

Chapter Thirteen

Popular Meanings of the Word “Pastoral”

On March 9, 1985, I flew to Baltimore for a convention entitled “The Catholic Church in the United States: Foundations and Futures.” Jesuit Father Joseph Carroll, who was one of my mentors at the Diocese of Oakland, flew with me. Joe was Oakland’s director of pastoral research, and he introduced me to many of the attendees, such as Bishop James W. Malone of Youngstown (who at that time was Chairman of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops) and Richard Schoenherr, the prophetic chronicler of the priest shortage. It was the first national Catholic convention I ever attended, a joint convention of the NPPC, the National Pastoral Planning Conference, and PADICON, the Parish and Diocesan Council Network.

On the opening day of the convention, I received an “orientation” to PADICON offered by Marliss Rogers and Father Mike Hammer of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Marliss Rogers was coordinator of the parish councils office and had begun collaborating with William Rademacher on *The New Practical Guide for Parish Councils*. Mike Hammer was a

dynamic presenter and experienced pastor. The two explained how PADICON had developed in 1983 as a more formal “network” from the less formal group called “Diocesan Parish Council Personnel” (DPCP).¹

Hammer and Rogers also described the common features of the parish “pastoral” council. Until the publication of the Code of Canon Law in 1983, few referred to parish councils as “pastoral.” But in their 1985 orientation, Hammer and Rogers had already identified the parish pastoral council’s key features. It was a planning body, first of all, a body concerned about the parish’s future. Second, it treated “pastoral” matters, matters such as evangelization and mission, and avoided the temporal affairs of daily administration. It also had a prayerful style. Hammer and Rogers taught that one-third of a council meeting should be devoted to prayer. In their focus on planning, on pastoral matters, and on prayerful discernment, they sketched the popular hallmarks of the parish “pastoral” council.

But in the course of their orientation to PADICON, they also said two things that disconcerted me. One was that pastoral councils coordinate a system of standing committees. The other was that the finance council is a sub-committee of the pastoral council. These ideas were new to me. Although I was a novice to councils, I knew that the new Code of Canon Law said nothing about standing committees or about the finance council as a sub-committee. Were these proposals universally accepted, and how had they developed?

The Application of Official Teaching

Eventually I saw that the Milwaukee proposals were local applications of the church’s official teaching. Council practitioners took the Vatican II recommendations and applied them as they saw fit. Although the church’s official teaching does not specifically recommend that councils coordinate standing committees, it certainly allows them to. Local practices spread from one diocese to another and gradually became common. We saw in Chapter Four how frequently councils regard themselves as the coordinators of standing committees. Making the finance council a committee of the pastoral council is a similar innovation. No Vatican document recommends it, but some practitioners have found it useful.² In the absence of more specific and official Vatican guidelines, council practitioners innovated and experimented. They applied the church’s teaching, and so “invented” the pastoral council. But in 1985 I did not

yet realize how fluid the situation was, or appreciate the enormous variety of parish councils.

My lack of experience, however, was not the only reason why I felt disconcerted by the Milwaukee proposals. The new Code of Canon Law, with its innovative and selective application of the Vatican II texts, had changed the church's official teaching about councils. In 1985, few had yet felt the effect of the change. No one had yet fully weighed the Code's teaching about the consultative nature of councils, or the effect of its application to parishes of the "pastoral" terminology. No one knew why the 1983 Code had ignored references to parish councils contained in the Vatican II Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People. But everyone could see that there were differences between what the sources said and what councils in fact did. Those differences were disconcerting. It took me years to distinguish between the church's official teaching and the pastoral application of it.

In this chapter, we will survey the popular literature about the "pastoral" parish council in the 1980s and 1990s. We have already traced the church's official teaching about councils in the Code. We rejected the thesis that canons 511-514 and 536-7 simply re-stated the intention of Vatican II regarding councils. There is no evidence that Vatican II envisioned "pastoral" councils at the parish level. Despite this, the Code's emphasis on the "pastoral" (as distinct from the "apostolic") council precipitated a tremendous effort of reflection. The popular literature about councils in the past twenty years is in many ways an attempt to digest and apply the teachings of the Code.³ When it recommended parish "pastoral" councils, it called into question many practices common to the early years of the council movement. Today's popular emphasis on planning, on prayerful discernment, and on pastoral matters, is an interpretive response to the Code.

