He has also served in Cambodia and Hong Kong and is the publisher of UCA News

This article was on-published by *La Croix International*, 25.3.2019

What is the Future of the Catholic Church in Australia?

Keith Suter

Preparations are underway for the Plenary Council of 2020-1. There is a risk that the preparations may take too narrow a focus. There would be value in doing a scenario planning exercise on the future of the Catholic Church in Australia.

I have been involved in stimulating a discussion on the future of the Uniting Church in Australia. 'Scenario planning' is not about making predictions or proposing what one would like to see happen.

Instead, it is about exploring possibilities: what *could* happen (something that is not necessarily being predicted from current trends, and not necessarily what one like to see happen). It is a way of encouraging people to think about the unthinkable and so broaden their mental horizons.

Two or four scenarios are devised. Never three. If there are three scenarios the client opts for the middle and least controversial one; the purpose of scenario planning is to get people out of their comfort zone. The actual methodology is set out on my website: www.churchfutures.com.au

For the Uniting Church I devised four scenarios:

- (i) **'Word and Deed'** (the amalgamation of parishes into a small number of big parishes, providing both spiritual and welfare services);

- (ii) **'Secular Welfare'** (just letting the congregations die off and concentrate on the expanding welfare work);
- (iii) **'Early Church'** (letting the welfare agencies go their own way and, instead, return to the thinking of the early church, such as the use of house churches); and
- (iv) **'Recessional'** (winding up the Uniting Church and letting the thriving parts go their own way, such as the Uniting Church private schools, hospitals and aged care facilities).

The Uniting Church has thriving education and welfare work, while many congregations are in decline. It looks like the second scenario is coming into play. The Uniting Church, therefore, needs to think about the implications of the second scenario: such as how to wind up congregations gracefully, and how to ensure Christian values are maintained in the welfare institutions (which are often financed by secular government).

The Catholic Church is much larger than the Uniting Church. Indeed it could be Australia's largest single employer outside government. But, as with the Uniting Church, its size and wealth now come less from the congregations and more from all the education and welfare work.

A scenario planning exercise would encourage people to think outside their mental horizons and so reduce the risk of being taken by surprise.

Dr KEITH SUTER, a television and radio current affairs commentator. He has been involved with the Uniting Church since its inception (and he even helped organise its inaugural event in 1977). His third PhD is on the future of the Uniting Church.

Catholic Governance – A Challenge for Improvement

Eric Hodgens

Posted on *Pearls & Irritations* 10 April 2019

A monarchical organization, powered by ideology, with promotion by patronage results in bad governance. The Catholic Church has a governance problem.

Wilton Gregory has been appointed Archbishop of Washington DC replacing Cardinal Donald Wuerl. While there will be some disappointed faces amongst younger bishops in the USA, most Catholic commentators are positive about the appointment. At 71 he is old for the job and has only four years till official retirement age. One factor may be a shortage of younger bishops who are in tune with Pope Francis.

Therein lies the problem. A monarchical organization combined with appointment by patronage inevitably weakens an organization. The first rule of any Human Resources (HR) department is to get the best person for the job. This entails advertising the job, publishing an accepted set of criteria for the choice of the successful candidate, having a competent selection process to scrutinise the applicants, and a clear system of making the final determination. The more transparent this whole process the better will be the result. This is HR best practice.

The Catholic Church has not embraced this practice. It still works on the monarchical model of its past glory days. A monarchy is literally one-man-rule. The monarch's advisors and administrators are answerable solely to him. They try to discover 'the mind of the boss' and reflect that back to him. This limits the frank and fearless advice needed for wise decisions.

The monarchical system tends to spawn an inner circle of influence with accompanying intrigue. George Pell was such an eminence grise. As archbishop first of Melbourne and then of Sydney he used his monarchical power to sack Melbourne's seminary staff and re-make Sydney's in tune with the papal ideology – making them both academies of clericalism. He also used his Vatican position and contacts to influence Australian episcopal appointments. The two main dioceses are headed up by his protegés.

The Roman system is monarchical. The pope is the sole appointer of bishops. Likewise, in a diocese, the Bishop has the final say on all matters. This explains the mediocrity of the Catholic bishops of the world.

