



arcvoice

A Report from Australian Reforming Catholics Inc.

September 2020

Issue No. 78

The Heart of the Matter in Church Reform

My fear is that the heart of being church is lost in the tussle over administering the church'. So says Francis Sullivan in his critique of *The Light from the Southern Cross* (See page 2 of this issue). In giving this insight into the report on Church governance, he is echoing what some of us have been saying for quite some time. Extending the participation in decision-making in the Church, while in principle very important in itself, will not bring about the long-needed fundamental reform that has now become critical.

Any concession to participation in governance will not address the power of the bishop which is enshrined in an outdated ecclesiology supported by Canon law. This power enables a bishop to appoint whomever he likes to participate in the important decision-making or to ignore any advice at his discretion. There is next to no chance that this aspect will be changed by the, now delayed, Plenary Council even if that power imbalance is addressed.

What is the heart of the Church that is being lost and how can it be prevented? Thousands of Catholics are giving away the practice of the faith even though they still espouse the values that they see in the life and teachings of Jesus. I doubt very much that many have done this because they couldn't influence the way the Church is governed. Rather, apart from reeling from the many abuse scandals, they have not seen Jesus' values reflected in the way that Church teachings are impacting on their lives. The heart of the Church is found in the way it responds with compassion in understanding how people struggle to deal with implied rejection. Jesus rejected no one.

So many Catholics feel alienated from the Church because of situations they are in, often situations that are extremely difficult, if not impossible, to avoid or through the effects of ignorant discrimination. These situations include being divorced and remarried to

establish stability for children, or using contraception when more children cannot be afforded and to maintain marital harmony, or being in a stable and loving homosexual relationship.

If people in situations like these believe that they are not cut off from the love of God then they should not be barred from the sacramental life of the Church. They should be helped to understand the spirit of its teaching and follow the primacy of their conscience. This is Church teaching. Yet how often do we hear that advice and understanding coming from the pulpit or of it even given privately?

At the recent ARC Annual General Meeting, the members strongly agreed that the bishops of Australia should be questioned about what they are doing to draw people back into the life of the Church by addressing issues like those above. This is their pastoral responsibility and they should be exercising it now. This is the heart of being Church that is lost while the delayed Plenary Council provides a handy excuse for procrastination.

John Buggy

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial ... 1

Francis Sullivan: *The Light from the Southern Cross* ...2-3

Paul Collins: *First Step to a Better Church* ... 4-5

Gideon Goosen: *Latest 'Instruction' from the Vatican, 2020* ... 6-7

John Buggy: *A Reflection on the Presence of Jesus* ... 7-8

Francis Sullivan: *Endemic secrecy in the Catholic Church*:... 8-9

Eric Hodgson: *Reflections on an Ordination Diamond Anniversary* ... 9-10

Reviewed by Franklin Rosenfeldt: Antonio Spadaro: *Pope Francis: My door is always open. A conversation on Faith, Hope and the Church in a Time of Change* ... 10

Alan Clague: *Why was the Lamb of God crucified* ... 11-12

Garry Everett: *The Australian Catholic Church's silent treatment* ..12-13

Drew Porter: *The Readings* ... 14

Noelene Uren: *Let your conscience be your guide* ... 15

Subscription Form, Secretariat, Have your Say

ARC website ... 16

The Light from the Southern Cross

A Report on Catholic Church Governance

Francis Sullivan

The Church culture of the past is still the culture we have today. And that is fundamentally what the Implementation Advisory Group (IAG) had to confront. How to navigate the realpolitik of the Catholic Church. No mean task for a group set up without any institutional clout or effective prominence.

Try writing a report with both hands tied behind your back. That was the task before the Implementation Advisory Group as they set off to deliver a review of the diocesan governance structures called for by the Royal Commission.

Firstly, any review was inevitably going to be hamstrung by the Canon law that prescribes the discerning and determining in the Church procedures and administration. It also entrenches the hierarchical division between clerics and the rest. Some things are regarded as ‘laity-free zones’!

Then came the funding cuts.

And to top it off into the mix was the less-than-subtle passive aggression that comes from some hyper-sensitive conservative prelates through their always eager emissaries.

Away from the public scrutiny of the Royal Commission, the IAG toiled to be taken seriously by segments within the Bishops Conference more animated to ‘move on’ from the scandal than to actually getting down to address the Commission’s findings.

The bishops did set up a committee to assist with the implementation of the Royal Commission’s recommendations. But in reality it was born at a time where the Conference itself was divided in reaction to the Commission and its resolve to respond actively to the recommendations was half-hearted at best. For the game plan had changed.

Now all the strategic and resource efforts were being directed to the Plenary Council, with its promise of repositioning the Church in everyday Australia. Harking back to the scandal was not only ‘old news’ it was also ‘too depressing’ for recently installed bishops and senior officials desperate for some ‘clean air’ in order for the Church to present a

new agenda of ‘abuse free’ evangelisation. So the strategy was obvious—leave the sins of the past in the past.

There is only one problem with this tactic. The Church culture of the past is still the culture we have today. And that is fundamentally what the IAG had to confront: how to navigate the realpolitik of the Catholic Church. No mean task for a group set up without any institutional clout or effective prominence.

I admire the IAG’s determination. Better said, their dedication to our Church. As concerned Catholics they put their shoulders to the wheel to recommend structural and procedural changes that could lead to greater transparency, accountability and participation within the daily operations of the Church at the national, diocesan and parish levels.

And good on them for laying out a plan. Sure it could be more adventurous, even radical, but my sense is that they wanted it to be achievable and in turn a realistic template others could use to assess whether change has happened at all.

We all know that if you pitch high no one gets to hit the ball. The IAG chose to ‘dance with the one you brung’, to encourage change from the realm of the possible so that any ‘we can’t do that’ chorus was bereft of its bugles and cymbals!

The upshot is a pragmatic array of very ‘do-able’ proposals that any diocese anywhere in Australia could implement tomorrow. Bishops don’t need to scurry to Rome for permission. They don’t need to protest that Church teaching is under threat. They don’t even need to question the theological orthodoxy of the report. Frankly they should be relieved. They have before them a way out of the log-jam that finds competent lay women and men locked out of serious decision-making and governance of the institution.

