

**SHARED  
RESPONSIBILITY  
AT WORK**

**THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS'  
ADVISORY COUNCIL  
1969 - 1974**

Edited by  
**MICHAEL J. SHEEHAN and RUSSELL SHAW**



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016

ADE4470 C2

# SHARED RESPONSIBILITY AT WORK

The Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council  
1969-1974

Edited by  
**MICHAEL J. SHEEHAN and RUSSELL SHAW**

1975  
Publications Office  
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE  
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

**Deacidified**

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Foreword, by Avery Dulles, S.J. . . . .	1
Introduction, by Russell Shaw . . . . .	3
Chronology of the Advisory Council, by Michael J. Sheehan . . . . .	7
A Venture in Shared Responsibility, by John Cardinal Dearden . . . . .	11
Origins of the Advisory Council, by Most Rev. Francis T. Hurley . . . . .	14
Early Days of the Advisory Council, by Francis X. Kennelly . . . . .	18
An Eye on Priorities: 1971, by Charles Tildon . . . . .	25
A New Mandate: 1972, by Joseph H. Maguire . . . . .	30
A Year of Transition: 1973, by David J. Doherty . . . . .	36
The End of the Beginning: 1974, by William Toomey . . . . .	42
Concern for the Poor and Underprivileged, by Helen M. Casey . . . . .	46
The Deck Was Not Stacked, by Joseph Francis, S.V.D. . . . .	51
The Advisory Council and the Spanish Speaking, by Virgil P. Elizondo . . . . .	54
Study of a National Pastoral Council, by Carol Frances Jegen, B.V.M. . . . .	56
Building a Community, by Most Rev. Edward A. McCarthy . . . . .	65
A Church in Miniature, by Most Rev. John F. Whealon . . . . .	67
Contributors, by Mrs. Michelle Donnelly . . . . .	69



# FOREWORD

A brief explanation of the genesis of this book will probably contribute to a better understanding of its contents. The U.S. Bishops' Advisory Council, as it approached its fifth birthday, resolved, at its September, 1973, meeting, that a record should be composed of its experiences and achievements thus far. Such a history seemed possible, because the events were still fresh in the memories of those who had fashioned the council and had lived through its early days. The history seemed desirable, moreover, for two main reasons. First, it was seen as a way of transmitting the lessons learned by experience to newly elected members, who were then replacing the original charter members. Second, the council felt that much could be gained by making its existence and activities known to a wider public.

To specify the proposal more concretely, and to take the necessary action, the Advisory Council named a committee of four of its own members: Steven T. Landregan, Mrs. Kathleen Lukens, William J. Whalen, and, as chairperson, myself. The projected history received immediate encouragement from Bishop James S. Rausch, General Secretary of the NCCB/USCC. At its meeting of September 18-19, 1973, the Administrative Board of the USCC adopted a motion introduced by Bishop Rausch approving "the Advisory Council's plan to begin work on a history of the Advisory Council."

The Committee on the History, after some deliberation, came to the conclusion that, to meet the various purposes envisaged, three distinct projects should be undertaken. First, materials should be gathered for subsequent use in composing, from a greater distance, a serious critical history. Second, some popular articles should be commissioned to acquaint a wider public with the work of the council. Third, an interim report on the first five years of the council should be written by persons who had shared in the establishment and workings of that body. This interim report would be directed to all who might be interested in such a work, but especially to those who had been, or might in the future be, connected with the Advisory Council, to bishops receiving reports of the work of the council, and to persons involved in comparable or connected organizations, such as diocesan pastoral councils.

The present volume, modest in scope and intention, represents the implementation of the last of these three efforts. The other two efforts are being pursued concurrently.

On behalf of the Committee on the History, I take great pleasure in thanking the authors of this volume. All of them are exceptionally busy persons, yet they responded promptly and even enthusiastically to the request that they should be contributors. We are fortunate indeed to have the frank personal recollections and judicious assessments of so many who have played crucial roles in the establishment and early developments of the Advisory Council. The council, as a creative American response to the directions given by Vatican II, appears to hold great promise for the future evolution of the Church in the United States.

This volume could not possibly have come to light without the dedicated labors of two individuals. The Rev. Michael J. Sheehan, Assistant General Secretary of the NCCB and USCC, has borne the burden of coordinating the preparations at every stage. Mr. Russell Shaw, Secretary for Public Affairs, NCCB/USCC, has worked with the Committee on the History from the beginning, and has done the final editing of the entire text. Father Sheehan and Mr. Shaw, through their anonymous services, have contributed vastly more than the relatively brief chapters here published under their names.

Washington, D.C.  
December 15, 1974

Avery Dulles, S.J.



# INTRODUCTION

By Russell Shaw

The creation of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council was a post-Vatican II phenomenon. It is difficult to think of such a body coming into being in any earlier period in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States.

Vatican II had breathed a new spirit and enunciated a new vision of the Church—as a community, a “people of God.” Although in no sense did Vatican II deny, do away with, or downgrade the hierarchical structure of the Church, it made abundantly clear that hierarchical structure does not exhaust its reality. It called on all Catholics to take to heart the obvious but sometimes overlooked fact that we are all in this thing called Church together.

“Shared responsibility” was the formula under which this fact came to be expressed. It was as an exercise in shared responsibility that the Advisory Council came into existence and continues to function. As Cardinal Dearden of Detroit expresses it in one of the papers collected here: “A functioning Advisory Council was seen as a hoped-for instance of shared responsibility in the Church at the national level. . . . What was needed as an initial step was a structure that would reflect the spirit of the total American Church in a way that would help the bishops meet their responsibilities to that Church.”

But, as Cardinal Dearden adds, “the devising of a formula was not a simple process.” That is an understatement. The Advisory Council was originally set up to act in a consultative capacity to the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference. Its name signified this: the United States Catholic Conference Advisory Council. Several of the contributors to this collection record the disappointment with which the original members discovered that they were thereby excluded from direct involvement in the affairs of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. To understand their disappointment—and to appreciate the significance of the eventual decision to extend the scope of the Advisory Council's competence to encompass the concerns of NCCB—it is necessary to know a bit about the two bodies, NCCB and USCC.

Many people take it for granted that the difference between them, whatever it may be, is negligible and that, for all practical purposes,

they are one and the same. The assumption is due in great part to history.

The bishops of the United States for half a century had a single organization, the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), for collaborative action at the national level. It is widely assumed that USCC and NCCB are the successors of the NCWC, and in a sense that is true. Both do trace their origins back to the old "welfare conference." From another point of view, however, both are considerably more than "successors" of the NCWC. This is especially true of the NCCB.

Responding to the directives of Vatican II, the U.S. bishops in the mid-1960s found themselves faced with the task of constituting themselves as an "episcopal conference." The nature and functions of such a conference are specified in the conciliar documents and in subsequent norms set forth by the Holy See. The "episcopal conference" is, then, the bishops of the country themselves, united for purposes of deliberation, decision making and collaboration in specific units of pastoral concern proper to the episcopacy. The functional units of NCCB are committees of bishops; the fulltime staff is small and its task is to serve the committees. One might say that the areas of interest to NCCB are those which pertain to the internal life of the Church: doctrine, liturgy, canon law, pastoral research and practices, priestly formation, priestly life and ministry, the permanent diaconate, etc. In simple terms, NCCB is the Catholic bishops of the United States working together *as bishops* in matters that concern the internal affairs of the Catholic Church *as a church*.

This obviously leaves a broad range of issues which are of concern to the bishops and the Church, and which also call for collaboration and cooperative action at the national level, but which do not pertain to the bishops precisely in their pastoral role or to the Church as a specifically ecclesial community. (To put it another way, many other organizations besides the Catholic Church have a responsibility with regard to social justice, but no other organization besides the Catholic Church has a responsibility with regard to issues in Catholic canon law.) It is in this broad area of "other" issues that the United States Catholic Conference was established to function.

The generic concerns of USCC can be enumerated rather simply: social justice and peace, health affairs, education, communications, and, instrumental to these, legislation and litigation. In fact, however, the specific concerns of USCC are as diverse and shifting as the issues and priorities of the contemporary United States and the contemporary world. The conference staff is organized in a fairly complex structure of departments, offices and "desks." Development of policy proposals for implementation by the staff is the responsibility of several corresponding

“mixed” committees made up of both bishops and non-bishops. Policy decisions are made by the Administrative Board (there is a similar Administrative Committee for NCCB) and ultimately by the general body of bishops, who are the members of the civil corporation which is USCC.

This has been a rather long detour through structures. Back, now, to the Advisory Council. As noted, there was disappointment over the original decision to limit the scope of its activity to USCC. Not surprisingly, the decision was eventually changed by the bishops, and the council—now re-named the “United States Catholic Bishops’ Advisory Council”—was empowered to concern itself with the issues confronting NCCB and to report to that body’s Administrative Committee as well as to the Administrative Board of USCC.

Why lay so much emphasis on what may seem like a bit of bureaucratic trivia of slight interest or importance? Precisely because the broadening of the Advisory Council’s competence from “USCC only” to “USCC *and* NCCB” signifies an important growth in understanding of the meaning of shared responsibility.

It might be put this way. As long as the Advisory Council was limited to USCC, the implicit message was that the bishops, in the area of their pastoral responsibilities (NCCB), had no need or reason to consult with non-bishops. Once NCCB, too, was opened up to the Advisory Council, the message was quite different: bishops, in exercising their pastoral responsibilities, find it advisable and desirable—possibly even necessary—to consult with non-bishops. Why? Because the pastoral office of bishops is among other things a ministry of service, and those who serve the people of God see the wisdom of consulting the people about the mode of service. To those who might regard this as a diminution or subversion of episcopal authority, one can only reply that it is nothing of the kind. It is no more and no less than a prudent adaptation of the manner in which the bishops’ authority is exercised, suited both to the contemporary theology of the Church and to the contemporary requirements of effective leadership.

The Advisory Council manifests yet another phenomenon in the contemporary life of the Church. The word is overworked but it is the only one that fits: “dialogue.” The role of the members of the council has been one of listening and speaking: listening to staff (and constituencies) of NCCB and USCC, listening and speaking among themselves, speaking in their reports to the Administrative Committee and Administrative Board, then listening again as the bishops respond—sometimes affirmatively, sometimes not—to their recommendations and proposals.

Such a process is time-consuming and can be frustrating. It is not a pastime for impatient people who require immediate action on complex issues. But, as the papers collected here make clear, it can be

immensely rewarding; it can "pay off" in the coin of solid achievement. Because it reports to the Administrative Committee and Board and not directly to the public, the Advisory Council and its work are not widely known. That is unfortunate, for in its first five years the council played a role in shaping decisions that led to such major new initiatives in the Church in the United States as the Campaign for Human Development, the forthcoming Bicentennial conference on "Liberty and Justice for All," and the greater thrust within NCCB and USCC toward concern for the Blacks, the Spanish-speaking, and other groups who have suffered from oppression and discrimination.

It would be overstating the case to lay such results solely at the door of the Advisory Council; many other influences from many other sources played an important part. Yet the voice of the Advisory Council has been heard and has made a contribution. That is no little thing.

The council has not compiled a record of consistent and unqualified success. One of the major undertakings of its first years, detailed here by Sister Carol Frances Jegen, was the "feasibility study" of a National Pastoral Council. Despite the Advisory Council's conclusion that such a body, though not immediately feasible, was desirable, the idea is somewhere on a back burner at the time this is written. One would hesitate, however, to say that it is dead. Some bishops, observing the work of the Advisory Council, have suggested that it should itself evolve into the National Pastoral Council; at the moment, the Advisory Council does not seem so disposed. In any case, the story of the "feasibility study" recorded here may turn out to be only one chapter in a much longer book which is still far from completion.

It would be impossible at this stage to undertake a "history" of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council, and these papers do not purport to be one. Rather, they are candid snapshots of an entity in flux—a postconciliar entity as exciting and hopeful as the Church itself in these years.

# CHRONOLOGY OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

By Michael J. Sheehan

This chronology of significant events is provided in order to give the reader an overall view of the Council's origins and its most important activities since its first meeting in 1969. The articles which follow go into greater detail on the items listed in the chronology.

*1968, April 23-24, St. Louis*—USCC general meeting, approval by the bishops of a Booz, Allen, Hamilton reorganization plan for NCCB/USCC; inclusion in the plan of a national advisory council for the USCC.

*1968, September 17-18, Washington*—*Ad Hoc* committee meeting under Archbishop Dearden to determine and begin the process of selection of first Advisory Council members.

*1969, March 25-26, Washington*—First meeting of the Advisory Council; orientation, explanation of function by Archbishop Dearden and Bishop Bernardin; presentations on the USCC offices, departments, and divisions; organization of Council committees.

*1969, October 3-4, Washington*—Second meeting; recommendations made on the activities of each USCC department; recommendation urging ordinaries to establish diocesan pastoral councils and office at USCC for pastoral councils; recommendation on the Black Manifesto, including an increased commitment of Church resources to the black community.

*1970, February 17-18, Washington*—USCC Administrative Board requests the Advisory Council to undertake a study of the nature and feasibility of a national pastoral council.

*1970, March 13-15, Kansas City, Kansas*—Third meeting; establishment of a steering committee to begin study of the feasibility of a national pastoral council.

*1970, August 29-31, Chicago*—Mundelein Consultation on the feasibility of a national pastoral council—101 dioceses, 36 organizations participate.

*1970, September 11-13, Marriottsville, Md.*—Fourth meeting; recommendations concerning the Campaign for Human Development, the Spanish-speaking and conscientious objection.

1971, February 12-14, Marriottsville, Md.—Fifth meeting; determination of priorities for the USCC, recommendation that press be invited to USCC meetings; emphasis on the need for dialogue between the bishops and the National Office for Black Catholics.

1971, September 10-12, Marriottsville, Md.—Sixth meeting; report of steering committee adopted—a national pastoral council while desirable is not feasible now; efforts needed to make a national pastoral council feasible; recommendations to the bishops for continued development of diocesan pastoral councils, an NCCB office for diocesan pastoral councils, enlargement of Advisory Council responsibilities to include NCCB, invitations to representatives of the Advisory Council to attend NCCB/USCC general meetings, designation of pastoral councils as topic for spring, 1972 regional discussions at the Atlanta general meeting of the bishops. Recommendations on the CHD, on the appointment of more minority bishops, on the role of women in the Church.

1971, November 15-19, Washington—The NCCB votes to implement several recommendations of Advisory Council; Advisory Council becomes advisory to the NCCB Administrative Committee as well as to the USCC Administrative Board; approval of admission of auditors to the NCCB/USCC general meetings.

1972, February 11-13, Marriottsville, Md.—Seventh meeting; recommendations for regional pastoral consultations on justice and peace and use of the 1971 synodal document, *Justice in the World*; Cardinal Krol addresses the Council and offers the liturgy; recommendations on the publication of the priesthood study commissioned by NCCB.

1972, April 11-13, Atlanta—NCCB/USCC general meeting; five Advisory Council members among the laity, religious and priest observers; regional discussions on the topic suggested by the Advisory Council, Pastoral Councils and Shared Responsibility.