The Council as Pastoral Planner

To begin, let us recall that there is no reference to pastoral planning in the documents of Vatican II or in Canon Law. Apart from a brief allusion to planning in the 1971 *Synod of Bishops* and the 1973 *Directory on Bishops*, the word does not appear in the church's official teaching about councils.⁴ But planning can be used as a synonym for the threefold task of pastoral councils. Canon 511 states that councils are to investigate pastoral matters, to ponder them, and to make practical recommendations.

This was the language of the Vatican II Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops. Canon 511 endorsed this concept of the pastoral council, and so indirectly affirmed the pastoral planning role for councils.

As a role for parish councils, however, pastoral planning predated the 1983 Code. As early as the mid-1970s, council theorists and diocesan guidelines were promoting the idea that the parish council should plan by setting goals and objectives.⁵ In 1981, Father William Harms, a leader in the National Pastoral Planning Conference, clearly proposed a comprehensive planning role for parish councils.⁶ By the late 1980s, the idea that parish councils were pastoral planners was well accepted. But pastoral planning at that time remained one among many roles assigned to the council.⁷ Very few leaders in the council movement argued that planning is the primary role of councils.⁸

The publication of the 1983 Code gave a new impetus to the parish council as pastoral planner. The Code's statement that the parish pastoral council has a "consultative only" vote was startlingly blunt. If the council is not a "deliberative" body, that is, if it cannot make legally binding decisions on behalf of the parish, what is its role? Some cynically said that councils exist to share responsibility, but not to share leadership. Through councils, Catholic pastors give an illusion of dialogue and collegiality, but no real power.⁹ This, however, was a minority view. Although councils do not have the final say, they do influence pastors.

Indeed, many people in the council movement were satisfied with (or at least resigned themselves to) a distinction between decision making and choosing. Councils help decide, but pastors choose. Although the final choice lies with the pastor, the literature suggests that the work of a council lays an indispensable foundation for wise decisions.¹⁰ Even councils with a "consultative only" vote can speak authoritatively in their planning role. Canonists agreed with the council practitioners. In 1993, John Renken made a detailed argument that pastoral planning was just what Canon 511 meant when it said that councils investigate, ponder, and recommend. Planning had begun to emerge as the primary role of councils.¹¹

Practical experience, not Canon Law, proved to be the decisive factor in the acceptance of the pastoral planning role for councils. By the early 1980s, writers had begun to register complaints about coordinating councils. Bertram Griffin spoke of "the growing sense of boredom on parish super councils where the only action month after month is hear-

ing reports from committees, commissions, and organizations, each having a reserved seat on the board."¹² Dissatisfaction had set in. Doubtless the Laity Decree said that apostolic councils may coordinate lay initiatives. But lay initiatives are not the same thing as standing ministerial committees, and the Laity Decree did not say that councils are to coordinate ministries.

Many began to envision pastoral planning councils as an alternative to coordinating councils. Planning councils would enable the parish to envision its mission and goals, it was said, leaving the implementation of those goals to ministry groups coordinated by the pastor and his staff.¹³ Writers started to imagine planning councils without the task assigned to them since the late 1960s—the task of ensuring the participation of parishioners. One does not need a council to communicate with and coordinate volunteers.¹⁴ If the goal is active participation by Catholics in parish life, many said that councils should only plan (and not coordinate) such participation. Planning is an enormous task in itself.

In short, the motive for the pastoral planning role was less official teaching than practical experience. The documents of the church did not state that councils should do pastoral planning. But when the official teaching said that councils investigate, ponder, and recommend, people associated those tasks with pastoral planning. Pastoral councils became planning councils.