The Report doesn't threaten the ultimate veto power of the bishop, nor does it insist on a revamp of canon law. Rather it zigzags through the entrenched scaffolds of clerical dominance to find avenues where models of shared decision-making can be enacted. Put plainly, the Report seeks to achieve in the short-term what purists dream about forever.

Critics will say that the Report falls too short. Conservatives will wring their hands at the implied loss of episcopal power. In the end, so what! If we are not careful we may well forget that beneath the debate about structures, administrative and procedural arrangements lies a culture of unspoken but well-known behaviours, norms and understandings. In other words, an ingrained 'the way things go around here' code. This culture emphatically places clerics above the rest, privileges entitlement over competency and resists equal participation of women as if warding off the devil! A culture where the understanding of sexuality is still struggling to keep pace with contemporary insights into the nature of the human person. The upshot is alienation and despair for too many baptised Catholics who nevertheless seek a sense of belonging and meaning making in their Church.

If this report is to morph into the now postponed Plenary Council process, what hope can ordinary Catholics hold? My fear is that the heart of being church is lost in the tussle over administering the church.

If nothing else the Royal Commission laid bare the hypocrisy of clerics and vowed religious as they systematically denied and then covered up the sexual abuse of children. Whether they realised it or not their very actions corroded the meaning of being a

church and the essence of religious life for many everyday Catholics. Sadly the drop off in Church attendance in all age groups over the course of the Royal Commission speaks volumes.

So what is at heart here is literally the heart of the Church. Affiliation to the institution, even to the conventional practices of Catholicism have lost their appeal. Yes, more democratic and representational structures and procedures will help. But a more relevant and nourishing spiritual experience is imperative. And the two do go together.

Faith communities should reflect the make-up and aspirations of their members as they seek to transcend that which weighs them down and be more attentive to what lightens the course of their daily lives. The less barriers there are to lay participation in the life and determinations of those communities the better they will reflect the unfolding understanding of God in their lives. In real terms that means the participation of lay people in the development and communication of Church teachings and social policies. There is no other way for the Church to be relevant for the existential circumstances of contemporary people.

These days call us, as Karl Rahner SJ said, to be a mystical church, less focussed on the institution and more attuned to the movements of the Spirit. My humble hope is that this Report can set us on a path where we can meet the Spirit anew, forge a pathway together and claim a lifestyle that gives credit to the Gospel that so eagerly stirs our imaginations and desires for love, goodness and truth.

FRANCIS SULLIVAN AO is Chair of the Mater Group and the former CEO of the Truth Justice and Healing Council.. He lives in Canberra and writes on Catholic Church affairs.

Letter to the Editor

I have just finished reading this *ARCVoice* 77. As always, it was packed full of excellent articles. I loved Kerry Gonzales's contribution, I suppose mainly because I agree so wholeheartedly with her, but also because she is an older woman who, like so many of us, 'in the autumn of our years', doesn't really care any more about whether or not the Church can change. Along with her, like Henry Lawson's *The Drover's Wife*, 'I am past carin'. And isn't that sad? At a time of our lives when we could do with some relevant spiritual support it just isn't there. I find myself envying those who are still so wholehearted in their Catholic beliefs but I cannot join them.

A friend who is a contributor to *ARCVoice* asked me to re-read the final paragraph from Bishop Long about the church rising from the ashes, 'especially through the lay faithful and women'. He pointed out that it reads as if women were not part of the lay faithful. I wonder if the Bishop does see the lay faithful as male and women as a separate group?

Noelene Uren

First Step to a Better Church

Paul Collins

I must admit up-front that I'm not a fan of committee reports. They're usually pedestrian and repetitious, even at the best of times. So, to be honest, I didn't approach the 200-page Governance Review Project Team (GRPT) report *The Light from the Southern Cross* with much enthusiasm.

The origin of the report is the Royal Commission on Child Sexual Abuse where the commissioners called for the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference (ACBC) to 'conduct a national review of the governance and management structures of dioceses and parishes, including in relation to issues of transparency, accountability, consultation and the participation of lay men and women'.

This task eventually landed in the lap of the GRPT with seven members and four international advisors. All are distinguished and generous Catholics, mainly laypeople, and they had to work within a tight time-frame and very limited terms of reference which focused on governance. My criticisms are not of them, but of the ACBC's failure to allow them to explore deeper ecclesiological issues.

The report gets off to a good start with a quirky quotation from Henry Lawson and an introduction that is based on sound theology, particularly on John Henry Newman's comment that 'Here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often'. They also quote Pope Francis' commentary: '[Newman] is not speaking here about changing for change's sake, or following every new fashion, but rather about the conviction that development and growth are a normal part of human life.' Francis says that change involves interior conversion, yet 'often we approach change as if it were a matter of simply putting on new clothes'. That is window-dressing without interior change.

While the report says that it 'is not seeking to remake the Church in the image of corporate or civil entities,' but only 'to identify existing good practice in the Catholic Church in Australia', there are four modern governance buzz words, originally suggested by the Royal Commission, that regularly recur:

Transparency Accountability
Consultation Participation

Clearly, it would be excellent if the hierarchy and institutional church adopted these standards as embedded working norms, but the problem is that these words are derived from the processes of modern democracy, when the church is neither modern, nor democratic. It is a baroque, seventeenth century absolutist structure with the pope as universal ruler and each bishop a tin-pot king in his own domain.

The report assumes that these governance principles can be grafted onto this absolutist system. I don't think they can, because the core problem here is ecclesiological. I don't blame the GRPT for not addressing this; it was not in their remit. But the reality is that root and branch reform will not occur until the absolutist model is jettisoned.

Fortunately, Vatican Council II has already given us an alternative model. The Council's primary document, *Lumen gentium* (chapters 1-2) develops dynamic images of the church as a community, the people of God on pilgrimage, drawn together by God's Spirit and gifted to minister in the church and as representatives of Christ in the world. The emphasis in these chapters is on the community, not the hierarchy. This model primarily envisages a church that is built-up from below with a leadership emerging from the community. In this context 'transparency', 'accountability', 'consultation' and 'participation' could operate successfully. As Jesus says 'No one puts new wine into old wineskins. New wine, fresh wineskins' (Matthew 9:17).