1972, September 8-10, Marriottsville, Md.—Eighth meeting; recommendations on diocesan pastoral councils, on the holding of regional pastoral consultations on youth and the Church in 1973, concerning a future national pastoral council; recommendations on the needs of Catholics living in doubtfully valid marriages, against the publication of the document entitled *The Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education*, on priestly life and ministry, on the reorganization of the council to reflect its new responsibilities; recommendations to the Administrative Board about communications, support for a constitutional amendment for non-denominational prayer, on youth, anti-busing, and a national conference on justice in the world.

1972, November 13-16, Washington—NCCB/USCC general meeting—

Rosa Gonzales, Council member, addresses the bishops in the name of the observers.

1972, *December 27-29, Marriottsville, Md.*—Interdisciplinary study on the concept of a national pastoral council sponsored by the steering committee for a national pastoral council; participation by eleven scholars from the fields of history, education, scripture, theology, canon law, sociology, psychology, and organizational skills.

1973, *February 2-4, Farmington, Michigan*—Ninth meeting; recommendations supporting a national pastoral letter on Christian moral values, the invitation of Council members to participate in spring regional meetings, the sending of materials on shared responsibility to the bishops urging that pastoral letters be written on the subject, new bylaws for the Council. The Council urges the better implementation of the educational dimension of CHD, prompter transmittal of CHD funds to the national office, recommendations concerning the Spanish-speaking Catholics, and amnesty for conscientious objectors to the Vietnamese war.

1973, *Spring Regional Meetings*—"Youth and the Church," suggested by the Advisory Council, is a topic for regional meetings; most Council members participate in the regional meetings around the country.

1973, *September 7-9, Marriottsville, Md.*—Tenth meeting; recommendations for an office of shared responsibility and for training programs for pastoral council personnel, of four models for consideration as a national pastoral council, the role of women in the Church; observations on the NCCB regional meetings, expression of pastoral concern about the first confession/first communion question as well as for the renewal of the procedural norms for marriage cases, and for procedures for laicization; recommendations for further study, but no immediate action on Catholic membership in the National Council of Churches, on the Spanish-speaking, on the canonization of Blessed Mother Seton; recommendations that communications in the Church be the topic for the 1974 spring NCCB regional meetings, that a history of the first five years of the Advisory Council be drawn up, on corporate investments, on prison reform, in support of the United Farm Workers, on the ministry of the Church to youth, on the updating of the Commission on the Colored and Indians, concerning the quality of life, and about the institutionalized mentally retarded.

1973, *September 10, Washington*—NCCB Administrative Committee decision to delay further study of a national pastoral council for the immediate future but continued efforts urged for the development of the concept of shared responsibility, parish and diocesan pastoral councils.

1973, *November 12-16, Washington*—NCCB/USCC general meeting; William Baroody, chairman of the Advisory Council steering committee for a national pastoral council, addresses the bishops in the name of the observers.

1973, December 3-5, Cleveland, Ohio—Several Advisory Council members and staff participate in organizing and conducting a national workshop on pastoral planning.

1974, February 1-3, San Antonio, Texas—Eleventh meeting (held in San Antonio to highlight the concerns of Spanish-speaking Catholics); recommendations on the Catholic observance of the bicentennial, on the national catechetical directory effort, concerning a right-to-life constitutional amendment, on the regional election process for Advisory Council members, on statements prepared for adoption by the USCC Administrative Board on Chile and South Vietnam, and on the policy for such statements, urging strong USCC action to help the International Development Association; recommendation for an office on shared responsibility in NCCB, the funding of which would be sought by Mr. William Baroody, chairman of the newly constituted standing committee on shared responsibility.

1974, Spring Regional Meetings—Council members participate in the meetings and the topic is the use of Modern Means of Communication as Instruments for Evangelization.

1974, August 12, Washington—NCCB/USCC Research, Plans and Programs Committee decides against an NCCB committee and secretariat for shared responsibility but will allow for one which would be limited to pastoral councils.

1974, September 13-15, Marriottsville, Md.—Twelfth meeting, Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Jean Jadot, addresses Council and celebrates the Eucharist; recommendations on the Eucharistic Congress, on women and the Church, of support for Catholic University of America, on the day of prayer and study on the renewal of faith, scheduled for the November, 1974 bishops' meeting, on the permanent diaconate, on the Holy Year pilgrimages, on supporting USCC pro-life activities, on the revision of the U.S. priestly formation program, on ecumenical affairs; there were also recommendations on the housing and urban crisis, the disposition of Montezuma Seminary properties, on the USCC Department of Education, in particular for the establishment of a national commission on married life in the Department, on Catholic Relief Services, and the World Hunger Crisis, urging a statement for amnesty.

1974, November 18-22, Washington—NCCB/USCC general meeting, Mrs. Teddy Nardi, Council member, in the name of the observers addresses the assembly of bishops.



# A VENTURE IN SHARED RESPONSIBILITY

By John Cardinal Dearden

A functioning Advisory Council was seen as a hoped-for instance of shared responsibility in the Church at the national level. In several discourses that I had addressed to the bishops, I had spoken of shared responsibility as a need of the Church and felt that some movement in this direction should be taken not only at the local level, but at the national level as well.

And yet in trying to achieve shared responsibility at the national level, the matter took on an unusual degree of complexity. It was evident from the beginning that a national pastoral council, in the strict sense of the term, was not immediately, if ever, achievable. What was needed as an initial step was a structure that could reflect the spirit of the total American Church in a way that would help the bishops meet their responsibilities to that Church. The devising of a formula was not a simple process.

Initially it seemed best to relate the work of the projected Advisory Council to the USCC. Since the USCC functions in the arena of public action, it touches upon a range of concerns that very immediately fall into the purview of the total Church. For this reason it was judged that the bishops would be more accepting and more understanding of the participation by an advisory body in their activities in that field. And in order to focus the impact of the participation of such a body as effectively as possible, it was judged best to have its point of insertion into the organization come through the Administrative Board of the USCC.

Once the matter was proposed for consideration by the bishops, it was accepted with great readiness and, seemingly, with few reservations. The record of movement of the concept through the conference is reflected in the minutes of the meetings of that time.

Perhaps the most difficult task at the outset was the choice of the persons who would serve on the council. To be representative of the total Church, it was necessary that its membership be drawn from all segments of the Church. Yet, granted the vastness and the complexity of this country, no simple process could bring about the representation

that was called for. Ultimately, a central committee was carefully brought together to choose the membership of the Advisory Council from persons whose names were presented from throughout the country by a process of election or selection. The committee could work only with the names that had been proposed. It was not free to add others of its own choosing. Through an involved procedure, the initial membership was brought together.

Within a remarkably short span of time—one year or so—the Advisory Council demonstrated its responsibility and maturity. What contributed greatly to the effectiveness of the Advisory Council almost from the beginning was the character of the original membership. The process of selection had brought together a most representative group of persons—bishops, priests, religious, and laity—a true cross-section of the American Church. Its membership reflected differences and commonalities. Certainly one of the first blessings that the undertaking received was the caliber of the original body. Because it was so diversified, so representative, yet so loving of the Church, it established its own distinctive esprit de corps and achieved a level of effectiveness that was extraordinary. The soundness of its presentations to the Administrative Board and the evidence of prayerful reflection that had preceded them won a high level of acceptance.

The very favorable experience with the Advisory Council in its relationship with the USCC helped to win acceptance of the proposal to broaden the scope of its concerns to the whole range of affairs considered by the bishops' conference. This would involve matters under consideration by the NCCB as well as the USCC. In the light of our earlier experience, it was felt that the most effective point of insertion for this new area of interest would be the Administrative Committee of the NCCB. Looking back over the years, I feel that our judgment was sound in proposing that the central boards of the two bodies be the point of contact between the Advisory Council and the bishops.

In retrospect, I think that it can be said that our hopes for a responsible body representative of the Church and lovingly committed to it have been strikingly realized. The Advisory Council has truly been a representative, responsible voice of the American Church, giving true, valid input into the deliberations of the bishops and bringing new dimensions into their thinking.

In a number of instances the importance of issues under consideration by the bishops has been underscored and their directions have been reinforced by the counsel that has come from the Advisory Council. In other instances matters have come up for consideration by the bishops that conceivably would have been bypassed had it not been for a strong representation by the Advisory Council. Even at times when the bishops

were unable to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Council, the process of evaluating them was itself a positive and constructive experience.

As is evident, the process has extended over a period of time. When the issue of opening the meetings of the bishops to attendance by non-bishops was raised, among those who had first title to participate were members of the Advisory Council. Allowing their representatives to sit at the general sessions of the bishops' meetings was an expression of trust and confidence. That trust and confidence had been earned.

All in all, it has been a healthy experience for the Church in the United States. I am confident that, as the Advisory Council gains more experience and grows to a fuller understanding of the various issues in which the Church is involved, and particularly grows in its own awareness of the movement of the life of the Church, it will have a lasting contribution to make.

The concept of this type of participation in decision-making is a sound one. Providentially, the initial concept has developed and matured on a secure basis. The experience that the bishops have had with it has been encouraging and helpful. A decision of the bishops' conference which has been enriched by the thoughtful ecclesial thinking of the Advisory Council reflects more surely the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

# ORIGINS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

By Most Rev. Francis T. Hurley

The proposal for the establishment of the Advisory Council for the United States Catholic Conference was the natural consequence of two forces affecting the Church in the United States in the late 1960s. One was the thrust of the Second Vatican Council urging wider participation by all Catholics, and particularly the laity, in the life, activity and even administration of the Church. The other was the rather business-like reorganization and restructuring of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the national coordinating agency of the bishops of the United States, under the guidance of the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton. The first force provided the ideology and the spirit; the second, the technique and structure.

The basic reorganization of the NCWC led almost inevitably to an advisory council. The NCWC became two entities, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the United States Catholic Conference (USCC). For many the establishment of two organizations seemed a distinction without a difference. Both were described as organizations of the bishops. It seemed that the bishops wore one hat or the other almost at whim. The distinction, however, did constitute a difference both by reason of activity and of the involvement of laity, religious and priests, other than staff, in the actions and policies of the bishops relating to the Church nationally.

The USCC is concerned with socio-civic-educational-charitable activities in which the laity and religious have a special competence and responsibility. Because of this they should be brought into the decision-making process to the extent their status warrants.

The NCCB, on the other hand, was to focus on matters of a more ecclesiastical, liturgical, canonical and pastoral nature. Not that the laity have no vested interest in these matters, but the responsibility for final decisions in these areas is properly that of the bishops.

The involvement of the laity in the decision-making process became the pivotal point in considering an advisory council. The documents of Vatican II made it clear that pastoral councils and priests' senates at the diocesan level were solely advisory. Yet neither the NCCB nor the

USCC was comparable to a diocese in structure, competency or authority. Further, an argument could be made that the laity, by reason of their inherent rights, should have more than merely a voice in some public issues affecting the Church politic.

For example, federal aid to education. This is an issue involving the parents' prime right in the education of their children and the right and responsibility of the bishops with regard to the religious education of children. In addition politics—sometimes partisan politics—and economics entered the picture. Two questions were asked: Should the decision on federal aid be made solely by the bishops or by the bishops and laity together? Should either group alone make the final decision? In answer the bishops reserved to themselves the final decision, but the questions had been raised.

There was rather immediate acceptance by the bishops of the concept of an advisory council. It fit clearly into the spirit of Vatican II. Developing the arena of activity for the council even helped to sharpen the focus of NCCB and USCC and to clarify the distinction between them. The council would be attached to the USCC, the agency which focused on the civic-political realm, a realm of proper competency for the layman. The council was positioned somewhat parallel to the Administrative Board, receiving reports and reviewing proposals from the conference's departments and making its recommendations to the board. The members of the council would not make the decisions but would be involved in the process.

It was not deemed necessary to ask the Advisory Council to serve the same function for NCCB. The NCCB through its committee memberships had considerable input from the laity and religious. More important, however, confining the council to USCC implied a greater degree of involvement in the decision-making process in matters in which the laity have a proper role.

The management consultant team from Booz, Allen & Hamilton explored alternate roles for members of the advisory council. One was the role of voice and vote; the other was that of voice only.

The role of voice and vote posed two difficulties. Granting such to a cross-section of priests, religious and laity would be tantamount to bringing them into membership on the Administrative Board of USCC, which, according to the reorganization plan, was to be comprised of bishops only. The consultant team felt that such involvement was not warranted or, if warranted, not timely.

The second difficulty was the effect of granting vote as well as voice on the concept of shared responsibility. This concept, while not new in the Church, needed more maturation. The decision was made, therefore, to attach the Advisory Council to the USCC in an advisory capacity.

The method of selection of the membership of the first Advisory Council is a matter of record. Certain concepts guided the system of selection. The members were to be a cross-section of bishops, priests, religious and laity. They were to be drawn from the Catholic people at large and not on the basis of institutional or organizational affiliation. They were to be classed not as representatives of any group (except the general categories of bishops, priests, religious and laity), ethnic community or geographical area. Rather, each member was to be a responsible Catholic who brought a particular expertise and knowledge to the deliberations of USCC.

The selection system was a combination of regional meetings designating 200 candidates, a national committee identifying 50 members from among these 200, and the Administrative Board of USCC making the final appointment of the 50. The system succeeded in bringing together a group of Catholics who reflected a very broad spectrum of the Catholic people of the United States—differing attitudes, racial and ethnic groups, regions, economic conditions, age, and even church organizations.

The regional meetings were an effective means of obtaining an imposing list of 200 candidates. Most bishops took very seriously the invitation from the president of USCC to send delegates to the regional meetings, choosing either personally or through councils, senates and lay organizations delegates very alive to developments in the Church. Only a few bishops selected the “standbys,” good Catholics but of no special competence or interest. A very few of the delegates—and there were some—were just dispatched from a chancery to be present for the rollcall of dioceses.

Some leaders of national Catholic organizations viewed the council either as a threat to their status or as superfluous or as a body that would not be sufficiently independent of the bishops. The Administrative Board of USCC, however, persisted in its determination to select on the basis of individual competency rather than organizational affiliation.

Some staff of USCC looked at the council with wary eye. Was it to be a super review board? A threat to the newly formed departmental committees that were comprised of a cross-section of bishops, priests, religious and laity? An intrusion of outsiders in their domain? Another layer of bureaucracy between a department and the Administrative Board?

To allay such fears it was made clear that the members of the Advisory Council had no relationship to any department, except the Executive, nor were they to enter into dealings with departmental staff.

The council would, indeed, review the activities of the departments but its report was to be merely another voice of consultation—whether

affirmative or critical of the departments—for the bishops in reaching their decisions.

The reporting procedure of the council is probably its weakest feature. Being only a voice, the council's thoughts and recommendations can easily be lost among many others, particularly since its "voice" is merely a report, and it is not involved in the give and take of dialogue and debate at the table where decisions are made.