The 35-year regime of popes Wojtyla and Ratzinger was heavily ideological and centralist. It opposed Communism. It opposed any review of sexual mores – contraception, divorce, clerical celibacy, homosexuality, family planning. It was suspicious of biological research. It opposed women's

ordination. It reduced episcopal authority and changed the Synod of Bishops into a papal rubber stamp.

As identity politics became more mainstream across the world, the Wojtyla ideology became a network. Sympathetic bishops and academics built up think tanks such as the JP II Institute for Marriage and the Family, the Napa Institute in California, founded and funded by the controversial Timothy Busch, and the Catholic Institute of Italy, supported by Steve Bannon. Similarly, tertiary institutions like Notre Dame University Sydney were founded – in this case by George Pell. New publishers like Ignatius Press, founded by Joseph Fessio SJ, disseminated the ideology. Altogether a war with several fronts and a small, but tight-knit, and often wealthy, bunch of warriors. And – a million miles away from the pastoral vision of Jesus.

The essential pre-requisite for selection as bishop was complete compliance with this papal ideology. This eliminated many potential leaders and favoured conformists. When the full force of the sexual abuse crisis hit in 2002 this monochrome cohort of defensive bishops was singularly unprepared for it. 'They're after us; protect the show.'

Catholic services which answer to the wider society such as education, health care and social services do very well – but at some distance from the bishop.

However diocesan administrations are still based on the old monarchical culture. The bishop alone has full executive power. And even in those organizations open to public scrutiny the bishop still has enormous influence particularly in key appointments. Take for example the Director of Catholic Education in Melbourne archdiocese. Despite reservations being signalled to the bishop beforehand Steven Elder was appointed without any transparency as to process. He has recently retired his position under clouded circumstances.

Will his successor be similarly parachuted in? A host of people will be affected by the outcome but, under this system they will have no input to the result.

The appointment of Wilton Gregory effectively reaches back over the Wojtyla/Ratzinger period. He became bishop in 1983 under the patronage of Cardinal Bernadin. He has known a different era. Many younger bishops do not. He fits this bill, but the appointment method is the same. He is Bergoglio's choice. That's the system. Observers can only guess the rationale. It would be more legitimate if the appointment procedure was more transparent.

The governance of the Church is still locked into its monarchical past. That model is inefficient in today's world with its diversity of specialisation, social science knowhow and technological sophistication and political structures. A wise incorporation of aspects of modern politics, including the separation of powers, would make it more effective in achieving its main goal – the pastoral care of all.

Eric Hodgens is a retired Catholic priest
of the Archdiocese of Melbourne

Frocks and Funny Hats

Noelene Uren

As the discussion about clericalism and the role of bishops in the Church continues, it was interesting to read an article by Eric Hodgens, Melbourne pastor emeritus (*The Swag*, Summer 2018). He wrote on how the influence of bishops in Church governance works against a collaborative Church. Eric describes how, as Christianity spread, it developed its own organisation much along the lines of the Jewish synagogue. Leaders emerged as overseers and were called bishops.

But then Emperor Constantine ‘Took the movement under his wing. What had started as a matter of the heart became one of the head and stayed that way.’ Constantine supervised the development of what had been a fairly simple charismatic movement into a state-endorsed, highly organised clerical institution. It became a religion with doctrines and rules. And bishops became very powerful.

As the Church grew, so did the influence of the bishops. They were a political as well as a spiritual power. They wore a full cassock, sash and skull cap of purple, the colour of royalty, jewelled ring and cross, donned the mitre and carried the crozier. People knelt, kissed their ring and addressed them as ‘Your Grace’. All very heady stuff and, as the maxim goes, ‘Power corrupts’. So many, rather than being servants of God and His people, served only themselves.

Any organisation needs leaders who are selfless in their service and, hopefully, aware of their own shortcomings. We do not need a caste system whereby, because of their ordination, priests and, therefore, bishops are seen as having been changed into men who are especially holy, above us lesser mortals. In the December 2018 edition of *ARCVoice*, we are drawn to a quote by Joan Chittister: ‘To be honest with you, I have never met anybody who wasn't special in a special way’.