The report's theological overview doesn't help much here. It tries to cover too much territory and, while the people of God are mentioned, when focusing on bishops it makes the surprising statement: 'In many ways, the diocesan bishop was central to the ecclesiology of Vatican II.' Perhaps that's true in an absolutist ecclesiology, but certainly not in a people-of-God understanding of the church, which is the direction in which we should have been heading all along since Vatican II.

It's hard to believe, but here we are, fifty-five years after the Council and we are still haven't integrated it's primary ecclesiology of the people of God into church structure. It shows you how effective the reactionaries have been, especially with the support of John Paul II and Benedict XVI and the bishops they appointed.

The guts of the report are in the summary of recommendations (paragraph 2.7). This is where

you'll find some suggestions that might have upset more precious bishops and clerics, but which, in fact, are so anodyne that they'll leave more hopeful Catholics disappointed.

Regarding the appointment of bishops, the report recommends that 'the processes and procedures leading to the appointment of bishops by the pope be explained to the public'; that there be prior consultation, including analysing the needs of the diocese; that there be 'a wider consultation process leading to the creation of a terna (list of three potential bishops' names), which should embrace genuine discernment that includes clergy and a larger number of lay people than is currently the case.' This is little different from what already happens. Everything, including transparency, depends on the decision of the pope and the papal nuncio. And why does the pope have a pivotal role? After all, bishops have only been appointed by Rome since the mid-nineteenth century. Before that they were appointed or elected locally.

There are no laid-down processes in the report that ensure that the people of God have agency and genuine input, let alone participating in some form of electing or appointing the bishop, and no specific processes to ensure that the nuncio and bishops involved engage in genuine consultation and dialogue.

The report sets out detailed recommendations for the establishment of diocesan pastoral councils, diocesan finance councils and for holding diocesan synods. It emphasizes the importance of lay review of diocesan expenditure and budgets. But there is no suggestion that members of these councils be freely elected by the faithful. They are appointed by the bishop.

It also asks the ACBC to ask Rome to legislate that 'the diocesan bishop will consult with the diocesan pastoral council and the council of priests before he makes particular law'. Here we are still asking the bishop to consult. We are still working from the absolutist model.

There are also calls for the inclusion of laity, particularly women, to appointments on diocesan decision-making bodies and agencies. One area where this is applied is in the selection and formation of candidates for the priesthood. Here, the report says, laity, particularly women, should play a decisive role in the selection, formation and training of candidates and deciding their suitability

for ordination. This is a particularly good move and would at least minimise the number of quite unsuitable candidates presently being ordained.

There is a recognition of the need for leadership training and a recommendation that the church set up a national centre for Catholic leadership and governance. One would hope that those selected for the episcopate would have to undergo such leadership training before episcopal ordination. There is also a call for 'the operations of the ACBC be made more accountable, inclusive and transparent through an expansion of its advisory membership, staffing and public communication of non-confidential agendas, internal reports and major decisions.'

The report admits that clericalism is still widespread in the church. Pope Francis has described clericalism as 'a really awful thing' and a 'perversion of the church'. The report admits that a 'culture of clericalism is inimical to a more collaborative, transparent and accountable system of governance' and that 'ways to combat the personalisation of decision-making power in a bishop and the dismantling of clericalism are primary focuses of this report and that many of the recommendations' attempt to address this.

There is much more in the report. There is rich material in the sixty pages of appendices, especially in the statistical and descriptive summary of dioceses, parishes, church authorities and pastoral ministries.

But truth be told, I found the report disappointing. Perhaps that's because my expectations were unrealistic, and I can't blame the GRPT for not doing something they were not asked to do. But they have still taken a first step towards a renewed church.

However, until all of us Catholics face up to the reality that nothing substantial will change in the church until we place the new wine of the people of God on pilgrimage into the new wineskins of a church built up from the community of baptised faithful, we'll just be applying band-aids.

This article was published on *Pearls & Irritations*

3 June 2020

Latest 'Instruction' from the Vatican, 2020

Gideon Goosen

This document (*The pastoral conversion of the Parish community in the service of the evangelising mission of the Church, 2020*) comes from the Congregation for Clergy, not the *Dicastery for Laity, Family and Life* – which might explain the tone of the second part of the document. I have always wondered how difficult it is to write a document that is relevant to various contexts throughout the universal Catholic Church. Yet the Curia try. This document ends up being a strong supporter of clericalism and the *status quo*.

The first part tries hard to incorporate what Pope Francis has said about the priority of the evangelising mission of the church and mentions many important topics like inclusiveness, the changing parish context, service to the community, and the importance of leaders to bring about a 'harmonious synthesis of charism and vocations at the service of proclamation of the Gospel' (#1).

In spite of this fine introduction the document ultimately sticks with the monarchical model of the parish priest being King of the Castle. He decides, he is the leader, no 'Team leader' approach. It even tells us what nomenclature are not allowed for people other than the clergy, who minister in the parish (#96). The neurosis of the Curia on this matter is as clear here as it was with the 1997 Instruction (*Instruction on certain questions regarding the collaboration of the non-ordained faithful in the sacred ministry of priests*). A parish council remains 'only consultative'. A fence is drawn around different ministries. This document serves as a protection for clericalism and the old monarchical model of the parish priest. Unless Canon Law is changed the vision of a re-invigorated church will remain a dream for the progressives and a nightmare for the traditionalists.

Like the 1997 document on curbing the aspirations of the laity to be involved in church life, this one reminds the laity what they cannot do.

The *Light from the Southern Cross (the report to the ACBC in response to the sexual abuse scandals)* embraces and promotes great values like transparency, accountability, co-responsibility, inclusiveness, promoting women in the church, and sharing

decision-making. However, this latest Vatican *Instruction*, by endorsing the monarchical model of governance regarding the power of the parish priest makes the implementation of the above values impossible. It also ignores the sexual abuse scandal and the urgent need for checks and balances. Business will be as usual.

There is one loophole. The above document does talk about 'pastorally problematic circumstances' (#87), meaning where there is a shortage of priests. This is Pope Francis' point re the Amazon region (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, *Querida Amazonia, 2020*). If there are too few priests we must therefore appoint lay folk where possible to do various jobs previously done by the pastor. (In many African countries for example, the local catechist has for a long time played a significant role in the local community.)