The USCC Advisory Council represented a desire of the bishops to bring responsible Catholic laity, priests and religious into the decision-making process on matters about which they have as great a concern as the bishops and often a comparable responsibility. The subject matter of the council was limited initially to what came within the purview of USCC in order to set the outer limits beyond which the bishops must retain ultimate responsibility. Within those limits, however, the Advisory Council was a model for involving the people of God in decisions affecting all of them. As a model it was expected that experience would dictate its growth, development and degree of involvement. Key to that development is a single question: Should the final decisions of USCC, a civic-political agency of the Church, be made by the bishops alone or by responsible people from many segments of the Church?

The Advisory Council subsequently became formally attached to the NCCB as well. In that area it must retain solely an advisory role because the bishops, as leaders of the Church and by reason of their office, cannot delegate their decision-making powers in the NCCB. In the USCC, however, the potential exists for moving beyond a solely advisory capacity. Whether that potential could or should be realized only experience will tell.

# EARLY DAYS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

By Francis X. Kennelly

A few weeks before the first meeting of the Advisory Council I received a telephone call from Msgr. Francis T. Hurley, now Bishop Hurley and then Associate General Secretary of the United States Catholic Conference. Msgr. Hurley explained that a temporary or acting chairman was required to conduct the first meeting. He asked me if I would accept this temporary position and I readily agreed to do so. It was suggested that I arrive in Washington early on Friday, March 25, 1969 for a meeting with Msgr. Hurley and Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin, General Secretary of USCC, in order to discuss the proposed agenda and the arrangements for the meeting which was to begin that evening.

I met with Bishop Bernardin and Msgr. Hurley early on the afternoon of March 25 at the Executive Offices of USCC. After meeting the staff and reviewing the physical arrangements which had been prepared, we discussed the format for the meeting. I was pleasantly surprised and extremely gratified to learn that, with the exception of the necessary orientation planned and the logistical problems which had been settled in advance, the Advisory Council was actually expected to organize itself, decide upon its own structure and method of operation, select its own agenda and in general conduct its affairs free from any direction or supervision which might have been superimposed upon it from either the USCC or its executive officers.

After reviewing the plans for the orientation discussion that evening and the proposed reports to be given by the directors of the five departments of USCC the following day, I inquired if any assignments would be given to the members of the Advisory Council prior to the next general assembly. I was advised that, in keeping with the idea that the council would be free to evolve its own structures, there were no preconceived plans for the members to take any action at this first meeting. I suggested that it would be a shameful waste of time and talent if the members were to leave this first meeting with no assignment to prepare for the next meeting, and it was agreed that we would suggest that committees be formed of and by the members to work in the five general areas of concern of the USCC departments.



It was also apparent that for the work of reviewing the USCC departmental activities we could have each committee review and report on the department which was its special concern. In this manner it became evident that, if the members were in accord with this thinking, the work of the Advisory Council could be accomplished through the committee system rather than by the council acting as a committee of the whole. It was agreed that, if the committee system was acceptable, each member of the council should insofar as possible be free to select the committee in whose subject matter he or she had the most interest and was best suited by special background, knowledge or expertise. We would also suggest that of the general divisions of council membership, i.e., bishops, priests, religious, lay men and women, be represented on each committee.

Now that it appeared we might leave this first meeting as a working council, it was necessary to propose that officers be elected in order to conduct the ongoing business of the council. We agreed that no election should take place until the end of the meeting. This would allow everyone to become acquainted with each of the members and give each of us a reasonable opportunity to make judgments about proposed officers and nominations to come from the floor before the final votes were cast. It would be necessary, however, to select a nominating committee after the first orientation session in order that they might have time to observe the members and place names in nomination. It was further agreed that the nominating committee should be asked to select two slates of officers in order that there would be some initial choices available, and that the committee should be composed of one person from each of the general categories of membership.

To prepare for the succeeding meetings it was assumed that an agenda committee would be required. Since we anticipated that committees would be formed and meet on the following day, it was proposed that each committee then elect a chairman and secretary; the chairmen thus selected could serve on an agenda committee with the officers of the council.

With these matters mapped out and after reviewing such items as the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report and the limited scope of the competence of the council—i.e., within the framework of USCC only—a tentative agenda for the meeting was prepared.

I have gone into some detail with regard to the events of my initial meeting with the authorities at USCC not only because I was the only member of the council present but, more important, because I believe they demonstrate very well that the council was given complete freedom to control its own fortunes. At the beginning of our meeting Bishop Bernardin and Msgr. Hurley had planned this first meeting only as an orientation session and as an opportunity for the members to become

acquainted with each other. They were quite evidently pleased when I encouraged them to believe that our members would want to get organized immediately and feel they had an assignment on which to get started before leaving the meeting. I am also certain, as was demonstrated later by the other members, that all of us were of the same mind with regard to assisting, in our own way, with the business of the USCC as soon as possible. I believe this freedom to evolve and the attitude of openness sparked the enthusiasm of each member of the council as the first meeting progressed.

The first opportunity the newly formed council members had to meet and become acquainted with each other and some of the staff of USCC was during a reception and dinner held prior to the evening session. The success of this first gathering was insured by the easy manner and genuine warmth of Archbishop John F. Dearden, Chairman of the Administrative Board of USCC, whose keen interest in each of the members he met as he circulated among them seemed to set an example for everyone. The other bishops rejected any form of ceremony or special title and soon made one feel that, as members of the council, they neither expected nor wished to be granted any special recognition. This relaxed attitude on the part of the bishops helped all of us to attain a feeling of unity from the very start which has grown over the years into a sense of community which can only be known to those of us who have experienced it as members of the Advisory Council.

An example of what I have been trying to communicate would be appropriate. During the dinner following the reception, I was seated at a table beside Archbishop Dearden. On his other side was a young lady who was then the youngest member of the council. Throughout dinner she several times addressed the Archbishop, to my amazement, as "Father." Later I asked her if she realized she had been calling Archbishop Dearden "Father" all evening. She explained that, after she had told him that she did not know how to address him in ordinary conversation, he had insisted that she call him "Father." I cite this not merely because it demonstrates the humility of the Archbishop but also as a further example of the effort made by all in authority to have the council members recognize that they were to be accepted as a part of the USCC team working hand in hand with the leadership of the conference for the best interests of the Church in the United States.

After dinner the meeting was officially opened with prayer by Archbishop Dearden. Bishop Bernardin then explained in some detail the organization of USCC, the relationship of the departments, divisions and committees, and the relationship of the Advisory Council to the Administrative Board. He explained the history, nature and purposes of the organization. Archbishop Dearden then explained why the Advisory

Council was conceived and how it was to function in relation to the rest of the USCC. The council was to be only advisory, as its name clearly implied. However, its deliberations and advice would be expected to form a part in the decision making of the Administrative Board. The council would function in three areas: first in an appraisal of the work of the departments of USCC; second to discuss and advise on particular matters presented to the council by the Administrative Board; and finally it would be free to consider such matters of interest to the Church in the United States as it might on its own initiative believe to be of concern to the people of God and the members of the hierarchy.

It was made perfectly clear that the council was to be concerned only with matters within the area of concern of USCC. A clear distinction was made between the competency of USCC and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The council's concerns would be restricted to those matters pertaining to planning and conducting programs in the Church's social, economic, educational and public affairs. It would not concern itself with questions of liturgy, ecumenism, priestly life and other pastoral concerns of NCCB.

Archbishop Dearden made it clear that we were to be free to develop our own council. We were expected to work to make it whatever we thought it should be. We were to work together as 50 Christian people interested in the actions and activities of the Church in the United States and, insofar as might be possible, as though there were no distinctions among us with regard to rank in the Church. Each member would be expected to give his advice freely and without fear of questions of motive. Each was to draw upon his or her own personal experience and background in order that every question might reflect the thinking of the entire Church. We were not selected as representatives of any group or area and should not feel that we should necessarily reflect the opinions of others. We were, however, thought to be representative of all of the various people of the Church in the United States and in that manner our advice would represent the thinking of a cross-section of the Catholic populace. After the answers to several questions which helped to clarify the information given, and which were addressed to Archbishop Dearden and Bishop Bernardin, the proposed agenda for the following day was discussed and accepted. A nominating committee was appointed and the meeting closed.

After the meeting I conferred briefly with the members of the nominations committee, Bishop Raymond Gallagher, Sister Marie Augusta Neal, Mr. Ruben Cardenas, Mrs. John Casey and Msgr. Richard Dwyer. They were already reviewing the biographical sketches of the various members. Again it was emphasized that two persons should be nominated for the office of chairman, vice chairman and secretary and that members of the nominations committee should not be excluded

from those to be nominated. Most of the council members remained for some time after the meeting discussing the events of the evening. It was apparent from many of the discussions of these small groups that the only real concern, if not disappointment, was the restriction of the council's advice to USCC exclusively.

I was requested by Msgr. Hurley to accompany him to Archbishop Dearden's room at the hotel later that evening to report to the Archbishop and Bishop Bernardin. I recall giving them my candid appraisal of the events of the evening and the reactions of the members with whom I had had an opportunity to discuss the matters after the meeting. It was very evident that Archbishop Dearden was most concerned for the success of the council and he wanted to be informed regarding the acceptance by the members of his explanations and proposals. I told him of the general enthusiasm of those with whom I had time to communicate and he seemed quite pleased with my report.

On Saturday, March 26, 1969 the meeting was reconvened at USCC headquarters. The various directors of the departments of USCC explained the work of their respective departments and the divisions within them. Each of the directors answered several questions from the council regarding their work.

Having had this opportunity to learn of the workings of the departments the council agreed to form five committees, one for each department of USCC then operating. The members were given ballots upon which to indicate their preference for committee work; assignments were made using the ballots as a guide. The committees were then given time to meet and organize. In the process they were requested to elect a chairman and secretary.

The nominating committee reported and elections were conducted for the officers of the council. The following were elected:

Chairman	—	Francis X. Kennelly
Vice Chairman	—	Charles G. Tildon
Secretary	—	Helen Casey

Social Development Committee

Chairman	—	David Doherty
Secretary	—	LeMay Bechtold

Christian Formation Committee

Chairman	—	Joseph Maguire
Secretary	—	Fr. Ernest Burns

International Affairs Committee

Chairman	—	Maureen McNamara
Secretary	—	Mrs. Allen Benjamin

Health Affairs Committee

Chairman	—	Archbishop Thomas McDonough
Secretary	—	Mrs. John Merlo

Communications Committee

Chairman	—	Msgr. J. Paul O'Connor
Secretary	—	Msgr. Henry McMurrough

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held for two full days, a Friday and Saturday, in order to allow sufficient time to cover the work which was anticipated. The dates of October 3 and 4, 1969, were accepted and the meeting was adjourned.

The agenda committee held its first meeting at USCC headquarters in June 1969. Msgr. Hurley met with us and his immediate reaction was consternation over the composition of the committee. For the first time he realized that, after months spent on the selection of Advisory Council members to insure a cross-section of all the people of the Church in the United States, everyone on the agenda committee with one exception was of Irish descent. Despite this handicap the several chairmen of the committees had suggestions for agenda items which were reviewed by the agenda committee. We agreed on several suggestions for review and report by each committee and decided to send them to the members who were to reply by indicating which of the items they felt should be given priority. Their replies were to be sent to USCC headquarters in time for our final agenda committee meeting in August.

At the August meeting, again held in Washington, we were able to agree upon a tentative list of items for discussion and review. We were also informed that the council would receive, at a later date, reports of the USCC departments which would also be included for review at our October meeting.

The agenda committee was disappointed that no specific questions were presented to the council by the Administrative Board. Msgr. Hurley assured us that such questions would be forthcoming in the future.

The comprehensive records of the minutes of the meeting of October 3 and 4 and the detailed report contained in the minutes of the Administrative Board meeting of November 8, 1969, fully indicate the scope and importance of the items covered. Two things stand out with regard to the October 3 and 4 meeting: first, the universal feeling of the members that they had insufficient time to work on the voluminous reports of the USCC departments; second, the debate on the response to the Black Manifesto.

Although a great deal of the time allotted for the meeting was spent considering the Black Manifesto and the other concerns of the social

development committee, I have always felt that the time and effort expended may have been the triggering device for what I believe was the response of the hierarchy to the social needs of the entire country in the institution of the Campaign For Human Development. It is my personal opinion that this and other social and economic responses to the Mexican-American community were among the most important activities generated by the deliberations of the Advisory Council in its formative years.

# AN EYE ON PRIORITIES: 1971

By Charles Tildon

During the September, 1970, meeting I was privileged to be elected chairman of the Advisory Council for the calendar year 1971. Other officers were: Joseph Maguire, vice chairman, and LeMay Bechtold, secretary.

However, my first experience in chairing a meeting of the USCC Advisory Council came quite unexpectedly at the Kansas City meeting in March of 1970 when I was called upon, in my capacity as vice chairman, to carry out the office of chairman for most of the meeting. Subsequently, I went to San Francisco to report on the recommendations of the Advisory Council to the USCC Administrative Board. This meeting was held in conjunction with the general meeting of bishops, and the communications media were broadly represented. I was given the opportunity to share part of a press conference with Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin, General Secretary of the Conference, Cardinal Dearden, President, and Archbishop Hannan, Chairman of the Communications Committee, where the major interest was the progress of the committee established to study the feasibility of a national pastoral council.

This was a new experience for me as a lay member of the Catholic Church. I felt it to be especially significant that a member of the black community was on national television representing the national Advisory Council of the United States bishops.

During the February, 1971 meeting of the Advisory Council the major agenda item was a study of priorities of the United States Catholic Conference. In discussions with Bishop Bernardin and Father James Rausch, Associate General Secretary of USCC, this emerged as a topic of overriding importance. One of the primary reasons for this was the decline in revenue available to the USCC. The USCC Committee on Research, Plans and Programs was to conduct a careful review of all programs of the Conference, and it was felt that the Advisory Council could provide a valuable service to the committee by recommending priorities to the Administrative Board at its February meeting.

Mr. John O'Neill, Director of the Office of Research, Plans and Programs, presented the objectives of the type of study the council was requested to do. The council then divided itself into study groups to evaluate the work of the departments of USCC. Preliminary reports on

priorities were then reported to the Administrative Board. The following is a summary of priority recommendations:

“It is the opinion of the Advisory Council that the highest priority of USCC departments and divisions should be the reformation of the Christian conscience and consciousness. USCC participates in the mission of the Church herself to bring Christ to all men, but has the challenge and opportunity of meeting men where they are: in their educational and social needs, in their health problems, or in their various relationships with other persons, groups and nations. The priority for USCC is then to search out how the saving and life-giving message of Christ can be brought to the American people, in these areas of human concern.

“Then, as a means of accomplishing this goal, the Advisory Council is of the opinion that it would be helpful if the USCC were to intensify or even redirect its efforts towards utilizing and influencing the secular institutions of American culture. No longer can we hope to shape our nation's destiny by the influence of the Catholic school or the church pulpit alone. Rather, it is these secular forces, such as national legislation, or the utilization of mass media, or participation in international activities such as the UN, that we American Catholics can most effectively bring our values to bear in shaping our country's development.

“We do not suggest, however, that USCC abandon its direct role of service to the American Church. We recommend that USCC continue to service, in those areas of national concern where local dioceses and organizations are not able to do this for themselves.