So many changes need to be made, but maybe, to begin with, titles and the regalia of office could be abolished. Two years ago I attended the funeral of my niece, Mary, in Darwin. The celebrant, a friend of Mary's, was Bishop Eugene Hurley, a much loved man. He entered the church wearing vestments and a mitre, admittedly a small white one. After the funeral he joined us in casual clothes and one of his friends remarked, ‘You look better without your funny hat’.

It may seem trifling, just a little thing, but maybe the time has come to finally abolish the frocks and funny hats so long loved by the clergy. It would be a start!

Noelene Uren is a retired primary school principal
and a regular contributor to *ARCVoice*



Manly Clericalism?

Alan Holroyd

Vatican II was held in Rome from 1962 to 1965 and its focus was to address the relationship between the Catholic Church and the modern world. In 1968 my young brother and I lived with our parents half-way up the hill in Manly's Darley Road. Things were pretty much unchanged. Further up from our house, there was St Patrick's Seminary on the left, do a 'U-turn' and down the hill a little was the Cardinal's Palace, further down was a sturdy suburban brick house which was the home of the enclosed Benedictine nuns – known then as the Tyburn nuns. Continuing down in the shopping centre of Manly's Corso and its surrounds, is the Catholic Church of St Mary Immaculate and St Athanasius. I look back fondly to those times when I knew nothing at all about clericalism. I was a young Manly man with so much to look forward to, enjoying life surrounded by Catholicity.

The parish priests at Manly were the PP, an aging, feisty, Irish-Australian Monsignor, supported by his curate, a sincerely pragmatic (and tolerant) priest who battled to retain a semblance of independence. In these times I was a young-ish member of the parish SVDP conference and the weekly meetings had an agenda probably set in Paris in 1833 by its founder, the Blessed Frederic Ozanam (1813-1853). However, for the Monsignor, meetings began with five decades of the rosary, himself kneeling at the head of the table on his well-padded chair, while the brothers knelt on the floor, all with rosary beads at hand. After the meeting the lady housekeeper brought in tea and scones. With all of this as the presbytery setting it was unlikely to get young men to join the conference, and so with the steering committee of the Northern Beaches Diocesan SVDP Council, the Manly Young Men's conference was convened – with the curate being the chaplain and meetings held in the parish hall.

One of our practical visitations was to mow the lawns and do the odd gardening jobs at the Tyburn convent up on Darley Road. On roster, two or three of us knocked on the convent door on a Saturday morning, a narrow flap was pulled back and two eyes appeared followed by, 'Oh. good morning boys. The side-gate and the lawnmower shed are open; we'll see you for morning tea in half an hour.' As promised, at about ten-thirty our job was done and a tray of cordial and biscuits appeared from a back hatch adjacent to the convent back door. After we enjoyed

the hospitality we replaced the tray on the shelf. Soon after a voice came through the timber wall: 'Thank you so much boys, and may God bless you. See you next time.'

After ten o'clock mass one Sunday, along with brothers of the Young Men's Conference and my fiancée, we were standing around chatting. From the crowd came two young men who introduced themselves as seminarians from St Pat's, paying a visit to our parish church. We made them welcome and, over a coffee in a local café, my fiancée and I offered to drive them back up to the seminary – which they accepted gladly. On arrival they invited us into the seminary and took us on a short tour, which included going into their second-storey rooms which were side by side along a long corridor. The rooms were simply furnished: a bed, a side table, armchair, desk, bookshelves and a wardrobe with a crucifix and a prayer on the walls. In jest, I congratulated the young seminarian on his bed-making skills, he replied that no, that was the work of the nuns. The windows of the rooms overlooked a lawn and the convent of the nuns who serviced the seminary in terms of the 'domestics', the bed-making, cleaning, washing, ironing and running the kitchen and dining services provided to the priests and the seminarians.

Representing the Young Men's at the quarterly meetings of the Diocesan Council, we met in one of the adjoining parish halls. On this occasion, my fiancée had volunteered to join the ladies who organised the supper, which concluded the meeting. When opening the meeting, the president welcomed the ladies and advised them that there was to be strict silence whilst the meeting was proceeding. This presented the ladies with an impossible challenge, because just beside the meeting hall, separated by a fibro wall, the noises of a boiling urn, rattling cutlery, clattering crockery and ... the hushed and muffled laughter from the generous ladies doing their kitchen duties – and, being careful not to hear any of the strict privacy of the Diocesan Council meeting which was also a challenge to the brothers of the Diocesan Council. Thankfully, the PP of Manly did not attend such meetings.