The idea that the tasks of the ordained have been fixed and remained unchanged for 2000 years must be rejected. For example, it is ridiculous to appoint an ordained person who has zero training in finance and administration to preside over the parish finance council which only has a 'consultative' voice. In all ministries competencies should be more important than status. I think the person who takes care of a parish without a pastor should be someone who has the skills to do so, not necessarily a deacon (#90). Likewise preaching was not always the task of the ordained. I suggest a preacher must have the necessary competencies in understanding the bible and in communication, rather than simply be ordained.

Perhaps some Vatican bureaucrats and conservatives in general, not willing to see that the world and their church has changed, will tolerate the 'except in extremes cases' approach thinking that is the end of the conversation.

Do you remember the 'special/extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist'? They were exceptions. Now they are the norm in the local church although some *Opus Dei* adherents in my parish use this argument to justify only receiving communion from a pastor not from a 'special minister of the Eucharist'. Do you remember women not being allowed in the sanctuary? and altar girls not being allowed to serve around the altar?

The critical issues for me are the governance issues of having checks and balances around the power of the bishops and pastors. If we get this right, other reforms are possible. Get this wrong, and it will be business as usual in spite of flowery

language in official documents. The 2020 *Instruction* does not put any checks and balances in place. The document *Light from the Southern Cross* makes some good suggestions but does not go far enough. Let me give one example: it recommends parish councils but fails to say they must be constituted by members elected by the parish. If not elected, councils will be rubber stamps. The councils must be mandatory. Otherwise we are all wasting our time.

The above document is actually instructing us not to change, or to put it another way: it is encouraging us to give priority to the evangelising mission of the church but is not prepared to change critical structures which would make it possible.

GIDEON GOOSEN is a Sydney theologian and now a member of the ARC Secretariat. His latest book which is ideal for parish use is entitled, *Clericalism: STORIES FROM THE PEW A Workbook for Parishes* to be published soon by Coventry Press, Melbourne.

A Reflection on the Presence of Jesus

John Buggy

As Churches have been closed during periods of the COVID-19 virus lockdowns, some Catholics have joined with others via video-conferencing and developed their own liturgies. They have held up bread and wine and remembered the words of Jesus at his last supper as a way of connecting with their fellow believers since their usual Sunday Mass and Eucharist has not been available for them. Then some ask the question: 'Is Jesus really present in this?'

Let me begin by saying that we need to stop to consider the word 'reality'. We say that God is love. Love is a reality but it is a reality that is hard to define. We use the word 'true love' but how do we define 'true'? So it is, I think, with 'real presence'.

Is not Jesus recorded as saying: 'When two or three are gathered together in My name, I am there in the midst of them.' (Matthew 18:20)?

I remember how for many years we used to go away for weekends with other families who went to our church. Being all in one large house, the kitchen on the Sunday morning was a joyful and chaotic scene: food being prepared and shared generously in all directions, care and assistance being given to one another's children, open-hearted conversation that kept everyone willingly in a crowded space. No one in a hurry to close off on the experience. It had a spiritual dimension that overcame the formalities of engagement that might be expected.

They would all gather again, an hour or two later, to sing and pray a liturgy that someone had prepared. Consecrated hosts were brought from the church and distributed during that liturgy. If questioned, I think that most would have thought that Jesus was only 'truly present' in the hosts that they consumed. But wasn't he truly present in both of their gatherings? Vatican II declares that Jesus is present in the people gathered at Mass, in the priest, when the scriptures are read, and in the Eucharist—all modes of his presence.

Are we going to believe that the early Christians had no Eucharistic celebration until someone came up with special words to say, and that these words had to be said by someone with special powers that have come to be attributed to priests only? While there are many instances in the New Testament writings of dedicated persons being sent out to communities to spread and reaffirm Christ's teaching, there is no indication that the Eucharist was restricted to occasions when they were present.

In the writings of the early fathers there are no special words used to express a conversion of bread and wine into Christ's body and blood. In the Eastern Church it comes about through the whole Eucharistic Prayer (*Anaphora*). For my thesis as part of my Licentiate in Theology I studied one of the bishops of the fourth century, Macarius of Magnesia, and read some his writings in the original Greek. He is significant in that he spoke a lot about the Eucharist and that Jesus is 'really present' but not about how that happened.

There is a well-worn expression in the Church—*lex orandi, lex credendi*—suggesting that the way the Church expresses itself in worship shapes what it believes. The doctrine of transubstantiation, based on Aristotle's philosophy of substance and accidents, has tended to lead us towards imagining the real presence as something that is material.

Some of us would remember when you could only receive communion on your tongue and to touch a consecrated host was out of the question. The priest had to say the exact words of consecration for fear of his action being invalid. The priest had to keep his fingers held tight after the consecration lest any small particle be unknowingly dropped. As people lined up kneeling along altar rails, an altar boy held a shiny golden plate under each person's chin in case a wafer was dropped as the priest placed it on the communicant's tongue. If any crumb fell to the floor, it had to be carefully wiped up with special cloths that could only be washed later by the priest himself or by certain nuns who were given permission to do so.

All this came from a 'material' understanding of the Eucharist. Tabernacles and sanctuary lamps were the focal points of churches and dominated the understanding of the presence of Christ. How differently the understanding of the Eucharist might have developed if the early church fathers had embraced the concepts of a different philosopher, for example, Plato, instead of Aristotle's view of the natural world.

In some ways we have moved away from practices that imply a materialistic notion of 'real presence'. Tabernacle moved to a side altar; communion placed in the hand; the priest no longer holding fingers together; lay people giving out communion. But seldom do we have it preached that Jesus is present 'in a sacramental way', the actual Church teaching. The change in practice happened because the Church has now placed the

focus at Mass on the presence of Jesus coming into the gathering of the people in addition to his presence through the reading of the scriptures and the Eucharistic prayer. A number of theologians like Edward Schillebeeckx, Piet Schoonenberg, Charles Davis and others have attempted to move the understanding forward that would be consistent with the practice. They outlined concepts like 'functionalisation', 'transfinalisation', and particularly 'transsignification'. For example, a coloured cloth is purely decorative, but if a government decides to raise it to the level of a national flag, then that same cloth is really and objectively no longer the same.