“The committees unanimously concurred that there are several functions presently performed by the USCC as a service to the bishops and the American Catholic Church-at-large which are of major importance and can only be properly handled by a national organization such as the USCC. The USCC should, therefore, continue, as a matter of course, such functions as liaison with the federal government and other national governments, liaison with other U.S. national religions as a participant in joint programs and in a spirit of ecumenism, and assisting local bishops in information gathering, research and other staff functions more effectively and efficiently conducted at a national level.”

Among the membership of the council was a significant black presence as well as an influential Spanish-speaking presence. Their contributions were felt throughout the activities of the council. The relationship of USCC with minorities became an important issue discussed at the February 1971 meeting. At this time the Advisory Council recommended to the Administrative Board that it invite the National Office for Black



Catholics to enter into "dialogue with a competent committee of bishops in order to restudy the budget requests of NOBC in a spirit of realistic dialogue toward the goal of funding adequate to need."

As a result of these recommendations, a special committee of bishops met with the executive committee of the NOBC in Detroit. Further meetings were subsequently held between the *ad hoc* committee and NOBC. Funds which had been allocated (\$150,000 from Conference funds and \$50,000 from another source) were made available to the NOBC.

The council also addressed the needs of the Spanish-speaking community, commending the bishops for the transfer of the national office for the Spanish-speaking to Washington, so that more effective means of communication with USCC, governmental and other agencies could be maintained.

The council recommended the appointment of diocesan directors for the Spanish-speaking in places where there were significant numbers of Spanish-speaking people. It urged that these diocesan directors seek out the needs and be responsive to the particular problems of the Spanish-speaking people on the local level.

It was also requested of the Administrative Board that it brought to the attention of the NCCB that serious efforts should be made without delay to promote the appointment of Black and Hispanic-American Ordinaries in the United States.

The Campaign for Human Development was a major agenda item during the September, 1971, meeting. A report was presented to the Council by Father Robert Monticello, the newly appointed Executive Director of the CHD. He gave an extensive summary of CHD's allocation of funds, its educational endeavors, administrative functions, promotional activities, membership and budget. The Advisory Council was then given the opportunity to present specific recommendations to the Administrative Board concerning the CHD.

One of the Advisory Council's concerns was that the Campaign for Human Development shun the image of being solely the bishops' anti-poverty campaign. The image of the CHD as a program of the entire Catholic community was stressed in press releases. It was also recommended that publicity and follow-up programs should be incorporated to advise the contributors on how their monies were spent. Follow-ups on specific proposals were recommended to evaluate compliance of actions with objectives. The Administrative Board referred the council's recommendations to the National Committee for the Campaign for Human Development, and it was reported that most of these recommendations were acted upon favorably.

With the Synod of Bishops only a few weeks away, there was a strong interest in international affairs and the topic of justice at the September meeting. The council proposed to the Administrative Board that it consider setting up a symposium on *A Call to Action*, Pope Paul's recently published letter on justice, and the documents on justice in the world which would come out of the 1971 Synod. In his response to the Advisory Council, the General Secretary reported that such action was under consideration by the Committee on International Affairs and the Committee on Social Development.

Sister Marie Augusta Neal, attempting to raise the consciousness of the Council and the bishops to the needs of women, proposed a recommendation to Cardinal Dearden that the American bishops request that at least one woman religious and one lay woman from the United States be invited to attend the Synod and that they ask that women from other areas of the world also be invited. The rationale for this was that justice was a key topic of the Synod, and one of the justice problems of the world is the position of women. Women form about half the People of God in whose service the Synod meets; and men other than bishops have been invited to participate in the Synod, and, therefore, women want to be represented as well. This resolution passed with a vote of 29 in favor, one opposed, and one abstention. It was the response of the bishops that invitations to participate or act as observers to the Synod were considered the exclusive right of the Holy See and outside the purview of individual prelates or conferences of bishops.

While these are only a few of the discussions and recommendations of the Advisory Council which took place during my chairmanship, the deliberations of the council during that time encompassed many of the activities of the departments and divisions of the USCC. The deep commitment that each member of the council—bishop, priest, religious, lay man and woman alike—has for the continuing renewal and growth of the Church and the betterment of all men was apparent in the discussions of the council. Decisions, even those which were unanimous or close to unanimous, were reached only after discussions which must be described as tough-minded and hard-hitting, while being pervaded by charity. However, no matter how heated a debate might be, there was a common factor of a very real and dedicated love for the Church.

The evening social hour was of great importance to the success of the council. It was not uncommon for members to share their feelings, insights, encouragements and disappointments concerning the Church and the People of God with one another until the early hours of the morning.

These periods of relaxation, daily liturgies and the willingness of the council members to share in fellowship with one another helped to create

a praying and witnessing community. The Advisory Council has become an effective force in the deliberations of the Catholic Church because it is such a community. An expired term on the council does not mean a severance from it. If the Advisory Council is able to keep this spirit, a great deal can happen in the Church today.

# A NEW MANDATE: 1972

By Joseph H. Maguire

1972 was the last year that the United States Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council was comprised entirely of persons who had been members since its inception in 1969. The officers for 1972 were myself, chairman; David Doherty of Pontiac, Mich., vice chairman; and Mrs. John M. Merlo of Chicago, secretary.

One of the most important developments, perhaps the most important, in the workings of the council was the enlargement of its mandate from the United States Catholic Conference alone, to the problems and issues of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops as well. This had been sought for a long time by many of the members, and it eliminated one tension from the preceding years, the hesitation about crossing into what might be termed "NCCB territory." The enlargement of the mandate was taken by the members of the council as a manifestation of support and confidence in its work. The work of the Steering Committee concerned with the study of the feasibility of a National Pastoral Council had led strongly in this direction.

Early in 1972 it was decided to extend to Cardinal Krol, President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference, an invitation to come to the February meeting of the council. His Eminence accepted the invitation, came to the meeting and spoke to the membership. He also was principal celebrant of the Eucharist and remained for dinner. This visit was important because it gave the members a much better insight into the hopes and ideas of the conference president and made him more sensitively aware of the persons comprising the council and the methods of their interaction.

An invitation was extended to His Eminence, Cardinal Shehan, Archbishop of Baltimore, to join the council for the Eucharist and for dinner at the fall, 1972, meeting. This was done largely because so many of the meetings of the council had been held in his archdiocese at Marriottsville. He accepted the invitation and came to one evening of the meeting for Mass and dinner.

Since the early days of the council attempts had been made to have by-laws formed and accepted. It was not until 1972 that these by-laws were finally ratified by the membership. It is a tribute to the con-

cern and genuine care of the membership that the council functioned so well for so long without these rather necessary aids to good order.

Another problem which had manifested itself and which was remedied in 1972 was the question of when and how to replace members and how to fill vacancies. In the time since 1969 approximately 15 persons had either resigned, been removed for non-attendance, or become less than optimally effective because of irregular attendance. In 1972 for the first time, charter members left the council, having completed terms of service, and procedures were established by the council for its restructuring and the replacement of members. These changes were accepted by the Administrative Committee of the NCCB. It is important to mention here that, while the absence of so many members made for difficulties in representing the People of God in the various states of life, geographical regions, etc., the members present did manifest in their comments and interventions a sense of awareness of the needs of the whole Church in this country. Often questions or remarks would be framed in terms of how such an issue would affect this or that group—a group sometimes not clearly and directly represented in the active membership of the council.

The Advisory Council had become, and continued to develop as, a praying and loving community with a real interest in the needs of the Church. Each session gave several opportunities for group and individual prayer. Differences of opinion would be stated firmly but always without rancor. The spirit present while members were at prayer survived and permeated while they were at work in meetings, discussion groups and committees.

One of the requests made prior to 1972 by the Steering Committee concerned the presence of observers at the semi-annual meetings of the bishops. In 1972 the bishops allowed observers for the first time. There were representatives of priests, religious and laity. There were five representatives of the laity and these were chosen from the membership of the Advisory Council. The same members observed at the spring and fall meetings (held in Atlanta and Washington, respectively). Those who participated in this historic development were Mrs. John J. Casey, Mr. David Doherty, Mrs. Sabas B. Gonzales, Mr. Joseph H. Maguire, and Mr. Charles Tildon.

In 1972, especially but not exclusively because of the expanded mandate to the council, members seized the initiative more than had previously been the case in suggesting items for the agenda. This was especially so in the preparation of the September meeting.

Some of the concerns of the council were of an ongoing and continuing nature; others would appear only once on the agenda. One of the former was the *Priestly Life and Ministry Study*. Msgr. Colin Mac-

Donald, a member of the council, was also director of the secretariat of the bishops' *ad hoc* Committee for Implementation of the Study. Publication of the summaries of studies from the historical, sociological and psychological points of view was urged by the council. An example of the latter would be the proposed reorganization chart submitted for the USCC. Father James Rausch, Associate General Secretary of the conference, made the presentation concerning the justification and reasons for such a reorganization, and the council divided into small groups for more detailed study and reported to the assembly. The assembly accepted the reorganization and made its report to the Administrative Board of USCC reflect that it had heard all the small group reports and had incorporated these.

Sometimes items were proposed which did not receive the consideration of the council because the council honestly felt unable to handle the topic. One such topic, topic of great concern to the members but of professional concern to (and within the professional ken of) only a few of them, was religious education. The council conveyed to the administrative bodies of the bishops its concern and yet its unwillingness to enter where it, to a significant degree, lacked a highly professional competence.

One of the actions taken in the February meeting was the appointment of a committee (Sister Marie Augusta Neal, chairperson, Father Kevin O'Rourke and Mr. William Toomey) to study the accomplishments, methods and future directions of the council. The report of the committee was submitted after the September meeting.

In considering the reorganization of the USCC, the membership time and again pointed to the role of the minorities and their interests and asked how these would or would not be served or served more effectively. The council also showed some dissatisfaction with or lack of understanding of the division between NCCB and USCC. Another reaction heard frequently was the belief that the USCC should function within its budget.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to discuss the work of the council during the tenure of any chairman without discussing at least a little the work of the Steering Committee. Recommendations at the spring, 1972, meeting were that the bishops discuss diocesan, regional and national pastoral councils at their regional meetings in Atlanta in April, 1972. Another recommendation was that regional pastoral consultations be held in the fall of 1972 concerning justice and peace. Suggestions such as this surfaced at other times in the history of the council, and it is interesting to note that the NCCB Bicentennial observance will see a national conference on justice and peace.

The September, 1972, meeting referred a number of questions and recommendations to the Administrative Board of the USCC to be given

to the USCC Committee on Communications for consideration and study. These were given with a view toward a more thorough implementation of the Vatican's *Pastoral Instruction on Social Communications*. These included: "Should the Catholic Press merit a subsidy? . . . The high blown, feudal style of address and language common to papal documents should be changed. . . . All forms of censorship should be publicly rejected, except in extreme cases. . . . How do we provide access to the media for the powerless? . . . How does the Church effort become a supporter of legitimate protest through use of the media of communication and her channels of education? . . . How can the decision-making processes in the Church be improved so that concerned people can be made aware of the process and offer suggestions in the spirit of productive communications? . . . (This is especially true of decisions made by Roman congregations which concern the life of Catholics in the U.S.A.)"

One item discussed at length and with intensity was submitted to the agenda by one of the members and was timely because of news reports concerning Catholics living in doubtfully valid (but "good faith") marriages. Critical of the tribunal system, desirous of a pastoral spirit of love and mercy, sensitive to the respect for the indissolubility of marriage and the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the council recommended that the NCCB continue to explore this question together with the Catholic Theological Society of America and the Canon Law Society of America, with a view to developing radically improved procedures for expediting marriage cases, perhaps even at the parish level, and recommending such procedures to the Holy See. This motion was able to receive the widespread support of the membership, including bishops, priests, religious and laity.

Archbishop Whealon, a member of the Council, submitted to the discussion and scrutiny of the council a document entitled: *Basic Teaching for Catholic Religious Education*. This was done rather late in the development of the document, but the council nonetheless voiced its reservations strongly. After a long and heated discussion, a resolution was passed (21 in favor, 6 opposed, 3 abstentions—a very unusual vote for the council, which seldom had more than one or two negatives and one or two abstentions) which noted the far-reaching pastoral implications of the document; its style, content and timeliness; and the development and existence of the General Catechetical Directory and the U.S. National Catechetical Directory. It recommended that the NCCB neither adopt nor promulgate the document in its present form, and it also suggested that if such a document were to be issued in the future it be recast to include a strong emphasis on the prophetic role of the Church's mission and be published in such a way as to show that it is supportive of the best efforts of religious education. All of this from a council which had on some occasions claimed a lack of expertise in

religious education! It certainly reflected the ability and willingness of the members to learn, to undertake careful attention to those with expertise and then to act. Many manifested a strongly negative sense about the document.

Despite this, it was clearly evident that Archbishop Whealon, one of the principal authors of the document, was cherished and yes, even admired, for submitting it to the scrutiny of the council even though it had not originally been on the agenda. The recommendations made were not ultimately accepted by the Administrative Committee, but they were carefully reviewed and this was well understood by the membership. Advice is only that; it should be considered and evaluated; it need not always be accepted.

At its September meeting, the council heard brief reports concerning the Campaign for Human Development and the Division for the Spanish Speaking and requested in-depth reports at the first meeting in 1973. The council had been briefed frequently on these two areas and it felt that the time was ripe for an extensive review. The council also stated its support for the efforts of the conference concerning equality of educational opportunity for all Americans with particular reference to busing.

A somewhat divided vote (17 for, six against and two opposed) was passed supporting enabling legislation to permit the recitation in public schools of any of a number of nondenominational prayers composed by religious leaders in interfaith and ecumenical fashion so as not to offend any theology or person, with such prayers being optional for each student. The council held that this should be accompanied by a total look at the impact of religious activity on social developments in this country.

The membership often has the problem of having too many topics for discussion and too little time in which to treat them. One of these was the question, raised during a Sunday morning meeting, of provisions for retired priests and religious. There was great concern for the proper maintenance of these persons in a state of care that would satisfy their needs and the needs of justice and charity, to say nothing of gratitude. The concern was communicated to the Administrative Committee.

Bishop Borders, a member of the council, authored a report entitled: *The Responsibility of the Church to Develop a Realistic Ecclesial Atmosphere Congenial to the Life Style of Youth*. The council came time and again to a concern for youth and its relationship to the Church. Many times questions concerning credibility of the Church were raised. The council asked that the statement of Bishop Borders be made available to all bishops and that youth and the Church be considered seriously as a topic for the spring, 1973, regional meetings of the bishops. Both of these things were, in fact, done.



The reorganization of the council, finally resolved in the September, 1972, meeting, called for a total membership of 60, divided as follows: 12 laymen, 12 laywomen, six bishops and alternates, six priests and alternates, six religious men and women with alternates, and 18 at-large members, including two bishops. Minorities, youth, and other groups would be chosen for representation among the at-large delegates if not already satisfactorily represented.

Elected to serve as officers for 1973 were: David Doherty, chairman; Sister Angelita Myerscough, vice chairperson; and Mr. Everett Cahill, secretary.

