

# Testimony

## A Pamphlet from Pax Christi San Antonio

Anticipating January 14, 2018

Pax Christi San Antonio does not solicit donations; however, anyone wishing to join should make a donation to Pax Christi U.S.A. and notify Maria Tobin, [matob@aol.com](mailto:matob@aol.com), to receive email messages sent to members. Pax Christi International was founded in 1945 with the encouragement of Bishop Pierre Marie Théas of Montauban, France, by Marthe Dortel Claudot, as a Christian lay organization dedicated to preventing a repetition of the savagery of the twentieth century's world wars. Send comments on the newsletter to [J6anthonyblasi@yahoo.com](mailto:J6anthonyblasi@yahoo.com).

### Editorial

After the calendar, the *Third Reading* commentary is based on the gospel reading for the Second Sunday in ordinary time. Tom Keene's poem is *Roosters We*. See <http://www.tomkeeneandthemuse.com/index.php> for more of Tom's poems. A thought piece, *Post Conciliar Clericalism*, follows.

### Calendar

**Monday January 8**, 4:00pm-9:00pm, SoL Center, Building Bridges: Naming & Negotiating Differences. Economic and Socio-Cultural Divides Panel, 4:00-6:00; Sol Reception 6-7; Religious Differences Panel 7:00-9:00. University Presbyterian Church, 300 Bushnell (Park off Shook). Register at [www.upcsa.org/registration/](http://www.upcsa.org/registration/). The title needed in the online form is Building Bridges: Naming & Negotiating Differences.

**Tuesday January 9**, 6:30pm-8:30pm, film and discussion, "Sin by Silence," on the imprisonment of battered women who defended themselves. Panelists include Cathy Maston, Patricia Castillo, Doshie Piper, and Bill Bush. Alamo Draffhouse Cinema Park North, 618 Northwest Loop 410 (Park North Shopping Center).

**Thursday January 11**, 7:00pm-8:30pm, MLK Jr. Commemorative Lecture, Kathleen Neal Cleaver, human rights activist. Laurie Auditorium, Trinity University, One Trinity Place. Park at Alamo Stadium, off Stadium Drive.

**Sunday January 14**, 2:00pm, Wreath-Laying Ceremony in honor of the life and struggles of Martin Luther King, Jr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Plaza, intersection of E. Houston and N. New Braunfels.

**Sunday January 14**, 4:00pm, Citywide Interfaith Worship Service. San Fernando Cathedral, 115 Main Plaza.

**Monday January 15**, 8:00am, Early Morning Worship Program. MLK Academy, 3101 Martin Luther King Drive.

**Monday January 15**, 10:00am, 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary MLK March, begins at 3101 MLK Drive and ends at Pittman-Sullivan Park, 1101 Iowa (3 mile route). Information at [sanantonio.gov/mlk](http://sanantonio.gov/mlk).

**Monday January 15**, 11:30am-3:30pm, MLK Commemoration Program. Pittman-Sullivan Park, 1101 Iowa.

**Tuesday January 16**, 6:00pm-8:00pm, Mayor Ron Nirenberg and State Senator José Menéndez, Cultural Conversations: From Community Trauma and Division to Hope and Action. Whitley Theological Center, Oblate School of Theology, 285 Oblate Dr.

**Wednesday January 17**, 5:30pm, Community Forum: Did Integration Ruin America? Hosted by the Alpha Phi Fraternity and the University of the Incarnate Word Ettlign Center for Civic Leadership. 5:30 networking over food; 6:00 presentation and introduction; 6:25, 6:45, 7:05 Breakout sessions: Neighborhoods (Rev. Dr. Trevor Alexander), Judicial System (Dr. Doshie Piper), Workplace (Ogutodu Akinwale). Ettlign Center, University of the Incarnate Word, 4301 Broadway.

**Thursday January 18**, 6:00pm-8:00pm, film about the death penalty: "The Last 40 Miles," followed by dialogue with film maker Alex Hannaford and with Kristin Houlié, Executive Director, Texas Coalition Against the Death Penalty. Chapel Auditorium, Our Lady of the Lake University, 411 SW 24<sup>th</sup> St. More information from [cwcs@ollusa.edu](mailto:cwcs@ollusa.edu).