The social activities for the young Catholics there included a basketball comp for the boys. As it happens, another assistant priest arrived and he was assigned to look after the spiritual and social activities of the Young Men's SVDP. He courageously volunteered to join in with the basketball, and it was soon found that his achievements were in the academic and spiritual pursuits of his priestly vocation and not in the fast

high flying physical game of basketball, with boisterous lads well aware of the teenage girls squealing along the sidelines. (I think that these times were a challenge to the curate's chastity vows.)

Once we were married I was ineligible for membership of the Young Men's and, besides, I was transferred to manage a country store. And it just so happened, about that time, coincidentally, at the ten o'clock mass one Sunday morning, the Monsignor solemnly advised the congregation that he was being moved: 'I'm going to take over Rose Bay.'

My job took us and our young family to the north-western township of Narrabri where our relationship with the church was an enlightening change. The community was smaller and more personal; a young priest had come down from Toowoomba, 'on loan' from the Queensland diocese

there. He did not wear the roman collar, he had a beard, a motorbike, a utility and would insist we not call him 'Father', but 'Please call me Peter'. Peter was a remarkable priest who did have a Jesus-ness about him. I went to some outlying townships with him a couple of times for Sunday mass. His only vestment was the stole and his piety was so genuine that we parishioners soon warmed to the sincerity of his way of walking in the sandals of Jesus of Nazareth. Looking back now, and thinking of clericalism, it never entered my curious and certainly critical mind. In my view, the real challenge for those who follow Jesus – as Catholics, is not so much clericalism but ... patriarchy, that is, not being so manly.

Alan Holroyd is ARCVoice's Illustrator



IN THE CLOSET OF THE VATICAN



POWER,
HOMOSEXUALITY,
HYPOCRISY

Frédéric Martel
ILLUSTRATED BY

In the Closet of the Vatican exposes the rot at the heart of the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Church today.

This brilliant piece of investigative writing is based on four years' authoritative research, including extensive interviews with those in power. The celibacy of priests, the condemnation of the use of contraceptives, the cover-up of countless cases of sexual abuse, the resignation of Benedict XVI, misogyny among the clergy, the dramatic fall in Europe of the number of vocations to the priesthood, the plotting against Pope Francis – all these issues are clouded in mystery and secrecy.

In the Closet of the Vatican is a book that reveals these secrets and penetrates this enigma. It derives from a system founded on a clerical culture of secrecy which starts in junior seminaries and continues right up to the Vatican itself. It is based on the double lives of priests and on extreme homophobia. The resulting schizophrenia in the Church is hard to fathom. But the more a prelate is homophobic, the more likely it is that he is himself gay.

'Behind rigidity there is always something hidden, in many cases a double life.' These are the words of Pope Francis himself and with them the Pope has unlocked the Closet. No one can claim to really understand the Catholic Church today until they have read this book. It reveals a truth that is extraordinary and disturbing.

This book will be reviewed in the next issue of ARCVoice.

Book reviews

Love your Enemies

by Arthur C Brooks

Reviewed by Michael Whelan SM

The sub-title of this book is probably a better guide to its content than the title: *How Decent People Can Save America From the Culture of Contempt**. The author's intent is deeply serious but his style is very readable, often even light-hearted. The author is Arthur C Brooks, former President of the American Enterprise Institute and about to join the faculty of the Kennedy School of Business at Harvard. He has a PhD in policy analysis and has published eleven books. *Love your Enemies* is explicitly about society and politics in the USA. Brooks' major concern is that "we are living in a culture of contempt" and it is polarizing and fragmenting society. The major thrust of the book however is found in a presentation—both practical and philosophical—that believes we can individually and together make a difference. I am reviewing this book because it has much to say about our situation in Australia.