At the end of 1972 the council began to replace some of its original members with newly chosen persons. The council was well on the way to fulfilling many of the hopes of those who had seen its birth. Now, on many occasions, references would be heard to the discussions and conclusions of the council—at meetings of the various committees of the conference, at the general meetings of the bishops, and in other forums. The council works with rather little publicity, but it does guarantee an intensity of consultation and evaluation on the work and plans of the conference that would be difficult to replace. The membership has proven itself deeply interested in many areas of concern and motivated by a love for the Church. It supports and it opposes—both openly, both prayerfully, and both thoughtfully. The respect that has grown among the members and between the members and the bishops is a good testimony of this.

I spoke in 1971 to the Administrative Board of USCC in reporting on one of the sessions of the council. I began my remarks with the words: "My Brothers. If these words of greeting are inappropriate, neither of us belongs here; if the greeting is appropriate, both of us—bishops and representatives of the Advisory Council—have reason to be here." I stayed, as did the bishops. There was, and is, reason for both to stay.

# A YEAR OF TRANSITION: 1973

By David J. Doherty

The development and maturation of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council during its first five years of existence has been a true sign of the continuing development of the American Catholic Church as it continues to strive, not always in harmony of effort but usually in harmony of purpose, to be sensitive to the will of the Holy Spirit and to meet the needs of the people of God in an ever more rapidly changing society.

1973 was a year of transition for the Advisory Council. It was the first year in which new members replaced original members, creating both an air of sadness at the departure of so many close friends and colleagues and a sense of anticipation at the realization that the spirit of Christian community which epitomized the original council would be more difficult to attain. Whereas the original membership had been together for more than five years without change, all subsequent bodies would face a one-third attrition each year and would never be together as an entire group for more than a single year.

1973 was a year of assessment and evaluation. The council received the evaluation report of its *ad hoc* committee which analyzed the efforts, organization and procedures of the council to date and at the same time expanded its membership, altered the representation, changed the system of election-selection to one of direct election, and approved formal by-laws.

It was a year of wonderment at the crises and frustrations that had been overcome through the help of the Holy Spirit and an honest, earnest, and rewarding pursuit of community prayer.

It was a year of thanksgiving that this most broadly representative body of American Catholics constituted by so many talented people of broadly diverse persuasions could represent often strongly divergent opinions in a spirit of mutual respect and Christian love.

It was a year of total turnover among the bishop-members, with all 10 bishops being replaced at the same time, a decision that probably would not have been repeated. It was, however, providential that John Cardinal Dearden, who inspired the birth of the council and shepherded it through several periods of trauma, was himself elected to the council.

He was then able to host the first meeting of new members in the Archdiocese of Detroit, present an orientation, place the council in perspective, and renew its hope for the future as a prime developer and practitioner of shared responsibility motivated by mutual Christian concern.

While 1973 was a year of transition, it was no less a year of productivity and debate on several major issues and actions. To explain adequately the significance of council actions it seems appropriate to comment on the process of the organization. The Advisory Council agenda is totally unrestricted. There is no issue of concern to the American Catholic Church to which the council cannot address itself and which it cannot, in turn, bring to the direct attention of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and/or the United States Catholic Conference.

Much of the agenda, however, is dictated by the necessity to react and advise the bishops on issues which they have placed on their own agenda for immediate action at their impending meetings. The imminence of formal action by the bishops and the timeliness of many of these items dictate Advisory Council priority. In addition to these issues, the membership can and does present its own concerns for the attention of the bishops. The staffs of the USCC and of the NCCB also keep the Advisory Council apprised of major issues under study by the several bishops' committees.

The bishops are influenced in several ways by Advisory Council decisions and recommendations. First, through the formal channel of Advisory Council communication, all recommendations are presented by an officer of the council both orally and in writing to the respective administrative bodies the USCC and NCCB. The bishops normally take this opportunity to ask questions, get a sense of the council vote and rationale for its position.

A second important avenue of communication and awareness is the influence of bishop members of the Advisory Council on their brother bishops, particularly those who serve on either of the respective administrative bodies. This form of influence cannot be valued too highly. The bishops who have participated to date on the council seem to have made the greatest adjustment among the membership in terms of evolving participation, sense of belonging, confidence in the openness and respect of the council, and advocacy for the process and the council's credibility in terms of sincerity, knowledge, preparation and prayerfulness. This relationship and the increasing number of bishops who have had an opportunity to share it is, perhaps, the most meaningful though subtle level of influence for the Advisory Council.

A third level of influence is exerted through strong and continuous

communication by the NCCB/USCC staff to the bishops. The staff members are constant advocates for the process of shared responsibility and serve most effectively as facilitators of that process.

A fourth conduit of communication has developed to a limited extent during the past three years. That is the Advisory Council's role as the principal lay observer of the bishops' general meetings as well as their regional meetings. While the need still exists to define and clarify the role of the observers, there is a unique opportunity for several members of the Advisory Council to become acquainted and participate with a large number of bishops in a more or less informal manner. It is possible that through some systematic effort the members of the Advisory Council could in a few years introduce themselves and have a brief discussion with each and every bishop in the country. There is an even stronger possibility of this at the regional bishops' meetings.

Finally, there is a continuing opportunity for each member of the council to communicate directly with his or her own bishop or with the bishops of his or her region. This opportunity to establish a personal relationship as well as to discuss specific issues of concern helps immeasurably in increasing the understanding and confidence of the bishops toward the work of the Advisory Council.

#### *Issues of Action and Debate*

1973 was highlighted by discussion and action on several important issues.

1) Recommendations to the bishops concerning a National Pastoral Council and the establishment of an Office for Shared Responsibility. While the NPC study is documented in detail in a separate section, it is important to highlight a few aspects in the context of 1973. At the 1973 fall meeting of the council four models for consideration as a national pastoral council were completed and given to the bishops in order to keep the idea of an NPC clearly in focus. In an effort to salvage the concept and buy time, the council also urged the bishops by a vote of 55 yes, 0 no, and 3 abstentions to establish an office on shared responsibility within the NCCB. This action was taken in recognition of the lack of preparedness among Catholics at large for an NPC and the necessity for the bishops to move on several fronts in assisting their people to understand better and develop a commitment to shared responsibility.

The decision of the Advisory Council was, first, to present the shared responsibility recommendation without tying it to the goal of a NPC, and, second, to present a detailed analysis of the NPC study including the concerns of the council for the negative publicity given NPC's by the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy, and then to seek a renewed commitment from the NCCB Administrative Committee.

The report presented to the NCCB was outlined as follows:

- A. Shared responsibility office
- B. Workshop for diocesan pastoral councils
- C. Training program for members of diocesan pastoral councils and parish councils
- D. Preamble and presentation of models for a National Pastoral Council
- E. Observations of regional bishops' meetings
- F. Recommendations on the structure and dynamics of an NPC as a result of the regional experience

The strategy of the Advisory Council was to place priority on obtaining the bishops' support for the promulgation of the concept of shared responsibility and for the strengthening of diocesan pastoral councils and the regional experience, then to test their present commitment to an NPC.

The result was clear. The bishops did support the effort toward shared responsibility and the strengthening in local dioceses of diocesan pastoral councils. They also dealt a serious blow to hopes for an NPC in the immediate future based largely on four considerations: 1) on the Advisory Council's original statement of two years before that an NPC was not feasible *at this time*; 2) on recent statements by Rome pertaining to the desirability of National Pastoral Councils; 3) on the need for further development of diocesan councils; and 4) on their own uncertainty over precisely what an NPC would entail.

2) The Advisory Council took specific action to encourage the bishops to give greater priority to the Spanish-speaking Catholics in terms of pastoral concerns at all levels, encouragement of vocations, and appointments to positions of high trust and decision making responsibility. Since the very first meeting of the council, the Spanish-speaking issue has received the most constant attention of any presented to the council. The Advisory Council has demonstrated great concern for the plight of Spanish-speaking Catholics and has submitted several recommendations on their behalf prior to 1973.

3) The Campaign for Human Development, while under the direct jurisdiction of its own advisory committee, nevertheless came under the general purview of the Advisory Council. Since one of the council members was also on the Campaign committee, it was convenient to receive a report of progress and difficulties at each council meeting. However, two in-depth presentations were also made to the council by the staff of the Campaign. The presentation at the spring meeting in Detroit prompted a lengthy series of recommendations, ranging from program direction to operation maintenance. These recommendations were not only well received by the bishops but were appreciated and acted upon by the staff of the Campaign. The efforts of the Campaign

staff to keep the Advisory Council well informed were a tribute to their desire to render service in the most complete way possible.

4) While more than a score of issues received the specific attention of the council in the two 1973 meetings, several generated very strong reaction. These included: a) opposition to the manner in which the decision on First Communion before first confession was communicated to the American bishops without proper acknowledgment of the practice of collegiality or the principle of subsidiarity; b) council support for an extension of the American norms for marriage tribunals (an issue which surfaced at council meetings on more than one occasion); c) concern over unreasonable delays in granting the laicization of priests; and d) council support for favorable consideration by the NCCB of the recommendations in the study by the *ad hoc* Committee for Priestly Life and Ministry. In each of the above issues the sentiment expressed by the council received an exceptionally strong vote of support.

5) Several major presentations were given to the Advisory Council by the staff and by members themselves. These prompted some initial reaction in the form of recommendations and resolutions, but more often than not they served to pave the way for future discussion and action. This is an effective means of planting a seed and providing basic information to allow the council to delve into the issue at a later date. Among the most significant issues presented in 1973 were: liturgy and worship, Church and youth, prison reform, quality of life, and corporate responsibility.

As this year of transition drew to a close it was apparent that the new members had been successfully assimilated into the council and were bringing a fresh dimension to its discussions. The reorganization appeared to be a healthy move in terms of direct constituent representation and accountability. The council had for some time wrestled with the problem of insufficient exposure to the average American Catholic. Although press releases and issues of special import did allow broader coverage, the concept of direct elections emanating from each diocese to the 12 regions could in the long run encourage more local interest in the activities of the council.

One of the major challenges presented by the transition was the maintenance of continuity provided by the constant membership of the first five years. This is an organizational challenge that will demand attention. However, the commitment and the sense of purpose remain and these represent the hope for the council and what it represents to the American Church. The shelving of plans for a National Pastoral Council in 1973 could give significant impetus to the evolution of the Advisory Council toward an even more representative body making an even greater contribution to the development of shared responsibility within the Church.

The United States Catholic Bishops' Advisory Council is a microcosm of the total American Church and must see itself as a constantly changing organization responding to the changing needs of the Church. While the evolution of the Advisory Council through its first five years was probably more rapid than it will be in the future, it will remain a major challenge of its membership and of the bishops themselves to see that the council not only fulfills its role of advising but continues its natural evolution according to the needs of the people of God.

This sensitivity to the will of the Spirit can only be maintained and sharpened by a continued emphasis within the council on community prayer and mutual support. This, perhaps, is the primary legacy of the first five years of council experience.

# THE END OF THE BEGINNING: 1974

By William A. Toomey, Jr.

1974 was the end of the beginning. The last 12 of the original members called together in the spring of 1969 to embark on a journey of shared responsibility in the Church in the United States came to the end of their terms on the Advisory Council. History is always written in the perspective of the writer, and thus is this chapter in the life of the council set to words.

Five years of continuous exposure to our brothers in Christ of Mexican American cultural background resulted in the selection of San Antonio, Tex., as the site for the first meeting of the council in 1974. Father Virgil Elizondo, vice chairperson, acted as host and arranged a meeting that warmly received the members and gave all a greater appreciation of the beauty and deep faith of the people of Mexican heritage. Sixteen new members had an opportunity to become assimilated into the council and hear from a council member who gave the original orientation in 1969—John Cardinal Dearden. Of special note in his talk was the concern that the council, through the elective process, not become populated with “common denominators.” The Church is diverse; so must those be who would be representative and of value to the bishops. The new members’ backgrounds, when viewed in light of the backgrounds of those elected the year before, seemed to have similarities. The experience of the year proved that the similarities extended into the deliberations of the council, a situation not completely pleasing to some members.

The council addressed itself to the matters of the NCCB and passed along concerns about the International Eucharistic Congress scheduled for 1976 in the United States; the Bicentennial celebration of the Church; the release for publication of all the new prayer forms in the new Sacramentary; the Scripture texts and the new Sacramental rites; the release of the report of the bishops’ *ad hoc* Committee for Priestly Life and Ministry; the willingness of the bishops to release the pastoral on our Blessed Mother “Behold Your Mother”; the National Catechetical Directory; the continued fight for quality of life; and the spring regional meetings of the bishops.

The council, in order to be of greater assistance in the preparation of the National Catechetical Directory, constituted an *ad hoc* committee to study the documents and report back to the body at future meetings. In response to inquiries and comments of regional chairmen and bishops



concerning the procedures for the election of council members on a regional basis, a new procedure was suggested. The basic element of the procedure was to utilize the spring regional meetings as a forum for the selection. This was not deemed advisable at this time by the NCCB.

The Steering Committee for a National Pastoral Council, in reflection on the response of the NCCB to its recommendations concerning the NPC, reported to the council that its task had been completed. The council, ever concerned about the theological principles of shared responsibility, voted to bring into being its first permanent committee, a Committee on Shared Responsibility. The council requested that the NCCB set up an Office on Shared Responsibility in Washington within the structure of the NCCB/USCC. Assistance in securing funds for this office was promised by the council. This was rejected by the NCCB. The council discussed the documentation of the USCC and made recommendations concerning: statements on Chile and South Vietnam; the policy of issuing statements on international justice issues; international development assistance; and the need to give greater emphasis to the pastoral problems of the Spanish-speaking.

The council heard a report on international concerns of USCC from Father J. Bryan Hehir, Director of the conference's Division of Justice and Peace. The report demonstrated to the council that the Church now had expertise in central staff that would be of great assistance in bringing the message of the Gospel to the problems of today in a manner understandable by all the People of God.

The 11th meeting of the council continued to upset many of the members who had expressed concern about the way the council operated to arrive at a report that was to give advice to the bishops. The council struggled with an agenda that was without major issues of the day, primarily because it was geared to the agendas of the Administrative Committee and Administrative Board. Members expressed a desire to have resolutions more formalized and arising out of the documentation and not from the interest of an individual.

Following the meeting the majority of council members were invited to participate in the spring regional meetings of the NCCB. In some regions members were given an opportunity to speak about the council, thus attempting to meet a continuing self-evaluation problem: belonging to a council that had influence but which was relatively unknown in the country.

The agenda committee met in mid-July to set the agenda. The documentation from the NCCB and USCC was expected to be heavy, with many items to be considered. The staff priests, as in the past, participated in the agenda meeting. This participation tended to affect strongly the direction of the agenda toward consideration of certain

items. A long-time interest of the council in the work of Catholic Relief Services finally resulted in the scheduling of a presentation by its director for the fall, 1974, meeting of the council. This was timely considering the Church's concern for world food problems.

The fall meeting returned to Marriottsville, Md., a site that was becoming the unofficial headquarters for the council. A new format was used to insure that all resolutions would be before the council, at least in preliminary form, by Saturday afternoon. Further, to meet the desire to bring grassroot concerns to the attention of the bishops, time was allotted to discuss issues proposed in advance by the members. The method was to be similar to the *varia* of the bishops' meetings.