**Thursday January 18**, 7:30pm-9:30pm, Dr. Luke Peterson, "Knowledge and Power in Middle Eastern Studies," extent to which knowledge is deliberately fashioned for pre-determined purposes. Northrup Hall 040, Trinity University, One Trinity Place. Park at Alamo Stadium, off Stadium Drive.

**Saturday January 20**, 5:30pm-10:30pm, Night of Hope Fundraiser for the Children of Gaza. St. George Maronite Catholic Church, 6070 Babcock Road. \$50.00; beneficiary is Middle East Children's Alliance (<https://mecaforpeace.org/>). Purchase tickets from <http://nightofhope2018.doatend.com/>.

**Thursday January 25**, 2:00pm-3:30pm, **in Austin**, Kimberly D. Russaw, Ph.D., "What Shall We Tell our Sons and Daughters," addressing violence against women as narrated in the Bible. Agard-Lovinggood Auditorium, 900 Chicon St., Huston-Tillotson University. Parking available on Chalmers Avenue. Information: Rev. Donald E. Brewington, [debrewington@htu.edu](mailto:debrewington@htu.edu).

**Sunday January 28**, 3:00pm-5:00pm, Annual Blessing of the Peacemakers and Announcing 2018 San Antonio Peace Laureates. Whitley Theological Center, Oblate School of Theology, 285 Oblate.

**Tuesday January 30**, 4:00pm. Laurie Brink, O.P., Ph.D., "Love your enemy and pray for those who persecute you" (Matt 5:44): Interpreting gospel ethics in an age of

polarization.” Reinbolt Hall, Assumption Chapel, St. Mary’s University, One Camino Santa Maria. Park in Lot D near the NW 36<sup>th</sup> St. entrance, or in Lot H near the Culebra Rd. entrance.

**Wednesday February 7**, 7:30pm-9:30pm, Shaka Senghor, on criminal justice reform. Jackson Auditorium, Weston Center, Texas Lutheran University, 1000 W. Court St., Seguin.

**Tuesday February 17**, 7:30pm, Diane Guerrero, on her memoir, *In the Country We Love: My Family Divided*. Award-winning actress recounts her experiences after her parents were deported. Jackson Auditorium, Weston Center, Texas Lutheran University, 1000 W. Court St., Seguin.

**Wednesday March 21**, 7:00pm-9:00pm, Salman Hameed, Ph.D., “The Crescent in the Scientific Age: Muslim Perceptions of Science and Religion.” University Center, Conference Room A, St. Mary’s University, One Camino Santa Maria.

**Saturday March 24, 8:45am, Pax Christi Texas State Conference: Paul K. Chappell of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “Warrior Strategies for Waging Peace in a Time of Nuclear Weapons.” Dominican Center for Spirituality, 6501 Almeda, Houston, Texas 77021.** Doors open 8:00am. Program: 8:45am-3:45pm, closing liturgy 4:00pm. Suggested donation \$40 individual, \$50 couple/family. Mail registration check to Pax Chisti Texas, 3901 Mattie St., Austin, TX 78723, by March 1. Some single rooms with shared bath available at the Center, \$40 per night; breakfast included. Contact Sr. Adrian Dover 713-440-3708.

### **Third Reading (John 1:35-42)**

This Sunday’s reading is one where we find a passage from the *Johannine Gospel* rather than the *Gospel of Mark*, since the latter is rather short. The *Johannine Gospel* frequently features as a type a person named in the legends about Jesus. The featured individual here is Andrew, one of two disciples of John the Baptizer who follow Jesus after the Baptizer points Jesus out as God’s lamb. The narrative points to Andrew by not even giving a name for the disciple who was with him.

The Baptizer’s words, “Look! The Lamb of God!” hearken back to the time of the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt. Moses had told the elders to slay a Passover lamb, the sprinkled blood of which would be a sign for the angels of death to spare their households (Exodus 12:21-23). Andrew and the unnamed disciple were seekers for the household of Jesus; Andrew, however, does not stop at joining the household of Jesus but goes to get his brother Simon to join too.

A second named individual who becomes a type is Simon. What type Simon comes to represent is not fleshed out in this part of the narrative. The passage provides only a clue by telling us that Jesus gives Simon the nickname *Kephas*, which the evangelist translates not as *rock (petra)* but *Rocky (Petros)*. A possible implication of the name is that this Simon Johnson needed to be worked on, hewn.