Decision Making and Discernment

A focus on pastoral planning, then, was the most important feature of the post-1983 "pastoral" council. The word pastoral also came to imply a deeper insight into decision making and discernment. Recall that, in early parish councils, decisions were usually reached by parliamentary procedure, and councillors were elected by a popular vote. In the 1980s, both parliamentary procedure and popular elections were subjected to ever-increasing criticism. As we saw in Chapter Four, several diocesan guidelines for parish councils discourage the use of parliamentary procedure. It gave an unfair advantage to its adepts, they said, and treated a decision as settled if a bare majority could be mustered to support it. The popular election of council members, once a fundamental principle of the council movement, also came under fire. Several diocesan guidelines, we saw in Chapter Seven, encouraged a process of "discerning" council

members for membership. These new ways of decision making and member selection can also be called hallmarks of the pastoral council.

It is worth remembering that Vatican documents say almost nothing about how councils are to select members and make decisions. To be sure, Pope John Paul II's apostolic exhortation of 1987, *Christifideles laici*, endorsed pastoral councils as a resource for decision-makers.¹⁵ But the Exhortation did not say when or how councils are to make decisions. Vatican documents have even less to say about the selection of council members. True, the 1973 Private Letter about pastoral councils from the Vatican Congregation for the Clergy made general comments on member selection. It emphasized that council members should be diverse and gifted.¹⁶ But it said nothing in practical terms about how they are to be selected. In the almost complete absence of Vatican direction about this topic, U.S. practitioners have shown great inventiveness. The shift away from the general election of councillors to discernment processes has been connected, in the popular mind, with the rise of the pastoral council.

Three Related Topics

Council decision making and member selection are complicated issues. The literature since the publication of the new Code has indirectly linked them to three topics: leadership, the priest shortage, and collaborative ministry. Let us look at each of these, starting with the topic of leadership.

Leadership

Before the 1980s, councils were often viewed as elected parish leaders who, as councillors, exercised collective leadership. Partially as a result of the new Code's statement that councils possess a vote that is "consultative only," leadership by councils came into question. Are councils indeed leadership bodies, or does leadership belong to the pastor alone?

Some maintained that councils do have a position of leadership, a new kind of decentralized, cooperative leadership.¹⁷ Others distinguished between the pastor's official role as presider at the council and the charismatic leadership exercised by the church's laity, leadership that does not depend on one's membership in a council (or, for that matter, whether or not one is ordained).¹⁸ The relation between official and charismatic leadership continues to remain problematic. Councils

undoubtedly "lead."¹⁹ But they do so indirectly, by contributing to decisions that belong ultimately to the pastor.

The Priest Shortage

In the 1980s and 1990s, U.S. Catholics became aware that the number of priests was falling, that the average age of priests was climbing, and that the ordination of seminarians was not keeping up with resignations, retirements, and deaths.²⁰ At the same time, there was great rise in the number of lay church professionals. In a church of fewer ordained leaders, laypeople increasingly assumed positions formerly held by priests.²¹

This has complicated the question of decision making and membership on councils. Councils now have to relate, not just to authoritative pastors, but to authoritative lay staffs as well. There is evidence to suggest that the relation between volunteer councillors and professional lay staff members is not always smooth sailing.²² Lay professionals find it no easier to take the advice of pastoral councils than do the clergy. They may feel trapped between the pastor who employs them and the council that advises him. Each of the three (pastor, lay professionals, and councillors) wants to know where in the group true wisdom resides.

Collaborative Ministry

Collaborative ministry is a third topic. It emerged as an answer to the question of how lay volunteer and professional ministers are to relate to priests. No longer, it was said, would ministers exercise leadership according to their hierarchical position. Henceforth, lay and ordained would collaborate, working together in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The literature on collaborative ministry describes how lay and ordained ministers work together, warns about the dangers, and offers advice drawn from theology, psychology, and the planning sciences.²³ A good example is Robert G. Duch's *Successful Parish Leadership*. Borrowing insights from Jungian psychology and organizational behavior, the book describes the wise leader—priest or lay—as one who correctly diagnoses the personality type of the follower and tailors a leadership style to his or her measure.²⁴ For the parish council, this kind of literature signaled a shift. Councils began to focus as much on *how* they worked as on *what* they did.