The council reviewed items of the NCCB documentation and presented resolutions on: a theme for the 1976 Eucharistic Congress; the *ad hoc* Committee on Women in Society and the Church; complete openness regarding women in the ministry in the Church; the Catholic University of America; selection of a lay person to speak on "Renewal of Faith" at the Bishops' meeting; the permanent diaconate; matters of concern to pro-life endeavors; the Holy Year; priestly formation program; report of the Bishop's Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs; continued format of spring regional meetings; and rededication to the concepts of shared responsibility. Seven concerns of the membership were reported to the NCCB.

The council formally voted to express concerns to the USCC on: the housing and urban crisis; the Montezuma Seminary question; the Committee on Education and its Family Life section; Catholic Relief Services and the world hunger crisis; Committee on Social Development and World Peace on the world food crisis; amnesty; the Respect Life program of the Department of Education; the National Disaster Relief Committee report. Two concerns of the membership were reported to the USCC. The most intense discussion of the meeting concerned the question of amnesty.

The meeting was honored by the appearance and presentation of Archbishop Jean Jadot, Apostolic Delegate in the United States. His remarks were warm, filled with pastoral concerns and direction for the council. The questions to him were met with candor, wit and a sense of great awareness of the problems facing the Church in the United States.

The format adopted resulted in a more orderly handling of the business of the council. The chair at times was commanding in order that the agenda be completed. As is usual when people are attending their second meeting, many participated who had not participated at the previous meeting. However, the membership of so many from the same national organization, National Council of Catholic Women, tended to

rob the council of diverse thinking that is so necessary to meet the challenges facing the Church today. The sharp differences that existed in councils of the past did not surface in 1974.

Elections for officers for 1975 resulted in the choice of Steven Landregan as chairperson, Dan Rupp as vice chairperson, and Teddy Nardi as secretary. Landregan and Nardi were elected in their first year of membership. Thus continued the practice of electing a layman as chairperson. The council membership, when called upon to elect members to represent it at the bishops' annual meeting, selected the outgoing and incoming officers, who were lay people. Some confusion arose over the role of the observers to the bishops' meeting and a new vote was suggested. This should be discussed in a future meeting in order that the council be best represented. A by-law change was passed to allow the immediate past chairperson to remain on the council for one year if his or her term would otherwise expire.

The necessary steps were taken to insure the election of regional representatives to replace those whose terms ended. An at-large selection committee was elected and given the suggestion that two people identified with Indian life and capable of speaking for Native Americans be selected for membership.

The council has prospered because of a desire on the part of those who have enjoyed membership and through the guiding spirit of the Lord as called upon by the prayers of the membership, especially as led in those prayers by Sister Dominga Zapata.

The year concluded with the participation of five council members as observers at the bishops' meeting and the chairing of the observers' group by William Toomey. The council members were well received by the bishops and were much more knowledgeable about the matters being discussed by the bishops than the other observers. Teddy Nardi was elected by the observers to give the report to the general meeting.

The role of the chairperson is to move the council through the business of the council and strive for participation by all those who are members and have something to contribute. This role could not have been fulfilled without the dedication of Dolores Gilmore, council secretary.

# CONCERN FOR THE POOR AND UNDERPRIVILEGED

By Helen M. Casey

Throughout the first five years of the Advisory Council, concern for the poor and underprivileged was a top priority. There was no meeting, beyond the initial organizational meeting, in which such concern was not reflected in one or more actions. It was manifested in the early years of the council through the reports of the various study groups which paralleled the USCC departmental committee structure at that time, viz., Social Development, Christian Formation, International Affairs, Health Affairs, Communications. These various reports were discussed, amended and then adopted by the whole group for submission to the Administrative Board. It was manifested also in responding to specific topics, such as the Black Manifesto.

Probably the most prominent programs, encompassing the whole spectrum of poverty problems, into which the Advisory Council has had considerable input are the Campaign for Human Development and the justice conference as part of the Bicentennial observation. In the case of the former, the Advisory Council's initial input came after the decision by the bishops to establish CHD; however, in the latter, the Advisory Council itself had a major role in pushing for a justice conference over a period of several meetings.

## *CAMPAIGN FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT*

At the September, 1970, meeting the Campaign for Human Development was first presented to the Advisory Council. CHD had been proposed by the NCCB at its November, 1969, meeting and authorized at its April, 1970, meeting. The Advisory Council had the benefit of a complete presentation of the concepts, structure, goals and promotional and educational effort planned for the fall of 1970.

The Advisory Council enthusiastically endorsed CHD, giving special emphasis to the educational phase of the campaign "as a means of changing attitudes toward the poor, and of creating in the spirit of renewal, a new sense of our commitment and responsibility as Christians." The council also advised strongly that persons from minority groups and regions be included on both the national committee and

staff. It recommended that the proposed executive and national committees be one and the same, but the proposal was not accepted by the Administrative Board as being in the best interests of the campaign goals.

In subsequent meetings, a report on CHD was always part of the Advisory Council agenda, with continuing full support but also with constructive criticism and suggestions.

At the February, 1971, meeting, particular concern was expressed that the national committee did not appear to have enough poor persons among its membership. The council also re-emphasized the importance of the education program with an awareness of the sensitivities of poor persons to assure their dignity.

The council was perceptive in urging even at this early date that dioceses adopt the national criteria so as to strengthen CHD overall and "establish a national unity in this area of concern."

At the September, 1971, meeting Father Robert Monticello, executive director, gave an extensive progress report on CHD which resulted in a number of recommendations. These included suggestions on publicity regarding funded programs, evaluation of funded programs, renewed priority on the education dimension of CHD, outside evaluation of entire CHD operation, a code of ethics for national committee members, and exploring alternate funding for eligible and rejected proposals.

At the February and September, 1972, meetings crowded agendas permitted only brief progress reports on CHD. At the February, 1973, meeting, however, an entire evening was devoted to a multimedia presentation which included oral reports, samplings of TV and radio spots and films, printed materials and a panel discussion plus distribution of a specially prepared document entitled *The Educational Thrust of the Campaign for Human Development: A Progress Report 1970-1972*. This presentation generated the greatest amount of written input ever received in council history, necessitating the establishment of a special *ad hoc* committee to synthesize the input. The recommendations once again expressed major concern that the educational dimension was lacking implementation in many areas of the country. The council suggested that the multi-media presentation be given to the bishops to familiarize them with the excellent materials available. The council also was concerned with delays on the part of some dioceses in transmitting funds collected in order to facilitate planning of allocations. Finally, council members committed themselves to personal support of CHD in their own areas.

## JUSTICE CONFERENCE

As far back as the second meeting of the Advisory Council in October,

1969, the council discussed the need of education of Catholic Americans in understanding and responding to social justice.

The vehicle at that time was the opportunity to review the proposed American bishops' response to Pope Paul's encyclical *Populorum Progressio*. The International Relations Study Group report, endorsed by the entire council, accepted with enthusiasm the objective, purpose and intent of such a statement and the need of it in the United States for Catholics in particular.

In the report to the Administrative Board on April 20, 1970, the Advisory Council "recommended that the Department of International Affairs be requested by the Administrative Board of USCC to conduct or commission a study to formulate the objectives and concerns of the Catholic Church in the United States in the international sphere, including some discussion of the theology of development." This recommendation was the first official statement, preparing the soil for a future justice conference, to go to the body to whom the council reported.

At the September, 1970, meeting, the Advisory Council again affirmed even more strongly that it "enthusiastically approves the request (from Department of International Affairs) for a statement from the bishops" on human solidarity.

The February, 1971, meeting saw further development of the council's concern for conscientization by means of recommendations in two separate segments of its report to the Administrative Board on February 16, 1971.

The September, 1971, meeting, marked the planting of the seed of a justice conference. The recommendation for the September 14, 1971, Administrative Board meeting was for "the setting up of a symposium on the 80th year letter—*A Call to Action*—and the documents which will come from the Synod on Justice in the World, a conference similar to the symposium on *Pacem in Terris* held in the United Nations building in 1964." In response, the General Secretary reported that "the council's recommendation . . . is under consideration in both the Committee on International Affairs and the Committee on Social Development. In the documentation for the Administrative Board meeting in February (1972), it is proposed that the two committees work jointly on a national conference on 'Justice in the World.' This, it is understood, would be preceded by diocesan and/or regional conferences on the subject. If a national conference is to be held, careful local planning and input will be essential to its success and impact on the nation."

A year later the General Secretary was able to state that the bishops had approved the appointment of a committee charged with the total planning of the participation of the Church in the observance of the

1976 Bicentennial and that this committee would assume responsibility for the conferences on justice. Cardinal Dearden had accepted the chairmanship and a search was underway for a project director.

### WOMEN IN THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY

On two occasions, the Advisory Council submitted specific recommendations.

The first was to the Administrative Board in September, 1971. The Council strongly recommended that the American bishops request that at least one woman religious and one lay woman from the United States be invited to attend the upcoming synod and that they ask that women from other areas of the world also be invited. Bishop Bernardin reported that the recommendation was not acted upon because the right to invite observers belonged exclusively to the Holy See.

The second recommendation went to the Administrative Committee of NCCB in September, 1973. The intent was to strengthen the position of women in the Church by some practical steps. The Advisory Council recommended:

1. That the NCCB *ad hoc* committee on Women in Society and in the Church have its status changed to a standing committee; and that either some women be admitted as members of the NCCB committees or that the committee be shifted from NCCB to USCC.
2. That an office on Women in Society and the Church be established at national headquarters, enabled to receive input and facilitate the processing of the work of the committee.
3. That the Committee on Women in Society and the Church, as quickly as possible, propose actions that would demonstrate a genuine determination of the American Catholic Church to realize in practice the full human dignity of women and their competency in participating more actively in the life and worship of the Church.

These recommendations were not regarded as feasible at the time because of structural and budgetary considerations.

Above I dealt with specific written recommendations submitted to the Administrative Board or Committee. In the effort to be precise, much of the flavor, emotion, and frank exchange of views among members was necessarily lost. The very great diversity of the membership, not only by categories such as bishops, priests, religious men and women, and lay men and women, ethnic background, age, geographic location, vocation, etc., but also the very life experiences and personalities of the

members created a mix that was guaranteed to be lively, at times even explosive, but always in Christian charity.

Abundantly aware of the vast social disorders of poverty and injustice both here and abroad, all were eager, at times impatient, that the Church in the U.S. make these top priorities. This accounts for the enthusiastic interest in the Campaign for Human Development, particularly in its education/attitude-changing aspects. It accounts also for the persistent pushing for a justice conference which would be to the Church in the United States what the Medellin Conference was to the Church in Latin America.

There was a great deal of gentle but persistent reminding of the often unrecognized discrimination against women in both Church and society and a call for the Church to make its actions match its words in this regard. It should be quickly added that there was strong support for the liberation of women on the part of the majority of the men on the council.



# THE DECK WAS NOT STACKED

By Joseph A. Francis, S.V.D.

When I was first approached by Bishop Bernardin about serving on the USCC Advisory Council, I was overjoyed but cautiously optimistic. Being in the unique position of a black provincial in a large international religious order and having had more exposure to the religious, civil and educational community as a unique black person, I had some reservations.

I knew what I wanted, but I did not know what the hierarchy wanted of me. Whatever it was they wanted, I was not so sure that I could give. It was not that I was unsure of my ability and willingness to give, but that I was uneasy in the thought that I might have to make too many compromises that would destroy my credibility with the black community. I was afraid that my selection would be viewed as a classic exercise of paternalism and that my contributions would be distilled to the point of ineffectiveness.

Most of these fears were reinforced by our first meeting in Washington, D.C. I came away with no little sense of frustration. However, I became curious to know more about the men and women who made up the council and this fact alone gave me reason for hope.

The meetings in which we came to grips with the "Black Manifesto" afforded me the opportunity to classify, in broad terms, members of the council. This meeting was the testing ground and, as far as I am concerned, it spelled the beginning of the council's process of maturity and it announced to the bishops and to the American Church that here was a group of men and women who would be heard and whose loyalty to the Church was unquestioned. While we disagreed on many aspects of the Manifesto and what should be our response as a Church, we learned to respect each other as persons with integrity and commitments. The issue could have been something other than the Black Manifesto, but I believe the group would have responded with equal enthusiasm, integrity and commitment.

At this point in the life of the USCC Advisory Council the Church was able to recognize a pluriformity of response indicative of a healthy pluralism among the members. This indicated that the "deck was not stacked." From the very beginning it was obvious that the only people who voted in blocks were the bishops, but later this was not the case.

Further, it was also obvious then, and continues to hold today, that more bishops are not influenced by episcopal interventions or the manner in which bishops vote.

If one were to ask me about the point in time when members of the USCC Advisory Council became truly members of an *ad hoc* Christian community, I would have to say it was in Kansas City. If one asks for an identification of time when the bishops really were sure of the council as trustworthy and useful, I would say that it was after the meeting in Chicago when the National Pastoral Council was discussed by the most diversified group in the history of the Catholic Church in America. It was at this time that the unique consistency and temperateness of the council was highlighted in the midst of the organized confusion of that Chicago consultation. The decision of the hierarchy to make the council advisory to the NCCB as well as the USCC marked the public acknowledgement of the bishops that "the people are the Church."

I suppose it would be well at this point to isolate what I, as a black, Catholic major religious superior would see as outstanding contributions of the USCC Advisory Council to the Church in America.

1. The influence it exercised in the establishment of the Campaign for Human Development. I am convinced that our discussion on the Black Manifesto helped to sensitize the bishops to what the response of the American Church should be.
2. The almost phenomenal, although belated, response to the Spanish-speaking. The Spanish-speaking members made their case clear and they were given support by *all*. It was at this point that I recognized the greatness of many of our bishops, although their posture was and still is far less liberal than mine or a fairly large number of the council members.
3. The response of the council to the National Office for Black Catholics, and that in spite of terribly bad relationships between the NCCB and NOBC, was something that only the council could do. To this extent it played the role of advocacy in reconciliation and practical realism.
4. The willingness of the council to discuss participatory government in the hierarchy by black and Spanish-speaking clergy opened the way for frank and honest dialogue about the selection of bishops. It took away the aura of magic and mythology which suppresses and follows the process by which mortal men become bishops. The process in which the council was engaged provided the bishops an opportunity to see and conclude that there is a need for wider consultation and input when priests are nominated for the episcopacy.

5. Not so well defined and documented, but very much in evidence, is the emergence of the role played by the women members of the council. What is so fascinating about this happening is that Spanish women, black women, white women, women religious—black, white, Spanish—young women, middle-aged women, etc., all responded as women—then with no let-up as women representing the various ethnic, professional, vocational and/or age categories mentioned. At this point I would presume to state that the contribution of women and minority representatives was the single most important fact of the council and the single most enriching experience of the council.
6. While efforts were made to utilize a “youth” input, I felt that they were far from successful.
7. Two of the most far-reaching inputs of this Council and assuredly the most publicized were the roles it played in the feasibility study on a National Pastoral Council and its support, at times stormy, of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry.