We tend to think of an evangelist as a single person, but the *Johannine Gospel*, called that because of its association with the letters of John, appears to be the work of a team, a school of Christians who collected narratives and worked them together over several decades. Their typological strategy invites us to find ourselves in the quest of Andrew and in the continuous learning and self-revising of Rocky.

## Poem

*Roosters we  
(To honor justice and peace advocates)*

We fill our lungs with morning air,  
and in throaty cry let it out  
to call up the sun,

wake our hens and brood of chicks  
to hunt and peck, peck and hunt:

a lineage of doing  
that comes down  
over horizons of time

to light the dark.

Tom Keene  
August 18, 2017

## Post Conciliar Clericalism

Anthony J. Blasi

### *Clericalism*

In a general way, any look at Catholicism is a look at clericalism. The Catholic churches, and the Roman communion in particular, are distinct from the rest of Christianity precisely by virtue of their having priests ordered under episcopal hierarchies. The more or less monarchical bishops govern the lower clergy, and the latter in some sense govern a laity. One can speak of rich Catholic lay traditions of piety, theology, social ethics, art, etc., but these have existed in association with and sometimes even in a counterpoint dialectic against the Catholic clerical apparatus. The intent in this essay is not to treat clericalism as a mere aspect to be taken into account when looking at something else Catholic, but to thematize it in the context of the post-conciliar Church. The thesis is that the Vatican II itself, and the dynamics that came after it, were to a great extent about clericalism and certain tensions endemic to

clericalism. In order to pursue such an analysis, clericalism *per se* is conceptualized in terms of a clergy/lay dialectic, since in essence there can be no clergy without a laity and vice-versa.

Clericalism implies more than the fact of there being religious specialists in a society, and even more than the approval of the fact of religion being pursued in a specialized and professional manner. In clericalism the fact of religious specialists is coupled to that of religious non-specialists, and the approval of the specialized and professional pursuit of religion is joined to a paradoxical disapproval of a specialist's self-sufficiency and of non-specialists encroaching upon the set-aside terrain of the clergy. Indeed, the clergy is set apart to perform some religious service for the laity which the laity is not to do for itself; the clergy is a contrived separate ministerial stratum. Hence in the clericalist ethic it is deemed right and proper for a laity to be religious partly in a second-hand fashion, settling for a vicarious religiosity provided by a clergy. This not only affects the character of "lay religion" but also that of the clerics' religion, for the latter becomes at least in part a commodity to be made available to a clientele of religious consumers. Clericalism should be seen, then, as a social and cultural system wherein there is not only a bifurcation of the religious community into two status groups but also a commodification of a religious tradition.

We need to understand clericalism as a subculture, a world view of a kind of institution-wide religious movement, rather than as an individual attitude or occupational discipline that happens to turn up frequently among clerics. Watch repair specialists, writers, and musical soloists all need to observe a disciplined solitude in order to pursue their work, for example, but they do so as individuals maintaining a personal line of activity rather than a collective effort. Clergy too may develop individual attitudes and disciplines in the course of their work, but these are not the same thing as a collective subculture of clericalism. In fact, clericalism may be shared well beyond the ranks of the clergy. Clericalism is a shared subculture, shared not only in the sense of being common to a number of people but also shared in the sense of being imparted, supported, expected, and valued. It is not conditioned but promoted, not a reinforced habit but an encouraged ethic, not deemed only useful but right. Approaching it differently, we can observe that there are ministers in non-clericalist denominations who themselves are not committed to clericalism. As with any subculture, clericalism needs the support of a social stratum which has a collective identity in order to survive as a coherent system of meanings, values, and norms, but it need not be unique to that stratum. Such symbolic vehicles as may be peculiar to the stratum, such as ritual performances, a distinctive life style, and status-specific cognitive systems, may help maintain the collective identity of the central clerical stratum, and thereby help maintain clericalism, but clericalism itself may be embodied in beliefs and practices other than such stratum-specific supports. It helps for purposes of clarity, to distinguish between a clericalist ethic and its expression on the one hand, and supportive practices of the clergy on the other.