Through this notion we can see that if a mouse were to nibble on a host that was dropped and unnoticed, there is really no need to be overly concerned. Christ's real presence in the Eucharist takes place in the reciprocal encounter between Jesus and ourselves. It is on this basis that we can say that Jesus is 'really present' with us when we commemorate his action at the last supper or in the account of his breaking bread on the way to Emmaus. The Church has some way to go yet, it seems, in bringing together the theology and the practice so that people are enabled to fully celebrate the life-giving gift of the real presence.

'Sacrament' is about 'relationship'. The sacrament is a sign of the encounter with Jesus in which his grace flows to us. Just, as is emphasised in Vatican II, that revelation is ongoing, perhaps there is much more to be developed and ongoing if we are to fully understand the ways in which the encounter with Jesus can take place. □

Newly Elected Secretariat

At the ARC Annual General Meeting on 12th September, the members elected and reconfirmed an expanded Secretariat. The eleven members are listed on the back page of this issue.

We extend a special thanks to **Barbara Brannan** who has retired from the Secretariat after serving ARC since 2004. In addition, her catering skills at our gatherings are legendary.

We also wish to remember fondly **Dr. Ron Watts** who died of a heart attack in August and acknowledge with much thanks his thoughtful contribution on the Secretariat.

Reflections on an Ordination Diamond Anniversary

The more reflective component of the Church is crying out for imaginative leadership on the ministry crisis and institutional re-organisation

Eric Hodgson

Ordained in 1960 my major anniversaries synced with the decades. I published a Golden Anniversary Reflection in 2010. It characterised the decades as:

- The awakening 60s
- The exciting 70s
- The suspicious 80s
- The depressing 90s and
- The imploding Noughties.

Ten years later we have added:

- The Counter-intuitive Teens

This decade has been notable for unexpected disruptions and reversals both good and bad but all remarkable.

First there was the election of Pope Francis. This brought a reversal of the 45 years of Restorationist policy under John Paul II and Benedict. Francis brought a pastoral mind and style of conversation which broke the formal kabuki-style image of the papacy. People heard the Jesus message in story and image as Jesus told it. Francis wanted to replace a self-referential church with one that looked outward and dealt with reality as it is. His vision was to replace a juridical institution with a pastoral community of service. His way to get there was synodal—with everyone equally walking The Way together.

This disrupted the whole Roman administration and the episcopacy around the world. They were the pope's Pretorian guard—but now, the pope wanted them to change tack.

Some were delighted. More were alarmed. The culture wars had been going on for decades, but now the leaders of the right swung into action with passive and overt resistance. Francis, though less familiar with Vatican politics, was the experienced veteran of South American intrigue.

He skilfully made progress against opposing winds and gradually built up his own team. The opposition continues but Francis, following his own mantras, is still ahead.

After years in pastoral leadership and administration, he had developed four rules of thumb:

- Unity is more important than conflict
- The whole is more important than the part
- Time is more important than space—gently, gently
- Reality is more important than the idea

He is not an ideologue. Pastoral experience has softened rigidity and dogmatism. He has no time for the hard right, or for the hard left. Reality is more important than the idea. Restorationism is over.

A second reversal grew out of the long-simmering problem of child abuse by clergy and religious institutions. Priests and religious had been criminally abusing children and the Church institution had doggedly covered it up. That was old news, but this was the decade secular society decided the Church could not be trusted to clean itself up. Australia, Ireland and the USA were in the forefront.

It was the secular state that was calling the Church to account. Post-enlightenment democracies paid greater respect to transparency and accountability than the Church. They, rightly, won the high moral ground. The Church was shamed and its hierarchy de-authorised. Who can forget the picture of four bishops answering to the Royal Commission – all speechless bar one?

Who can forget Chile's Fernando Karadima? Or Mexico's Marciel Marcial? Or the film *Spotlight* and the *Boston Globe's* expose of church corruption?

Who can forget one cardinal being defrocked while another cardinal became prisoner in the dock? Twelve well-instructed jurors were convinced he was guilty beyond reasonable doubt. The final appeal court judged that they should have had some doubt. But would those jurors be any the less convinced by that finding?

Rank and file Catholics reacted variously. Some left in disgust, others organised reform groups, others joined proxy resistance causes such as same-

sex marriage. Catholics started to have second thoughts about the Church during the baby boomer revolution starting in the 60s. Paul VI's condemnation of contraception in 1968 was a turning point. It began the de-authorisation of papal and episcopal leadership.

John Paul II's insistence on conformity to his hard line—specially on sexuality—deepened the divide and set up the culture wars that persist today.

Rejection of papal teaching showed in dropping Mass attendance. The next step was disaffiliation, which went on relentlessly during the teens decade as attested by census data.

The arrival of growing secularisation has made disaffiliation easy. Society in general is more relaxed and many formerly strictly observed 'principles' look more like Victorian prissiness. Mere habits were often disguised as values.

Finally, the decade has ended with the disruption of a fearsome pandemic. Social distancing plays havoc with communal institutions. Participation patterns are fractured. Will they ever return? Some will, many won't. It may not be the end, but the threat is there.

Meanwhile, as Francis confidently gives the lead, bishops are not to be seen. Synodality energises the pope but seems to hold no attraction for most bishops. Episcopal conferences appear limp when everyone knows they are divided and lack decisive leadership. They are not entirely to blame because conformity, not creative imagination, was a condition of episcopal selection under the Wojtyla/Ratzinger regime.

The more reflective component of the Church is crying out for imaginative leadership on the ministry crisis and institutional re-organisation. But episcopal conferences seem paralysed. No imagination limits freedom to move. Pastors tend to service their flock as best they can with depleted numbers in constricted circumstances.

Some stalwart and sophisticated laity maintain hope because of their love of the community that believes and hopes in Jesus of Nazareth and the loving and merciful God whom Jesus calls 'Father'. What shape will the phoenix rising from these ashes take in the coming Twenties?

ERIC HODGENS is a theologian and senior priest of the Catholic Archdiocese of Melbourne (Australia). This article was published in *La Croix International* on 4.8.2020

Book Review

Antonio Spadaro: *Pope Francis: My door is always open. A conversation on Faith, Hope and the Church in a Time of Change*

Reviewed by Franklin Rosenfeldt

I have just finished reading this delightful little book which is a record of a series of three extended interviews with Pope Francis by Antonio Spadaro, held over several days in the summer of 2013. In six chapters the book covers the life history of Francis, his Jesuit background and his views on various matters including optimism, spirituality and church history. Francis comes over as a humble man of high intellect and wide education and one with an interest in the arts and music; not unlike the delightful character we got to know in the movie, *The Two Popes*.