While there are other important facts to record and useful observations and assessments to be made, I shall conclude here.

I can honestly say that for me: “Happiness is being a member of the USCC/NCCB Advisory Council.” It is one of the few groups of which I know where “authority is exercised by serving and power is the means of freeing men to love God and each other.”

# THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AND THE SPANISH SPEAKING

By Virgil P. Elizondo

From the very beginning, with the presence of Rosa Gonzales of Corpus Christi, the council has shown growing interest and concern for the pastoral needs of the Spanish-speaking and other minorities. It was Rosa who moved the council to the realization that the Mexicans had been made to feel as orphans within the North American Church. For the most part they have been ignored and neglected in the mainstream life of the Catholic Church in the United States.

Other voices from the Spanish-speaking community played a significant role in the early days of the council. Among them were Reuben Cardenas and Mrs. Odon Betanzos. The council's commitment to Spanish-speaking issues is recorded in a number of the papers in this volume, and I shall not repeat what they say. Here I wish only to note a few of the developments during the period of my own participation in the council.

Members of the Advisory Council have shown an increasing concern for the questions and problems of the Mexican American. They invited Mr. Paul Sedillo, director of the USCC Division for the Spanish Speaking, to make a major presentation at one of the semiannual meetings held in Detroit in February, 1973. Following Mr. Sedillo's presentation it was the unanimous vote of the council that the Church should consider as a top priority item its response to the Spanish-speaking.

In a special effort to become acquainted with the needs and questions of the Spanish-speaking, the council made the dramatic move of having its semiannual meeting in San Antonio, Tex., where it could take a first-hand look at the conditions in which many of the Mexican Americans live. Thus, in February of 1974 the council came to San Antonio for their meeting. During its course the council members took advantage of the occasion to tour many of the areas of San Antonio, to participate in the liturgical celebrations of the Spanish-speaking, and to tour the Mexican American Cultural Center where research and personnel formation has been going on for ministry in the bilingual, bicultural community. At this meeting the council also recommended to the bishops that studies be made for setting up a major endowment fund so that monies could be used for programs in relation to the pastoral needs of the Spanish-

speaking. The council noted that even though many programs are considered urgent and necessary, when it comes to the point of funding they die because no one seems to have the money for them. Thus, it was deemed all-important to recommend to the bishops to set up a *major endowment fund for pastoral programs for the Spanish-speaking*. As of the writing of this article we have not heard from the bishops in response.

There is also a sign of greater participation as more Spanish-speaking Catholics have been added to the council within the past years. Beginning with Rosa Gonzales, other members who have been added include: Sister Dominga Zapata of Chicago, Mr. Filemon Vela of Brownsville, Tex., Mr. Gary Tijerina of San Antonio, and myself.

Through the meetings of the Advisory Council all the members have been sensitized to the particular needs of the large percentage of the American population which heretofore had remained the silent, suffering minority. Many good and sincere Catholic leaders, who had before been simply ignorant of the problems, have become quite concerned and are moving to help the Church respond more effectively to the Mexican American.

# STUDY OF A NATIONAL PASTORAL COUNCIL

By Sister Carol Frances Jegen, B.V.M.

The March, 1970, meeting of the Advisory Council in Kansas City, Mo., was highly significant. That meeting has often been referred to by council members as a real breakthrough in the identity of the Advisory Council. The Christian community aspects of the council came into clearer focus because new opportunities for mutual sharing, particularly in prayer, were made possible at St. John's Seminary.

It was helpful that the awareness of these community dimensions of the Advisory Council had been heightened when the invitation was extended by Bishop Bernardin, General Secretary of the NCCB, to undertake a study on the possible establishment of a National Pastoral Council. From the beginning, Christian community implications became a major part of the National Pastoral Council deliberations.

From the standpoint of the evolution of the Advisory Council, it should be noted that the invitation to study a National Pastoral Council came from the NCCB Administrative Committee rather than from the USCC Administrative Board. At that time, the Advisory Council functioned only in relation to the USCC. When the NCCB considered exploring a National Pastoral Council and turned to the USCC's Advisory Council, the role of the Advisory Council already had expanded somewhat beyond its original design.

The resolution of the Advisory Council accepting the invitation of the bishops to study the feasibility of a National Pastoral Council deserves comment. Of special note are the references to "new channels of communication"; fostering "creative contributions to the renewal of the Church"; "the need to draw on the wisdom and experience" of as many of the faithful as possible; and the importance of prayer permeating the entire study. The four basic questions mentioned by Cardinal Dearden in the invitation from the bishops were repeated in the Advisory Council's acceptance resolution as major guidelines for the projected study:

- Exercise of shared responsibility
- Nature of a National Pastoral Council
- Determination of membership in such a council
- The relationship of a National Pastoral Council to other national bodies

The extent of this new responsibility shouldered by the Advisory Council was clear. Because the study could not be handled in depth by the entire council, a Steering Committee of 15 persons was elected to undertake the work. The committee included: 10 lay persons elected from and by the lay members of the council; 1 woman religious elected by the women religious members; 1 man religious elected by the men religious members; 2 priests elected by the priest members; and 1 bishop elected by the bishop members.

Two months after its election the Steering Committee met for the first time and determined to sponsor an interdisciplinary consultation before the end of the following summer. This consultation was the suggestion of Avery Dulles, S.J., Advisory Council member, who had joined the Steering Committee as a theological consultant. Excitement and urgency were felt by the Committee to such an extent that this national consultation was conceived and undertaken in an extraordinarily brief period of time. In announcing the consultation, Msgr. J. Paul O'Connor, chancellor of the Diocese of Youngstown and chairman of the Steering Committee, described its two main objectives as follows:

First, to establish contact with organizations and individuals, including those not identified with national Catholic groups, in order to get their thinking on the subject of a National Pastoral Council.

Second, to generate information and ideas concerning a National Pastoral Council and stimulate dialogue on the subject among as many Catholics as possible.

The interdisciplinary consultation held at Mundelein College in Chicago from August 29 to 31, 1970, to explore the possibility of a National Pastoral Council had considerable historical significance for the life of the Church in the United States. Probably no other meeting has gathered together such a wide and diverse representation of the people of God in working sessions designed to elicit open dialogue on the future of the Church in our country. Representatives of 101 archdioceses and dioceses and 36 national Catholic organizations responded to the invitations which were sent across the land. These representatives had the opportunity to listen and respond to scholars from the fields of theology, canon law, Church history, and the social sciences as they presented papers and reactions on various aspects of a National Pastoral Council in the light of the history of Catholicism in the United States. Additional helpful insights were contributed by a few members of Protestant communions who were also invited. The consultation was not solely an occasion of lectures, panels, and small group discussions, but included prayerful reflection culminating in Eucharistic celebrations.

One of the major objectives of the Steering Committee in sponsoring the consultation was to begin a process of serious reflection and dialogue

throughout the Church in the United States as to the desirability and feasibility of a National Pastoral Council. Feedback from such wide-spread deliberation was considered of utmost importance. Consequently, two publications emerged from the consultation and were distributed by the USCC through the diocesan and organizational representatives in order to assist those consultation delegates in explaining the concept of a National Pastoral Council and in soliciting the opinions of the faithful. The papers given at the Consultation and a range of reaction to them were edited into a small booklet entitled *A National Pastoral Council: Pro and Con*. A shorter, simpler, summary statement with the title *A National Pastoral Council: Yes, No and Maybe* was also composed. About 1,200 copies of the booklet and 42,000 copies of the pamphlet were sold in the months following the Mundelein consultation.

Additional publicity resulting from the appearance of articles and notices in the diocesan press and other religious periodicals along with a television talk show in Chicago helped raise the issue of a possible National Pastoral Council in the public consciousness. Reactions did come, not to the extent the Steering Committee had originally envisioned, but in sufficient volume to collate the responses and to use the gathered material as a partial basis for a first major progress report to the Advisory Council and to the NCCB Administrative Committee in the fall of 1971.

In order to prepare this report, the Steering Committee met from July 23-26, 1971, in Pomfret, Conn. The careful deliberations of those five days resulted in a 55-page report which was approved by the Advisory Council for the NCCB Administrative Committee. This report included six sections:

- I. An Introductory Statement
- II. History of the Feasibility Study
- III. Rationale for the Desirability of a National Pastoral Council
- IV. Directions toward Feasibility
- V. Recommendations
- VI. Response to the Questions Originally Proposed to the Advisory Council

An Appendix was added which contained:

- A. An Evaluation of Cooperation
- B. An Evaluation, Summary, and Interpretation of Responses
- C. Selected Responses

The selected responses included a special report from the Spanish-speaking Catholics for whom the pamphlet had been translated into Spanish.



The Pomfret meeting was not without its tensions, the major one being the weight of evidence contained in the surveys and questionnaires which followed the Mundelein consultation. Several members of the Steering Committee felt strongly that the data collected could not be evaluated as though they were the results of a scientific survey because this clearly was not the case. Several Steering Committee members maintained that conclusions drawn from such data could not be considered definitive. Robert McMillan, S.J., Assistant Professor of Sociology at Holy Cross College, agreed with this opinion in his sociological evaluation of the data collected. His reasons were included in Appendix B of the report. In a footnote to this appendix, the Steering Committee mentioned that it "consciously based its decisions on additional factors which are enunciated elsewhere in this report."

A careful analysis of the Pomfret meeting's report is most important for a correct understanding of the Steering Committee's position. Newspaper headlines quickly highlighted the conclusion of the study, with emphasis on the lack of feasibility for a National Pastoral Council at that time. Equal emphasis was not given to the Steering Committee's conclusions as to the desirability of a National Pastoral Council. In the light of subsequent events, the question might well be asked about the somewhat negative impact of the press coverage.

In the Steering Committee's summary and interpretation of responses, considerable attention was given to the meaning of the words *feasible* and *desirable*, with an effort to distinguish between them. The committee hoped to go on with its work on the premise that the desirability factor prominent in the report indicated that continued work needed to be done to make the desired National Pastoral Council feasible in the near future. To that end the committee determined to bend all its energies, and was encouraged to do so by the NCCB Administrative Committee who accepted the report in September, 1971.

One major recommendation of the Steering Committee as adopted in the 1971 Advisory Council Report was the further development of diocesan councils and regional consultations. It was further suggested that the role of the Advisory Council be expanded to include NCCB agenda items. Both of these recommendations were acted on as interim steps to the possible establishment of a National Pastoral Council by 1976 as part of the Bicentennial celebration of the United States.

Various study projects were inaugurated in 1972. The Canon Law Society of America was requested to give research assistance. The bishops were requested to discuss the role and function of diocesan pastoral councils at their spring meeting. These discussions were carried on in the regional groupings in April of that year. Summary reports of those discussions were communicated to the Steering Committee and

were included in a July, 1972, booklet reporting a survey on diocesan pastoral councils. This survey was undertaken by the USCC staff under the direction of the Steering Committee. The results showed that at that time, out of 137 jurisdictions responding, 57 had pastoral councils in existence and 68 had plans to establish them. Additional helpful information pertaining to the benefits, problems, and achievements of diocesan councils were included in the survey report. Each bishop in the United States received a copy of the 81-page report entitled *A Survey of Diocesan Pastoral Councils in the United States of America*.

1972 also saw the beginning of several explorations regarding the development of training programs for members of parish and diocesan councils. The survey was partly responsible for highlighting the need for such programs.

Another pertinent study project of that year was the preparation of materials on shared responsibility for the purpose of writing pastoral letters on that subject. Nine pages of notes were compiled, drawn largely from several documents of the Second Vatican Council. This paper on *Shared Responsibility* along with a bibliography was sent to the Ordinaries of the country.

December of 1972 brought several other study projects into existence as a result of a second interdisciplinary meeting. Eleven scholars from the fields of history, education, Scripture, theology, canon law, sociology, psychology, and organizational skills met with six members of the Steering Committee for three days at the Marriottsville Spiritual Center in Maryland. Some of the topics raised at that meeting, on which the scholars present agreed to do research, were: clarification about the international concerns of a "National" Pastoral Council; determination about the balance between "prophetic" and "representative" functions of a National Pastoral Council; clarification of the role of a National Pastoral Council and its members in regard to authority in the Church; clarification of the theological meaning of the word "pastoral" in the term National Pastoral Council; development of a national Catholic consciousness; leadership in the light of Vatican II.

A major setback to the work of the Steering Committee occurred in the summer of 1972 with a widely circulated news story stating that the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy under the leadership of Cardinal Wright had adopted a negative position regarding the formation of National Pastoral Councils. When Advisory Council members met in September they shared several press reports to that effect from various parts of the United States. The Steering Committee's reaction, adopted by the Advisory Council, was to ask that a delegation from the committee be sent to the Congregation of the Clergy in Rome to dialogue about the results of the National Pastoral Council research undertaken to date in

the United States. The research would include the data gathered from the experience of diocesan pastoral councils as recorded in the *1972 Survey Report*.

Such a delegation was not sent to Rome. Rather, Bishop Bernardin met with Cardinal Wright in October of that year and reviewed with him all the documents which the Steering Committee had developed. Bishop Bernardin also reported the encouraging actions taken by the Administrative Committee of NCCB, the entire body of United States bishops, and the Advisory Council. Cardinal Wright's response was one of appreciation for all the work undertaken by the Advisory Council. He refuted the recent news stories which implied that some official stand had been taken on the formation of National Pastoral Councils, because the congregation had not addressed the question but had focused its deliberations on diocesan pastoral councils. He further explained that National Pastoral Councils were not called for explicitly by Vatican II as were diocesan pastoral councils. Consequently, the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy had been concerned primarily with the fostering of diocesan pastoral councils. As the question of National Pastoral Councils becomes more viable, congregations other than the Congregation of the Clergy will probably address the question also.

When the report of Bishop Bernardin's meeting was discussed in the February, 1973, meeting of the Steering Committee, the hope was expressed that Cardinal Wright would make some statement to the press to offset the negative influence of the earlier stories which he claimed were inaccurate as far as the thinking of the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy was concerned. During the years of its work, from the days of the Mundelein consultation on, the Steering Committee could not ignore the organized opposition to a National Pastoral Council, an opposition which made considerable use of those negative press reports to further its end of preventing the establishment of a National Pastoral Council. For whatever reasons, a positive clarifying press statement on this matter was never issued by Cardinal Wright.

The summer of 1973 found another Steering Committee project underway. A small group worked diligently to prepare models of a National Pastoral Council for presentation to the entire Advisory Council at the September meeting. It was hoped that those models would be circulated throughout the country for discussion purposes. As a result of the discussions, specific recommendations could be made to the Administrative Committee of NCCB regarding the structure of a National Pastoral Council. The 1976 target date was still very much in mind.