Supportive symbol systems, such as ritual, distinctive life styles, and socially unique cognitive systems, can help separate a clergy from a laity, but these can lead to a clericalist *esprit de corps* only indirectly. They set the clergy off but do not unite it into a social unit. The latter is accomplished by creating formal organizations with budgets, boards, internal newsletters, leadership structures, and—most importantly—politics. If

the clerical formal organization can make life difficult in some way for the individual clergy, the latter become united into differing political factions in order to protect themselves. This development of a political forum not only involves coalition formation, wherein informal friendship networks and alliances of the like-minded emerge, but also increased interactions with enemies, neutrals, and potentially threatening personages for the purpose of collecting politically important information. The inadvertent product of all this is a separate clerical world of intrigue, surveillance, and opinion formation. This separate world is the social basis of the clericalist *esprit de corps*. It follows that clericalism allows for competition and even conflict within such a world, but not disinterest. One who is apathetic about the special politics of the religious institution is simply, from the clericalist perspective, a bad corporate citizen. The pressures for boundary maintenance are exerted as much about being a partisan as about what kind of partisan to be.

### *Vatican II and Clericalism*

In one sense the Second Vatican Council was a result of a history of clericalism. The Council of Trent, repeating and going beyond a pattern set by a previous church reform from the age of the Cluniac movement, had set about correcting abuses by strengthening the clerical aspect of the Church. Bishops were to be churchmen named by churchmen; specifically, they were to be named by the pope and his advisors, not by secular rulers. These same bishops were to be present in their dioceses, preaching, making visitations, providing for the training of the clergy, and guarding orthodoxy. The clergy were to be trained in isolation from the wider world, have a distinctive life style instilled into them, and be thoroughly educated in a specialized system of knowledge. This Tridentine program not only succeeded in reforming the Catholic Church, it also determined the form of irreligion. If the Church government became more genuinely religious, the rival secular governments became more genuinely secular. The First Vatican Council reaffirmed the cultural reality of Catholicism in response, by identifying a deposit of doctrine from the past as the Church's, and it reaffirmed the structural reality of the Church by identifying the papacy as the most doctrinally important entity. The result was an even more self-contained province of meaning than that produced by Trent, for now not only was the Church distinct from the rest of the world by virtue of its religiosity but also by virtue of its doctrinal stands. As masters of doctrinal analysis, the new clergy were specialists in a way they had not been before, and in the manner of all specialists they would be discontent with the world when they found it interfering with their prerogatives.

Think for a moment of the Church between the two Vatican Councils. Matters of doctrine and scripture were decided by curial committees, not by the local bishops and clergy. Matters of cult were decided in Rome—even down to such matters as the shape of chasubles. The clerical orders, along with the non-clerical religious orders, were subject to cardinals who were themselves usually not members of religious orders. While Pope Leo XIII encouraged remarkable revivals of neo-Thomism and social ethics, both of which embodied a local clericalist professionalism throughout the world, limits were simultaneously being set by an increasingly centralized Roman administration. There were new developments in philosophy with which the neo-Thomists found much in common, but the Roman authorities discouraged any explorations into that potential

common ground. And Social Catholicism had first to work its way around formulae left over from the vagaries of Italian politics and the matter of the Papal States, and then contend with corporatist notions that were akin to certain management stratagems in the Turin auto plants. The Vatican, at first reluctant to get into the matter of therapeutic abortion, began to overrule the moral theologians in the latter's specialized area—double effect in medical ethics. And if that was not bad enough, local customs were to be repealed in 1917 by a codified canon law, unless one could keep a practice out of Rome's sight for forty years. The clerical role had been subjected to modern management, and the clerics would not like it. When the Second Vatican Council was called, there was no shortage of periti whose clerical expertise had been trampled upon, whose careers had been marked by organizational oppression, and whose reputations had been maligned. Now the clergy were to have their say.

It is instructive to examine the Second Vatican Council's decrees from this perspective. The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* focuses on the very intersection of the clerical and lay roles; it says that the Church desires the faithful to be led to full, conscious, and active participation in the liturgy (#14). This can be seen as a non-clericalist initiative in the sense that lay participation is to be encouraged and subjectively enriched, but in fact clericalism does not entail lay non-participation and non-consciousness but rather a lay involvement in the religiosity given-off by the clergy. For a religiosity to be second hand and commodity-like is not for it to approximate a sleep walk but for it to be a different but related religiosity vis-à-vis that of the cleric. The initiative and spontaneity is that of the priest; the lay person has a share in what the priest generates. Thus, the faithful are to *be led* to their richer participation. Moreover, the Council goes on in the same section to point out that the clergy itself needed to be trained in liturgy so that *they* could realize the enriched participation among the faithful. The process of liturgical change set in motion by the Council heightened the role of the clergy.