What I found particularly interesting was the chapter on his prayer life. Every morning Francis reads the priests' breviary, the Psalms and then celebrates Mass. He also prays the Rosary, but what he really likes is his 'adoration in the evening' where he spends an hour between seven and eight o'clock in front of the Blessed Sacrament in adoration and sometimes falls asleep praying. Such silent worship has been part of his life for a long time. Francis comes across as a very prayerful person.

This book is an easy read and helps us get to know more about the leader of the largest religious group in the world, the Roman Catholic Church.

FRANK ROSENFELDT is a coordinator of Inclusive Catholics, one of the Church reform groups that is affiliated with ACCCR.

Why was the Lamb of God crucified?

Alan Clague

The earliest civilisations were characterised by aggression and exploitation—warfare, racism, slavery, patriarchy and gender inequality. The powerful lorded it over the powerless. Humanity was clearly flawed, and the Biblical writers attributed this to the sin of the mythical Adam and Eve which placed humanity under the dominion of the devil. Jesus presented a different model of human behaviour—all people should love the rest of humanity as they loved themselves, and exploitation of the weak was evil. Paul emphasised the primacy of love, and specifically endorsed racial and gender equality. The Christian movement believed a ‘paradigm shift’ had occurred, initiated by the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. The ‘kingdom of God’ had arrived, and the world was no longer ruled by Satan. Yet Jesus did not promise a radical change in society by his establishment of the kingdom. He said ‘The kingdom of God is not coming with things that can be observed’ (Luke 17:20).

The writers of the New Testament gave particular emphasis to Jesus’ death as a main driving force of this change. John the Baptist called Jesus the ‘lamb of God’, and Paul made this more specific when he wrote ‘For our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed’ (1Cor 5:7). Hebrews contrasts the requirement for repeated sacrifice in the Old Testament with Jesus’ unique sacrifice: ‘Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sin’ (Heb 9:22). It says of Jesus: ‘He has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself’ (Heb 9:26).

The issue of Jesus’ sacrifice, usually referred to as the ‘atonement’, became central to Christian theology. Its interpretation revolved largely around the meaning of two Greek words, ‘hilasmos’, translated as ‘propitiation’ or ‘expiation’ and ‘katallagee’ translated as ‘reconciliation’ or in older translations ‘atonement’, but their meaning was interpreted differently over the centuries. Interpretation was not helped by the use of ‘kingdom of God’ not only as the internal changes within individuals which Jesus announced, but also

the eschatological kingdom of God where God reigned as an omnipotent king. Analysis by theologians was coloured by their understanding of kingship and their interpretation of Scripture, particularly the sin of Adam and Eve, which was accepted as placing humanity under control of Satan. In today’s world, we know Adam and Eve never existed, and our omnipotent kings have been disempowered, so the bases of some interpretations have lost some relevance.

As conditions in the Christian world changed, different interpretations of the meaning of Jesus’ sacrificial death were proposed. An early interpretation, usually referred to as the ‘recapitulation theory’, was proposed by St Irenaeus in the second century. Jesus, as the new Adam, recapitulates Adam’s life, but unlike Adam, is obedient, not disobedient, and so resets humanity’s history. Another very early interpretation was that Jesus’ death served as an inspiration to Christians to follow the life of unselfish love that he lived and taught. Augustine and many others subsequently also supported this ‘moral influence’ interpretation of Jesus’ life, death and resurrection. Another early interpretation was the ransom theory, more recently called the ‘Christus Victor’ theory. This held that humanity was controlled by the devil following the Fall, but Jesus ransomed himself to the devil, thereby freeing humanity, allowed the devil to kill him, but then was victorious over the devil by his resurrection.

In the eleventh century, St Anselm wrote *‘Cur Deus Homo?’* (Why was God human?), a major treatise proposing a new, different approach. He proposed that humanity’s sinfulness demanded satisfaction be paid to God. But satisfaction to God could only be adequate if made by a divine person, hence the divine second person of the trinity, Jesus, had to become human and be sacrificed. This interpretation, termed the ‘penal substitution’ model, achieved great popularity from that time onward, although modified subsequently by theologians such as St Thomas Aquinas. What is often forgotten, although made explicit in the text, is that it was written primarily in an attempt to refute a theological attack on Christianity by Islamic scholars (‘infidels’ in the text), who claimed that an omnipotent God could never lower himself to become human, so that Christianity was based on a lie.

The primary purpose of this article was not simply to review the various approaches to an aspect of Christian theology, but to draw attention

to the fact that the various environments of different ages have led to the popularisation of different religious theories. When everyone believed their lives were manipulated by malevolent spirits, the devil figured prominently. When the concept of Adam and Eve initiating sin was an accepted physical reality, Jesus as the new Adam was invoked. When monarchical political systems predominated, God as the omnipotent king who demanded satisfaction for wrongdoing was proposed. The Church today lives at ease with these various theologies, some of which are mutually exclusive, even though the world no longer accepts the bases of their arguments. However, there is strong Church resistance to accepting other areas of difference that have become prominent in recent times.

Biblical interpretation has been manipulated to exclude women from the priesthood. Paul's initial statement of gender equality was subverted within 40 years of his death in some later, non-Pauline epistles to conform with patriarchal Greek society. Worldwide legal suppression of women continued until very recently, and is still present in the Catholic Church. This suppression is completely at odds with contemporary Australian gender equality. If gender equality is still not feasible in other parts of the Catholic Church, this is no reason to inflict this rule

on the Australian Church. Let it be like the allowable variable rationale of Christ's sacrifice.

Mandatory celibacy was imposed on the priesthood a thousand years ago, and change of this has been stubbornly resisted, even though there is a critical shortage of priests in Australia. Eastern rite Catholics and Orthodox Christians allow married priests. Married Anglican priests are ordained in the Catholic Church. There is a suspicion that celibacy was a factor in the sexual crimes of the clergy, recently revealed as a major scandal. Once again, we are dealing with a topic having a diversity of opinion within Catholicism. Once again, let us allow diversity for those countries that wish to allow married priests.