Social scientists define contempt as anger mixed with disgust. These two emotions form a toxic combination, like ammonia mixed with bleach. In the words of the nineteenth-century philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, contempt is 'the unsullied conviction of the worthlessness of another'. Deriving from the Latin word *contemptus*, meaning

'scorn', contempt represents not merely an outburst following a moment of deep frustration with another but rather an enduring attitude of complete disdain" (page 10). The best response to contempt is love. He turns to St Thomas Aquinas: "To love is to will the good of the other" Brooks adds: "The modern philosopher Michael Novak refines this further by adding two words: "To love is to will the good of the other as other. He continues: 'Love is not sentimental, nor restful in illusions, but watchful, alert, and ready to follow evidence. It seeks the real as lungs crave air". The whole of Chapter One is given to an analysis of "The Culture of Contempt". He cites the psychologist John Gottman who has done long-term studies of human relationships. Gottman says he can predict with 94% accuracy whether a couple will divorce within three years: "It is not from the anger that the couples express. The biggest warning signs, he explains, are indicators of *contempt*" (Page 23).

Chapter Four might be the most interesting of the eight Chapters in this book: "How Can I Love My Enemies If They are Immoral?" Brooks offers three practical lessons. Firstly, focus your moral arguments on the moral values we share—compassion and fairness. Secondly, beware of those who use moral disagreements as a wedge. Thirdly, divergent moral values can make us stronger.

It is encouraging to find a popular book, addressing obvious challenges at this time, by inviting us back to the way of the Gospels.

*Arthur C Brooks, *Love Your Enemies: How Decent People Can Save America From the Culture of Contempt*, Harper Paperback, 2019. 400 pages, index and endnotes. Fishpond - \$35.62.

Saving Catholics

A Workbook for Reform and Renewal in the Catholic Church

by Gideon Goosen

Review by Brian Bright

As we move from the first stage of Plenary 2020, 'Listening and Dialogue', to the second stage, 'Listening and Discernment', you will find Gideon Goosen's workbook a very useful resource to reflect upon as we approach Pentecost. It stimulates discussion about thought-provoking topics such as our common priesthood as the baptised, clericalism, power and the reform of governance in a hierarchical church, women's rightful place in a modern church and the concept of *sensus fidelium*. This little gem nicely links our coming Australian synod with the outcomes of Vatican II, and helps us to see the possibilities of church renewal for our times.

Goosen's use of pop-up questions, historical notes and Youtube links make this a user-friendly resource for personal reflection at small group meetings.

Saving Catholics can be purchased from Pauline Books and Media, Sydney
or on-line from Morning Star Publishing

Have your say!

ARC*Voice* is a report of news, opinion and reflection on the renewal and reform currently experienced in the Catholic Church.

Your contributions, letters, articles or comments are most welcome

The opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the Editor or of ARC

Please send material to:

The Editor

ARC*Voice*

Unit 68/28 Curagul Road

NORTH TURRAMURRA NSW 2074

OR (preferably) email:
mknowlden@bigpond.com

Tel: 02 9488 7927

ARC Secretariat

Barbara Brannan 02 9451 7130

barbarabrannan@mac.com

Rob Brian 0438 718 519 robertfbrian@gmail.com

John Buggy (Spokesperson)
0419217543 jbuggy@ozemail.com.au

Rob Butler 03 5989 8496 butlershore2@bigpond.com

Alan Clague 07 3376 3879 clague@aapt.net.au

Margaret Knowlden (Editor) 02 9488 7927
mknowlden@bigpond.com

Peter Meury 0243 884 809 petermeury@bigpond.com

Ron Watts 0415 389 910 claudew1@bigpond.com

Standby Committee

(for special events)

Maureen Brian
Maureen Couch
Norma Piper

ARC Website: www.e-arc.org

Contains all back copies of *ARCVoice*



Annual subscription (from 1 July to 30 June):

\$30 Concession: \$20 for Religious & Pensioners (NOT Seniors)

Renewal [] New Member []

Name

Address

..... Postcode

Telephone (...) Mobile

.....

Fax (....) Email

Subscription \$

Donation (always welcome) \$

TOTAL \$

Would you like to share in the work for ARC in any way? circle: YES / NO

If YES, please let us know what you would want to do.

Payment can be made by cheque, money order, cash or by direct deposit to ARC's Westpac Account BSB 032-089 Account No. 14-7944 (Please identify yourself as the sender)

Send to ARC c/- Rob Brian 28 Lancaster Road, DOVER HEIGHTS, New South Wales 2030
Mobile: 0438 718 519 robertfbrian@gmail.com