This liturgical re-emphasis of clericalism may have raised the quality of lay religiosity at the expense of both lay trust and clerical interiority. The lay Catholic adherent who was not particularly "religiously musical" before the Council trusted the priest to do the praying; the model was quasi-monastic in that clergy and lay inhabited different worlds and that the function of prayer was carried out, as it were, in a cloister. But after the Council the lay person had to share not in the automatic favor of God brought down by means of prayer, but participate in the prayer effort itself. With sociological hindsight, we might anticipate that a decline in Sunday mass attendance would accompany such an increase in full, conscious, and active participation, since many people preferred to be inactive but "saved." But what about the priest? After the Council his religiosity could not be simply one appropriate for a spiritually inclined individual who had dedicated his life to God, but one that could be put across successfully to a gathering of people with many other matters on their minds. The requisite second hand nature of the lay religiosity under the clericalist regime may impoverish the religiosity of the cleric, and replace what was lost with the imperative to encourage a sense of community within the parish (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* #42).

The Council not only promoted clericalism in a practical way in its liturgical reforms, but it made clericalism a matter of theology as well. According to the *Dogmatic*

*Constitution on the Church*, the clergy not only specialized in the same religion as the laity had but had a religious status that was *essentially* different from that of the laity:

Though they differ essentially and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are none the less ordered one to another; each in its own proper way shares in the one priesthood of Christ. (#10)

Notice the ordering of the two to one another, which is the dialectical center of clericalism. The Council gives theological legitimacy to this by linking both to the priesthood of Christ. The maintenance of two subcultural systems to support the two theological legitimations requires two social systems. The lay system is evidently to take the form of a parish life, in turn encouraged by the sense of community developed at mass. The clerical system requires a comparable social system, and hence it should be no surprise that the Council was concerned with the quality of collective life available to the clergy. No doubt pre-Council clericalist wisdom had informed the drafting of the relevant conciliar passages. The theological statement on the Church describes a unique college of priests united with a bishop, a brotherhood whose members provide mutual help spontaneously (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* #10; see also *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* #8). And the Council left no doubt that this brotherhood was ordered to this clericalist function as a collectivity, not as a set of parallel individuals:

As the laity through the divine choice have Christ as their brother, who, though Lord of all, came not to be served but to serve (cf. Mt. 20:28), they also have as brothers those in the sacred ministry who by teaching, by sanctifying and by ruling with the authority of Christ so nourish the family of God that the new commandment of love may be fulfilled by all. (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* #32).

Moreover, the Council decreed that this clericalist stance was not only to be supported by the priestly brotherhood but that it was to take up their whole life (*Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* #2).

Clericalism not only makes demands on the clergy, entailing difficult dilemmas for its own religiosity, but presents the laity too with a peculiar dilemma. When the clergy are convinced of their particular kind of religion—and they must be to succeed in attracting its clientele—they face the inevitable dilemma of leading that clientele to a mere complement religiosity. The client is not to do precisely the same thing as the cleric. Moreover, the client is not encouraged to go to a competing kind of religion—say, in another denomination. Thus, the client is to acquiesce to the cleric's activity, but not acquiesce to the competitor's activity. This amounts to a selective acquiescence, selectivity itself, of course, entailing a degree of inacquiescent conduct. If the client were purchasing something having a utilitarian value—e.g., a computer or an automobile—it would be possible to select a product in terms of what it can do, without knowing how it does it. However, when selecting a religion one cannot make a simple utilitarian decision, and one would need to know as much or more about religion as the cleric to make the selection of one kind of religion over another. If one were actually to learn that much about religion, one would be too involved to make a good client; one would not be sufficiently passive. This dilemma predisposes clericalism to associate ethnic, class life style, community, and other emblem-generating identities with a particular religious

identity as short-cuts to achieving a religious identity at all. This enables the client to acquiesce to a particular religion on some non-religious ground, and thereby be committed to a particular religion without being too religious. In the era of the pluralist nation state, where the dynamics of national life overcome more local commitments, the opportunity for religion itself to become the basis for a religious choice becomes more critical than such secondary correlates of denominational identities. The result is that religious adherence becomes volatile, and much more dependent on religiosity itself.