These are issues that will probably receive little or no consideration at the forthcoming Australian Plenary Council, yet they are ones where Australian Catholics have clearly expressed disagreement with current Church policy. The extent to which these are considered at the Plenary Council will indicate the seriousness with which the Bishops of Australia accept the *sensus fidelium* of Australian Catholics.

ALAN CLAGUE is a member
of the ARC Secretariat

The Australian Catholic Church's silent treatment

Garry Everett

Changing the culture of the church should be the major task for the Australian Bishops. After all, the first and only independent assessment of that culture, by the Royal Commission into the sexual abuse of minors, described the culture as 'toxic'.

'At best, the silent treatment is an immature behaviour used by spoilt brats and manipulative individuals. At worst, it is a weapon used by abusers to punish their victims.' (www.healthline.com)

In the world of human relationships, we were fond of the saying: 'Silence is golden'. It

purportedly indicated a certain form of wisdom, but we were never sure because the silence was deafening, and communication had ceased. Nothing much has changed. Recently in Victoria, the health minister Jenny Mikakos refused to answer any questions about COVID-19, and the Prime Minister declined to comment on the unusual outbursts of federal back-bencher Craig Kelly.

In a different context, leaders in the Catholic Church in Australia also employed the same tactics. I recently wrote to three Bishops on the matter of the relationship between the toxic culture of the Church and the outcomes of the plenary Council meeting next year. No Bishop replied, and only one secretary (a woman), acknowledged receipt of my letter. From discussions with other Church members, I have discovered that 'the silent treatment' is almost the default response.

Is it either a case of immaturity or punishment? Could it be both immaturity and punishment? Or

are there other explanations? One possible alternative explanation is that the silent treatment is a behaviour that others have allowed to flourish. By not having the behaviour named, or called out, the perpetrator assumes that his or her silence is acceptable. This should raise the question: ‘Why is it so?’

Part of the answer lies in our understanding of how the prevailing culture works. Culture is a complex concept and a term not subject to simple definition. As a reality, the culture of any organisation is subtle, powerful and all pervasive. Its capacity to influence thoughts, feelings and behaviours is often un-recognised, un-appreciated and un-challenged. In fact it is this ‘everydayness’, something akin to the autonomic systems of the body that keep us alive without our being conscious of them, that gives culture its power. Once a behaviour or value becomes part of the culture, it is almost irremovable.

In most democracies, there are usually two or more political parties vying for control. This oppositional model is healthy because it allows the prevailing culture and all its manifestations to be subject to regular and searching scrutiny.

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, claims to be a divinely ordained hierarchy, with no place for opposition. Recently, the Vatican issued an instruction that the term ‘leadership team’ was not to be used when describing leadership at a parish level. The parish priest is the only genuine leader. He does not share leadership. The Second Vatican Council (1962-65) advocated the establishment of parish councils, but they were advisory only. The priest alone has power of veto.

In this hierarchical model, all power is reserved to priests (all Bishops are priests). In this model, there is very little opportunity to expose or critique the operating culture. If ‘the silent treatment’ is part of the culture, then the culture will reinforce that particular manifestation. Breton and Largent, in their book *The Paradigm Conspiracy*, carefully explain how the role of any prevailing paradigm is to protect the paradigm from change.

Changing the culture of the church should be the major task for the Australian Bishops. After all, the first and only independent assessment of that culture, by the Royal Commission into the sexual

abuse of minors, described the culture as ‘toxic’. Some aspects that claimed attention were lack of inclusion and participation by lay people, lack of accountability and lack of transparency. But these factors stem from a deeper culture of power, privilege and sense of entitlement, which are not often spoken about.

It is interesting to note that the Plenary Council processes to date have not included specific input from cultural anthropologists. Nor are any such scholars included in the list of delegates to next year’s meeting of the Council. One wonders how the decision-makers, the Bishops, will manage to address the whole question of changing the culture if they are not open to discussing the problem adequately, nor have at their disposal some experts to guide them. Hopefully, the bishops will not focus on superficial changes which will not survive in a culture inimical to those changes.

One measure of the strength of the Catholic Church (and of its culture) is attendance at Mass on a weekend. This attendance measure is not a participation nor satisfaction measure.

Since 1950 when the attendance rate was approximately 55%, it has steadily declined to about 10% in 2016. This statistic alone should be sufficient stimulus for the Bishops to act. If they were managing directors of a company with such results, they probably would have been sacked by now. No Bishop has been able to reverse this downwards trend in participation. Will the Plenary Council? Its agenda is in the hands of the bishops, and attempts to access or influence the agenda have been met by the silent treatment.

The Catholic Church in Australia has not only lost participants, but has also lost most of its credibility, public trust and influence on social matters. These are cultural problems, and if the Council of 2021 does not address the need for deep cultural change, then the surrounding silence emanating from that failure will deafen all ears to everything else.

GARRY EVERETT was part of the writing team that produced the document on the theme *Open to Conversion, Renewal and Reform* for the Plenary Council. He strongly criticised it and holds an individual dissenting opinion.

This article was published on *Pearls and Irritations* on 14.8.20.

The Readings

Drew Porter

I wonder whether there is a need for Readings at Mass at all. Are they really appropriate today? The wording is mostly archaic, verbose, misogynous and, in some cases, offensive.

So what could replace the Readings? Well there is a wide range of material to choose from, that is relevant, contemporary and thought-provoking. May I suggest a few of the following:

Recommendation 1:

Happiness is An Inside Job: John Powell SJ discloses 10 best practices for happiness. A larger world and fuller life await you. But you have to grow into it by stretching.

1. We must accept ourselves as we are
2. We must accept full responsibility for our lives
3. We must try to fulfil our needs for relaxation, exercise and nourishment
4. We must make our lives an act of love
5. We must stretch by stepping out of our comfort zones
6. We must learn to be 'good finders'
7. We must seek growth, not perfection
8. We must learn to communicate effectively
9. We must learn to enjoy the good things in life
10. We must make prayer a part of our daily lives.

My Assumption: Happiness is a natural condition. Practices 1-10 are then further explored, explained, and elaborated in a detailed summary/overview. Again with 10 profound messages to address each practice, to finally challenge ourselves.