By the time the Steering Committee met in September, 1973, the press carried reports of a circular letter issued on January 25, 1973, by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops and other Ordinaries of places concerning pastoral

councils, according to the views of the combined plenary congregation of March 15, 1972. In the Steering Committee's *Preamble Statement for Presentation of Models*, the final paragraph voiced the committee's response to the circular letter as follows:

The letter concludes by asking the Conference of Bishops "to notify the Sacred Congregation concerning their experiences with this matter so that we may have a suitable record of their experiences in the future." This desire for continual communication on the preparatory stages toward a National Pastoral Council had previously been voiced by Cardinal Wright to Archbishop Bernardin in 1972 regarding the Advisory Council's work in this area. More recently, according to current press releases a reliable source within the Clergy Congregation told NC News that "it is widely felt that an educational program of dialogue and forum is necessary even in the smallest countries . . . before an attempt is made to draw up an agenda for a national council which would be equally profitable to the hierarchy and the laity . . ." To this end of fostering one aspect of an "educational program of dialogue and forum," we present these four models of a National Pastoral Council in primitive stages of development. It is our hope that serious study and discussion of these models be given by a wide representation of our people throughout the coming year.

The Steering Committee also recommended the establishment of an Office on Shared Responsibility within the conference. Other recommendations focused on further development and training of members of diocesan pastoral councils. The Advisory Council accepted all the recommendations of the Steering Committee and sent them on to the Administrative Committee. As a result of the Administrative Committee's action, Msgr. O'Connor, outgoing chairman of the Steering Committee, and Mr. William Baroody, newly elected chairman, received a letter from Bishop Rausch, General Secretary of NCCB. The most significant parts of the letter are given here:

The bishops have received the four models for an NPC prepared by the Advisory Council and are grateful for all the efforts expended in drawing them up. However, there does not seem to be solid support for the establishment at this time of an NPC in the United States. This is in keeping with the conclusion of the Steering Committee presented by the Advisory Council to the Administrative Committee in 1971, and significant thrust for an NPC since 1971 simply has not developed.

The Circular Letter from Rome on pastoral councils earlier this year, while encouraging the development of diocesan pastoral councils, discouraged the establishment of pastoral councils at the national level. Moreover, other countries which have given serious

consideration to the establishment of an NPC have decided that the project is not presently feasible. For these reasons, the Administrative Committee has determined that there would be no useful purpose served in distributing the models prepared by the Advisory Council for the evaluation of Catholic groups and individuals in the country. The Administrative Committee wishes that further study of an NPC be delayed for the immediate future, and that emphasis be placed on the development of the Advisory Council as a structure already embodying the very best which an NPC would offer the Church in the United States. Continued development of pastoral councils on the parish and diocesan levels and increased understanding of the theological principles of shared responsibility should also take place.

The letter did go on to encourage cooperation with the NCCB/USCC Committee on Research, Plans and Programs toward the development by the National Council of Catholic Laity of a training program for pastoral council leaders.

Mr. Barody's reaction to Bishop Rausch's letter included a request to speak to the Administrative Committee. Before that request could be honored, the Steering Committee met at the February, 1974, Advisory Council Meeting in San Antonio. Quite simply, a decision had to be reached about continued existence as a Steering Committee. Even though the question of a National Pastoral Council had to be postponed temporarily, the development of shared responsibility was seen to be more important than ever. In this context, the Steering Committee agreed to continue its endeavors, an agreement with which both the Advisory Council and the NCCB Administrative Committee concurred.

*Shared responsibility* was a keynote sounded for the Steering Committee right from the beginning of its existence as the first question presented to it for exploration. On a note of shared responsibility, this brief history of the life of the Advisory Council's Steering Committee will conclude by recalling the committee's hopes as reflected in its 1971 report. In its *Rationale for the Desirability of a National Pastoral Council*, the Steering Committee, focusing on the ecclesiological developments of the Second Vatican Council, highlighted its awareness of the "serious needs of the Church in the United States at the present time." In the words of that *Rationale Statement*:

. . . Since the days of Vatican II the exercise of such responsibility has often been referred to in the context of "shared responsibility." That the Second Vatican Council saw fit to begin to spell out some ways in which shared responsibility could be exercised flows from that Council's awareness of aspects of Christian life which needs special emphasis today . . .

Our most pressing problems both within and beyond the Church are national in scope. As such they demand national concern and organized effort on a national scale if they are to be met in any effective way. Such an emphasis on shared responsibility on a national level does not preclude the necessity of regional and local concern and organized effort as well. As a matter of fact, national effort can be weak or even totally ineffective if it lacks regional and local support. But local and regional efforts alone are insufficient to handle problems which have assumed national proportions—problems such as poverty, peace, human dignity, and religious meaning in the present cultural expressions of life in the United States.

As the Advisory Council we have been deeply impressed by the expressed desire for a meaningful participation in the life of the Church on the part of all segments of the Church's life. We are unanimous in our request that most serious consideration be given to this deeply felt concern at a crucial hour in the history of the Church in the United States.

In 1974, that statement still stands as the Steering Committee, now a Committee on Shared Responsibility, continues to work as a standing committee of the NCCB/USCC Advisory Council.

# BUILDING A COMMUNITY

By Most Rev. Edward A. McCarthy

The Advisory Council was born in an age of distrust and tension within the Church. The very composition of the council was destined to reflect this for its members, as a cross-section of the Church, represented varying viewpoints and emotions. The way the council dealt with this was, in my mind, one of its most beautiful achievements in witnessing to the dynamics of how the unifying love of earnest Christians can prevail over disruptive tensions to produce a unified community.

I recall the original organization meeting at which His Eminence, John Cardinal Dearden, then President of the bishops' conference, presided. While it was clear that the members were thrilled to be part of a new initiative in dialogue and in sharing responsibility in the Church, it was also clear that there were those who harbored suspicions of the proposal. They wanted to be assured that their council would be taken seriously; that they would not be a mere rubber stamp group or a window dressing. The members were told that they were advisory to the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference. When they learned that this USCC board did not deal with such pastoral questions as the sacred liturgy, some were disturbed for they felt they were being restricted from expressing themselves on issues which to them were very basic in the life of the Church. Tensions within the group itself soon began to appear as representatives of special, sometimes conflicting, interests began to express themselves.

I feel that the key to the creation of the spirit of unity and respect and dialogue which soon emerged was in the early recognition among the leaders and members of the Council that if they were to be sort of a microcosm of the Church, they had to be not only a dialoguing community, but a community of prayer and of love. That community took shape when periods were set aside in the agenda for celebrating the sacred liturgy together and for other forms of common prayer, and when it was determined that, long and hard-working as the days were, they should not close without a general period of joyfulness and fellowship. It was in these recreation periods that we soon discovered extraordinary talents among the group, such as the ability to lead in the singing of an Irish lullaby, or Negro spiritual, or Chicano melody as all gathered around the piano.

As a bishop, I developed a new appreciation and respect for the earnest concern and dedication that the priests, religious and laity of our nation have for the work of Christ; for the insights, the thought and the wisdom which they bring to evaluation and planning; and for their ability to articulate their thoughts in effective yet courteous ways. At times, issues were raised and solutions were suggested which seemed oversimplified, perhaps even naive, in the light of lengthier and more in-depth debates of the same issues in meetings of the bishops. However, comparing the meetings of the Advisory Council with those of the bishops' conference, I did find the Advisory Council discussions frequently stimulating, simply because the approaches and the questions asked were fresh and less conditioned by traditional patterns of thought. I also felt that the council, which is not burdened with the entire order of business that must necessarily occupy a bishops' meeting, is freer to think creatively and in more depth about some of the issues of concern in the Church. I feel that the proposals of the council are being welcomed gratefully by the bishops as valued contributions to the leadership of the Church in our times.

The Advisory Council experience has given the members a more comprehensive vision to the overall programs of the Church, and afforded sympathetic understanding of the role of the bishops and the problems and responsibilities they face.



# A CHURCH IN MINIATURE

By Most Rev. John F. Whealon

I became a member of the Advisory Council in 1969. This membership was contemporary with my coming to the Archdiocese of Hartford, and so I began in Hartford and began involvement with the Advisory Council in the spring of that year.

The overriding memory which I have is of the Advisory Council as a small Catholic community. It developed a noticeable spirit of unity, sociability and liturgy almost at the beginning. Though the members represented many parts of the country and various orders in the Church, nevertheless they coalesced into a working unity in which charity prevailed.

It seems to me in retrospect that the place in which we met was contributory to that community development. We met mostly at Marriottsville, in a building which in architecture and setting was ideal. The chapel, the respect for the ecology of the area, the spirit of the Sisters, the beautiful setting of the grounds—all this made Marriottsville a place in which we were happy to stay and work, to pray and relax together.

Concerning the effectiveness of the Advisory Council, I can make judgment from the viewpoint of a member of the council as well as a member of the Administrative Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The recommendations developed by the Advisory Council were developed as a result of considerable study and dialogue. At times the discussions were so prolonged as to test the patience of the members. Yet the results of those discussions were, it seemed to me, generally balanced and considerate of the welfare of the entire Church. They were recognized by both the Advisory Council and the bishops as clearly advisory. From the viewpoint of the bishops, I know how seriously these recommendations were accepted and how much attention was paid to their implementation. The Advisory Council had a clear and discernible impact on the decisions of the bishops during the past five years.

Generally speaking, it is only the bishops who realized this. The Advisory Council seems destined to feel that its painstaking efforts are not appreciated by the Catholic faithful and the Church at large in this

country. The service of the Advisory Council is thus a somewhat humble service—and this is in accord with Gospel values.

During the first five years of existence of the Advisory Council there were in the United States a number of tensions within the Catholic community. Those tensions have been reflected accurately within the Advisory Council, so far as I can judge. It has been a Church in miniature, and in the spirit of the Church within this nation the Advisory Council has moved to greater maturity, to a better understanding of Christ and of His Church as reflected in our lives.

# CONTRIBUTORS

By Michelle Donnelly

## *Mrs. John J. Casey (Helen)*

Mrs. Casey is the mother of four and lives in Midland, Mich. She is Vice-President of the Michigan Catholic Conference and serves as an educational coordinator for the Campaign for Human Development and on the NCCB Committee for the Observance of the Bicentennial.

## *John Cardinal Dearden*

A native of Valley Falls, R. I., Cardinal Dearden was educated in schools in Cleveland and in Rome, where he was ordained in 1934. He served in parish work and as a seminary professor before he was named Coadjutor Bishop of Pittsburgh in 1948. He became Bishop of Pittsburgh in 1950, Archbishop of Detroit in 1958, and was named a cardinal in 1969. He served as the first President of the NCCB and USCC from 1966 to 1971.

## *David J. Doherty*

Mr. Doherty resides in Flint, Mich., where he is the Special Consultant for Program Development for Flint Community Schools. He holds a Ph.D. in educational administration. He is married and the father of five children.

## *Mrs. Michelle Donnelly*

Mrs. Donnelly resides in Alexandria, Virginia. She is the Administrative Secretary to the Assistant General Secretary of NCCB/USCC and, in that capacity, has been closely associated with the Advisory Council since 1971.

## *Rev. Avery Dulles, S.J.*

Father Dulles is a member of the Society of Jesus and currently teaches theology at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. Father Dulles has authored a number of articles and books on a variety of topics, including revelation, apologetics, grace, Christian unity and Ecclesiology.

## *Rev. Virgil Elizondo*

A priest of the Archdiocese of San Antonio, Father Elizondo is President of the Mexican American Cultural Center and director of the Pastoral

Institute of Religious Studies, both in San Antonio. He became an at-large member of the Advisory Council in 1972.

*Rev. Joseph Francis, S.V.D.*

A priest of the Society of the Divine Word, Father Francis was born in Lafayette, La. He is Provincial of the Southern Province of his religious society and is President of the Conference of Major Superiors of Men.

*Bishop Francis T. Hurley*

A priest of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, Bishop Hurley was assigned to the National Catholic Welfare Conference in 1957. He became Associate General Secretary of the new National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference in 1968. It was while he held this position that the Advisory Council came into existence and his efforts were instrumental in its formation. He was named the Auxiliary Bishop of Juneau, Alaska, in 1970 and Ordinary of that diocese in 1971.

*Sister Carol Frances Jegen, B.V.M.*

Sister Carol Frances Jegen is a member of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and has been active in renewal programs in religious life and liturgy. She founded the theology department at Mundelein College in Chicago and is a professor of religious studies there.

*Francis X. Kennelly*

Mr. Kennelly is a member of the Trenton Diocesan Pastoral Council and served as first chairman of the USCC Advisory Council. He lives in Red Bank, N.J., where he practices law. He is married and has two children.

*Bishop Edward A. McCarthy*

A native of Cincinnati, Ohio, Bishop McCarthy was ordained a priest in 1943. He was appointed Auxiliary Bishop of Cincinnati in 1965 and became the first Bishop of Phoenix, Ariz., in 1969.

*Joseph H. Maguire, Jr.*

Mr. Maguire is Assistant Dean of Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., and chairman of the English Department there. He served as Chairman of the Advisory Council in 1972 and also served as Vice-Chairman of the Steering Committee studying the feasibility of a National Pastoral Council.

*Russell Shaw*

Mr. Shaw is Secretary for Public Affairs of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and United States Catholic Conference. He is the author of several books and many articles.

*Rev. Michael J. Sheehan*

A priest of the Diocese of Dallas, Father Sheehan came to Washington in 1971 as Assistant General Secretary of the U.S. Catholic Conference. His responsibilities in that position were soon expanded to include those of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Father Sheehan has worked closely with the Advisory Council since 1971, acting as the principal staff person of NCCB/USCC relating to the Council.

*Charles G. Tildon, Jr.*

Mr. Tildon is a native of Baltimore, Md., and is presently employed by the Maryland Service Corps. He is deeply committed to the Black cause and has been active in many professional, civic, church and fraternal organizations in the Maryland community. Mr. Tildon is married and has one son.

*William A. Toomey, Jr.*

Mr. Toomey, who lives in Albany, is a labor arbitrator, and works as district director of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations—Cornell University. He is married and is the father of nine children.

*Archbishop John F. Whealon*

Archbishop Whealon was born in Barberton, Ohio, and was ordained in 1945. He was named Auxiliary Bishop of Cleveland in 1961, Bishop of Erie in 1967, and Archbishop of Hartford in 1969. He was a member of the Advisory Council from 1969 until 1972.



## STANDING ORDER SERVICE

By filling in and returning the form below, you will be included in the standing order service, a plan by which each new printing of the USCC Publications Office is automatically mailed to subscribers. These printings are mainly Papal Documents and the Bishops' yearly statements but may include special publications or an occasional pamphlet of current interest. Many include indexes, study outlines and bibliographies.

Not all Papal messages or documents are included but rather a selection of the more important ones or those of special interest to American Catholics, or for which there is an unusual number of requests.

There are usually from 15 to 30 printings each year ranging in price from 10¢ to 75¢. The total yearly bill is usually \$12.00 to \$20.00 depending on the number of items published during the year. Occasional special standing order discounts off the list prices are offered on some items.

Billings are made annually in December for the preceding year, unless you specify otherwise or unless the quantity ordered is large. You may cancel your standing order any time.

-----

I wish to place a standing order for ..... copies of all new printings issued by the USCC Publications Office until such time as I request cancellation of this order.

Please address the mailings as follows:

Name .....  
(Print)

Address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

Signature .....