### *Post-Conciliar Developments*

It would be impossible to survey all of the important post-conciliar developments and to interpret them within the framework of clericalism. However, a few illustrative cases may offer some insight. The liturgy changed from Latin to the vernacular languages and church altars faced the people; these were changes that emphasized worship being a joint effort of priest and people. In this joint effort, preaching was to be a central part of the worship activity. What would appear to make the priests' role more important and meaningful, however, turned out to be the occasion of lower recruitment rates into the ministry, higher rates of resignation from the clerical ranks, and a general clergy identity crisis. The changes drew the clergy into a contested accommodation, accommodation being both a rapprochement with a surrounding culture and a maintenance of a separateness from it. Accommodation entails an internal conflict, in this case an internal institutional conflict. Clergy "progressives" wanted to begin facing the people, communicating with them, and preaching effectively to them because they wanted to put across a religiosity. The opponents to change were willing to engage in conflict for a significant reason; while they may have liked Latin, preferred facing walls and candle stocks during mass, and disliked serious preaching, the real objection was that the religiosity which could be put across to people was not the religiosity that had personally moved them in their own lives. The commodification of religion left them dissatisfied, and they treasured precisely those traditional practices that made commodification difficult. The dilemma was that what made commodification difficult also made successful ministry difficult for them.

A review of the questionnaire studies of Catholic priests that sociologists undertook in the years immediately following the Council showed that age was an important factor consistently. The older age cohorts tended to hold "pre-Vatican" views and the younger ones more "progressive" views. To ascertain what the pre- and post-Council stances were with respect to the ministerial role, we can turn to a few of those studies. One 1971 study of an international mission society of priests, the Society of the Divine Word, whose members were largely born in Europe, asked the respondents to select one of the following three statements as the one with which they could most agree:

A Christian minister is someone...

- a. ordained to the priesthood and thereby authorized to celebrate the Eucharist and administer the sacraments of Penance and Anointing the Sick.
- b. whose fundamental obligation is to spread Christ's Gospel and to administer the sacraments to the faithful.

c. who has been authorized by the people of God to build Christian community, lead it in its celebration of God's grace and inspire it to share actively in the world's concerns.

Those over age 65 tended to choose "a" and "b"; those aged 56-65 tended to choose "b," as did those aged 46-55. The 36-45 age group favored "b" and "c," while the 25-35 age group chose "c," as did those under age 25. Similar results turned up in a study of English Roman Catholic priests and another study of delegates to the Jesuit General Congregation (international council). Responses "a" and "b," favored by the older clergy, speak of activity on the part of the minister while "c," favored by the younger clergy, speaks about effects in the lives of non-ministers brought about in part by the ministers. The post-conciliar stance seems to make the identity of the minister depend on the responsiveness of the faithful, thereby putting the clergy identities at risk.

Another 1971 study, in the U.S.A., sponsored by the National Federation of Priests' Councils (fearful that the American bishops would not release the findings of the study the bishops had commissioned), the priests were asked to rate various activities as more or less valuable ideally, and then actually. Offering daily mass ranked high, both ideally and actually. "Working to make the liturgy more meaningful to people" ranked very high ideally but middling in actuality. Being a man of prayer ranked high ideally but not so high actually. We might see this in the context of what was said above—that priests could have treasured the kind of religiosity that was not readily commodified. The mass occasioned something meaningful, but putting it over to people was not so satisfying and perhaps seemed somehow to undercut being a man of prayer.

Studies of American seminarians in 1966 and 1984 both show the respondents identifying "holiness" as the most important quality of priests. There can, of course, be many kinds of holiness. If the seminarians meant "piety," and if the clergy role tended to undermine that, one could anticipate mass resignations from the priesthood represented by these cohorts of seminarians. However, when asked what the most important qualities of seminarians were, piety was ranked first by only 14% in 1966 and 18% in 1984; responsibility was ranked first by 34% and 33%, and apostolic zeal by 38% and 25%. Maybe the seminarians understood the religious leadership (clericalist) function as constitutive of holiness, or maybe they idealized the priest role and responded to their own role in more practical terms; it is hard to say. In any event, the respondents seemed to be preparing to be the responsible parties in religious matters, thereby placing a great weight upon themselves.