Recommendation 2:

Winning With Wisdom: Clive H. Porter leads the way on how to make better informed decisions. To grow in wisdom is the challenge for everyone each day.

So here is a daily program for 365 days of the year (step by step) to enrich their lives. Simply through the *Reading, Reflection and Resolution*—a call to action!

- 1:1 Reading the 'Wisdom Quotation of the Day';
- 1:2 Reflecting and Discerning on what this wisdom quote means to me the reader;
- 1:3 Resolving to do something related to the wisdom statement. The action needs to demonstrate the value of one's discernment.

This is a collection of observations and quotes by some of the world's best known thinkers, and characters past and present. Covering corporate, government, pastoral, military and academic leaders. Just some of the themes included are: *Discipline, life, value, choices, persistence, goodwill, living in the moment, visual value, habits, targeting, clarity in action, strategic thinking and enthusiasm.*

Each of the 365 days in the book *Winning With Wisdom* has a different theme/heading. So WISE IN TIME is the one for 13 January; 14 January is HABITS; 15 January is TARGETTING; 16 January is SELF-MASTERY....and so on for the year.

Recommendation 3:

Reflections: Nine tenths of wisdom consists of being wise in time. Theodore Roosevelt 1858-1919 U.S. President

How do I use my time? Do I use it wisely or do I waste it? Time-wasters can include watching too much TV. You end up watching your life away rather than investing time to lead, to learn, to listen, to love or do something that creates value. I think about quality time activities. What are these quality activities? They can be any of the above.

RESOLUTION: I commit myself to quality time: developing my vision and mission; thinking about it, writing it, working it. Quality time is also action time: creating visual value for people, contacts, clients, customers and my companies.

RESULT: Wisdom is demonstrated by how I use my time.

HOMILY: Also a few of my thoughts: The Homily must be engaging, enthusiastic, stimulating, sometimes provocative/controversial and with a clear message. Never from the pulpit, and no more than eight minutes. Come to think about it, why does the Pastor have to deliver the Homily?

DREW PORTER is a Jesuit Alumni and has worked in tourism, arranging study tours for students and clergy.

Let your conscience be your guide

Noelene Uren

Those of us of an age to recall early Disney movies, clever animations that delighted us in childhood, may remember *Pinocchio*, the toy that wanted to be real. As a boy made of wood he lacked the faculties that humans possess and that included a conscience. Without the ability to know when he was doing wrong his journey to become a real boy would be difficult. So he was given an interim conscience, a cricket named Jimminy who told him, **‘Always let your conscience be your guide’**.

We all have a conscience, that faculty by which we know right from wrong, our moral compass. The word itself is woven into our language. Politicians are in some cases allowed a ‘conscience vote’, someone who refuses to go to war on moral or religious grounds can claim to be a ‘conscientious objector’; and an unscrupulous decision can be called ‘unconscionable’. Conscience helps us, as the Cricket said, to ‘take the straight and narrow path’.

Growing up, we Catholics of that era were not encouraged to make decisions according to our conscience. Of course we knew we had one. From the age of seven, when we made our first confession, we were taught to regularly examine it, but thinking for ourselves when it concerned our religion was actively discouraged. We were told, ‘just have faith’. Mandatory rules were laid down and hanging over our heads always was the fear that if we disobeyed those we would be committing a sin, worst of all a mortal sin for which we would be condemned to hell for all eternity—unless of course we were lucky enough to get to confession before we died in a state of sin. So when Hamlet said, ‘Thus conscience does make cowards of us all’, he was rather talking about awareness, ‘that dread of

something after death’, that stopped us from breaking man-made rules that didn’t always have anything to do with our moral compass.

There were many of these rules, among them fasting from midnight before receiving the Eucharist. Even a nursing mother was once told that if she had a drink of water after midnight she could not go to Communion. Not eating meat on Friday was another one. So as young people we worried about going to a party on Friday night and forgetfully eating that stray sausage roll or cocktail frankfurt, both of which would be high on the menu back then. Sometimes the rule was actually an advantage. When I was seventeen I went on an organised coach trip in Tasmania. Our food was a set menu and Friday found us in a café where the lunch was a ham salad. Being the only Catholic in the group I said I would just have the salad. Instead I was presented with a crayfish. I ate it to the jeers of my companions, safe in the knowledge that I had avoided committing a sin.

But it isn’t the 1950’s any more and the world has changed irrevocably. Man has breached the boundaries of Planet Earth, nuclear weapons exist that could destroy us all and a deadly virus has swept our planet, leaving us isolated, bewildered and, for the young, facing a terrifyingly uncertain future. We need a Church that is fit for purpose in this 21st century, a Church that nurtures and spiritually renews us, a Church that isn’t constantly judgemental but that teaches, as stated by Vatican II, the primacy of conscience. One result of this would be that those who are divorced and re-married, those who are homosexual or transgender, those couples who wish to limit the size of their families can, knowing about primacy of conscience, rely not on a priest’s judgement but on their moral compass, their own conscience, when deciding to receive the Eucharist. This, for the Church, would at least be a small step into the world as we know it today.

NOELENE UREN is a member of the ARC Secretariat and a regular contributor to *ARCVoice*

***“Mother Church is wonderful, she looks after you. It’s
Father Church that is the problem, hedging us around
with rules and regulations.”***

Bob Maguire, a well-known maverick Melbourne priest who was on a recent TV episode of *Arn’s Brush with Fame*

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

Rob Brian 02 9371 8519 robertfbrian@gmail.com

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

Rob Butler 0419 207 943 butlershore2@bigpond.com

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

Gideon Goosen 0425 351 334 gcgoosen@gmail.com

Don Humphrey 0418 248 246 kdhumphrey34@hotmail.com

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

Shirley Lohman 02 9484 4718 shirley.lohman@live.com.au

Peter Meury 0243 884 809 petermeury@bigpond.com

Maureen Ryan 0403 931 782 roberter8@gmail.com

Noelene Uren 0402 923 601 wlmur5@bigpond.com

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 \$

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 (Record your name at the bank and let us know)

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.

Send to ARC c/- Rob Brian 28 Lancaster Road, DOVER HEIGHTS, New South Wales 2030

Tel: 02 9371 8519 e-mail: robertfbrian@gmail.com