As the clergy role became more clericalist, the brotherhood of priests seems to have become more a system of social support for the occupation of putting religion over to the laity, and less a system of social support for the traditional and hierarchically endorsed attributes of the priesthood. In another part of the American study commissioned by the National Federation of Priests' Councils, the respondents were asked whether they would be supported by their fellow clergy and by their church authorities if they were to take certain actions. The researchers focused on the percentage differences between those reporting the two kinds of support. For example, if respondents were to involve themselves personally in civil rights activities, only 15% reported a difference between the reactions of their bishops and their clerical colleagues. Also low was a 21% difference for resigning from the active ministry. Some

other possible actions of parish clergy would elicit a more widely anticipated disagreement—participating in the anti-war movement (33%) and going out socially with a woman friend (36%). However, dramatically higher differences in anticipated reactions occurred with speaking out against the Church's position on clerical celibacy (55%) and counselling couples that they may follow their own consciences in the use of contraceptives (59%). To go out with a woman friend and to resign from the ministry was not as controversial in the sense of pitting priest colleagues against bishops, as speaking out against celibacy or counselling couples to follow their own consciences in the use of contraceptives. The priests' colleagues seemed to the respondents as most distinctively supportive of what they might do in their roles oriented to lay people. In all these cases, bishops were less supportive than other priests.

Post-conciliar clericalism appears to have created a dilemma for the non-parish clergy as well. While pre-conciliar clerical life made being a priest meaningful apart from the function of putting religiosity over to the faithful, post-conciliar clericalism places a normative burden of sorts on the priest to perform a particular pastoral role. The Catholic clergy, especially that part of it in teaching and scholarly pursuits, is segmented into a variety of non-parish roles. While clericalism places strain upon the religious interiority of the parish priest by virtue of placing too much religious value on his work, it may deprive the life of the non-parish priest by placing too little religious value on his work. An extreme case was that of the Jesuit "special students", who had been selected for graduate study, often in secular universities, in order to create a new kind of scholarly elite. Since the selectees' special contributions were often specific to secular disciplines, the problem emerged when they began to serve other than specifically church functions. The elite ended up "representing" the Church, in something of a token manner, in the context of an external secular environment rather than directly functioning in the distinctively religious realm.

The paradoxes and dilemmas of clericalism are not limited to the clergy. As the clerical role becomes increasingly identified with a clericalist religiosity, and theologically legitimated for being so, the influence of the clergy outside the distinctly religious setting comes to be deemed less legitimate. Thus, clericalist religiosity seems to be compatible with a secularization process in which religion and other institutions become increasingly differentiated from one another. An earlier embodiment of clericalism, wherein clergy held power in non-religious contexts, would be, of course, incompatible with such a secularization process. Thus, secularization may not entail the fall of religion as much as the clericalization of it. In this context, it is interesting to review a study of Irish university students and worker night school enrollees, conducted in 1967 as the conciliar changes were beginning to have their effect. High percentages agreed with the statement, "There is too much uncritical obedience to the clergy in non-religious affairs." The percentages suggest that the respondents knew of clergy "meddling" too far afield in the past and a desire that they not do so in the future, and notably the clergy themselves concurred in this (67% of priest students). Such attitudes seem fully compatible with the contemporary form of clericalism.

The heightened clericalist hew of religiosity not only implies a clergy retreat from non-clericalist religiosity and from the non-religious in general, but also a lay involvement in the clericalist religiosity. In receiving even a second-hand religiosity, as it were, the laity comes to share a cognitive horizon with the clergy. That which is relevant

to the priest's religiosity is also relevant to the laity's religiosity, when that religiosity is shared, albeit through different roles. Numerous church issues—e.g., whether divorce should keep one from the full sacramental life, whether birth control interferes with the matter of matrimony, whether marriage should prevent priests from presiding at mass, whether women should preside at mass—suddenly come to be seen as properly lay issues. In the U.S.A., the 1987 survey of lay Catholics conducted by William V. D'Antonio and colleagues showed a widespread belief that the laity should participate in setting policy on such matters as divorce, birth control, priestly celibacy, and female ordination, as well as on such an issue as the morality of homosexual behavior. Percentages holding such views tend to be higher for the young than for the old, and for the more educated than for the less educated. It should be noted that clericalism cannot be expected to persist without meeting countervailing forces. A notable limit upon it comes from the hierarchy. Even though the bishops have clericalist tendencies themselves, they are selected to be bishops on grounds other than that of being attitudinally typical of the lower clergy. In order to appreciate this, it is useful to contrast two kinds of mobility into elite status—contest mobility and sponsored mobility. In contest mobility, lagging candidates for elite status as well as successful ones are kept in contention until a climax. In an organizational framework, a system of contest mobility makes mobility contingent on demonstrated performance; for example, successful pastors in parishes would be candidates for the episcopacy. In sponsored mobility systems, potential candidates for elite status are noted early in their careers, prior to performance, on the basis of the impression they make at that early time, and then are recruited into the elite in a special track to which potential rivals do not have access. In an organizational framework, a system of sponsored mobility makes entry into the elite contingent upon having an informal bond of friendship or trust with someone about to become a member of the elite himself. For example, a young cleric who had been a trusted assistant to a bishop who himself has a relationship with a particularly powerful Vatican official, may well be sponsored successfully for an important future appointment. In the process, the upwardly mobile cleric may have the hierarchy rather than his lower clergy colleagues as his reference group. A study of the French hierarchy described this as recruitment through co-optation. This is not the place to describe or explain the agendas of the Vatican and the bishops, but the fact that the agendas may not be clericalist ones can set limits on the clericalism of the lower clergy by means of the ecclesiastical controls of the higher clergy over the lower and by means of the application of the same recruitment process to the selection even of the lower clergy. In this context, it may be useful to recall the late John Seidler's description of the Catholic Church as a "lazy monopoly," in which the responsible executives fail to respond to criticism but instead allow clerical critics to depart. This failure to respond may persist until the shortage of clergy becomes too great a problem to ignore.

The ability of the hierarchy to set limits on the clericalism of the lower clergy is related to its ability to embody the Catholic tradition in non-ministerial structures. We have seen that clerical orders can no longer do this because the conciliar theology has rendered their non-ministerial specialties religiously meaningless. The clerical orders have adapted by making theological education less intellectual and more ministerial, and by replacing a clerical privatized spirituality with a service-oriented, lay-centered spirituality. The female orders have responded differently to this same dynamic, so that

female religious have begun to take on the functions of spiritual direction and liturgical leadership. The imperative to clericalize one's religious involvement led many of these women to advocate the expansion of female involvement to all ministerial roles except the priesthood, and others to advocate the ordination of women to the priesthood as well.

### *Conclusion*

In a 1968/9 essay that was clearly out of step with the times, the late Jesuit Joseph Fichter pointed out the untenable quandary into which the Council's ethic was placing the priest. He argued that it is "necessary to deny the notions that priests can do only what lay people cannot do, and that priests must do only what bishops do" (Fichter, "The myth of the hyphenated clergy," in *Organization Man in the Church*, 1974). The Council had theologically legitimated a circumscribed clerical space, outside of which the laity was to take the Church into the modern world, and inside of which the priest was to be a specialist in partaking in his bishop's fullness of the priesthood. Fichter termed this a "myth," which stood quite in contrast with the real world of the clergy. He argued that the point should not be identity, a full time description of activity; even the parish priest is not leading cultic activities most of the time. The point should be service. Any valid service done by an ordained person should be deemed, he argued, fully legitimate and doctrinally encouraged. The priest can be one among many servants of the poor, a scholar, a social conscience. Was this, in 1968, already an agenda for Vatican III?

### **Links**

Pax Christi International  
<http://www.paxchristi.net/>

Pax Christi U.S.A.  
<http://www.paxchristiusa.org>

Pax Christi Texas  
<http://www.paxchristitexas.org>

Pax Christi San Antonio  
<http://www.paxchristisa.org>

Marianist Social Justice Collaborative  
[www.msjc.net](http://www.msjc.net)

Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, International JPIC Committee  
<http://saccvi.blogspot.com/>

San Antonio Peace Center  
<http://www.sanantoniopace.center>

Interfaith Radio, (*Interfaith Voices*)

<http://www.interfaithradio.org/>

Texas Catholic Campaign to End the Death Penalty

[www.txccedp.org](http://www.txccedp.org)