A greater attention to group process fueled the critique of parliamentary procedure. Many saw that a heavy-handed use of rules of order could destroy a group's cohesiveness. Some writers began to emphasize the importance of reaching consensus in the council. Consensus, they said,

is a call to holiness. It does not polarize the council into winners and losers, but creates a sense of cohesiveness. Hence it is best suited to councils.²⁵ To be sure, not everyone saw the benefits of the consensus approach. Some preferred parliamentary procedure, and some warned that the search for consensus can be time-consuming and a hindrance to ministry.²⁶ The issues are undoubtedly complex. But diocesan guidelines and popular publications since the 1980s have generally extolled the search for consensus. It is a popular feature of the pastoral council.

The emphasis on group process has also changed council member selection. Popular elections have not always guaranteed a high quality of parish councillors. As an alternative, many writers have suggested the “discernment” of councillors as an alternative to popular elections. We shall examine discernment at greater length in Chapter Fifteen. For now it is enough to say that discernment means a thorough weighing of the potential council member’s gifts for the ministry. Proponents of discernment view service on the council as a vocation that must be tested by the community and that requires formation. They advocate a series of parish meetings, to which interested parishioners are invited to learn about the council, discuss whether they would serve well on it, and receive training.²⁷

To be sure, popular election remains the norm throughout the U.S., as we saw in Chapter Seven, and some parishes prefer to draw council members from parish standing committees.²⁸ But since the 1980s, guidelines and popular literature have increasingly recommended the “discernment” of council members. Discernment and consensus are identified, in the popular mind, with the pastoral council.

Pastoral as Spiritual

The pastoral council of this period was, first of all, a planning body. Second, it was an office whose group process received great attention. But its most distinctive feature, in the popular imagination, was its spirituality. For many, pastoral meant spiritual (in contrast to temporal). This direction could be seen as early as 1982 in Bernadette Gasslein’s *Parish Council: New Parish Ministries*, a Canadian book that was later reprinted in the U.S. Published before the revision of the Code of Canon Law, the book did not use the expression “pastoral council.” But its emphasis on the “ministry-type Parish Council” foreshadowed the pastoral council. Gasslein’s ministry-type council focused on “nourishing and building up

the Christian community." It sought to identify priorities that are "pastoral" or "spiritual" and then to involve people in ministry by "discerning" their gifts and inviting them to serve. To be sure, this kind of council had many of the features of older councils. Its members were elected, for example, and Gasslein envisioned a system of permanent committees. But the ministry-type council did not focus on political representation, on the coordination of committees, or on greater ministerial efficiency. It was rather a council in which members would "help one another discuss individual and common visions, and to translate them into action."²⁹ The terms ministry, community, spirituality, discernment, and vision—all of these came to be associated in the popular mind with the "pastoral" council.

Once again, we should recall that in canon law the word "pastoral" does not mean "spiritual" as opposed to "temporal." Instead, the adjective pastoral describes all those things pertaining to the pastor and his concerns. The canonist Roch Pagé expressed it this way: "Everything depends on the pastor" in the realm of pastoral councils, including their "establishment, direction, resources, effectiveness and dynamism."³⁰ A pastoral council is not a more spiritual council, in terms of canon law, but a council consulted by the pastor in order to serve his people better. Its scope is not limited to one or another aspect of the church's apostolate or spirituality. Indeed, canon law implied that councils may advise the pastor on any practical aspect of parish life to which he might draw its attention.

In the popular mind, however, pastoral councils were concerned about ministry and spirituality. The very titles of books from this period indicate what "pastoral" was coming to mean. Councils were to help create "a vision for parish life, mission, and ministry," to be places for "implementing spirituality," and to become "communities of spiritual leaders."³¹ Many called for a more spiritual content in council meetings. If councils are to plan for the parish, said these authors, then they should get in touch with the spiritual dimensions of Christian community. How were they to do this? The literature of the period recommended that councils study the Scriptures, undertake pastoral planning as a kind of ministry, and clarify the mission of the parish.³² This would make them more pastoral.

The form of meetings changed as well as the content. Judging from the literature of the period, people began to see the far-reaching effect of par-

ticipation on a council. Such participation means more than a perfunctory commitment to a narrow aspect of the church as an institution. Rather, it embraces the very lives of participants. Writers began to advocate group processes designed to engage councillors at a personal level: by telling autobiographical stories about faith, by theological reflection, by prayerful discernment, and by efforts to imagine the parish's future. People responded to the invitations of those who, like Mike Hammer and Marliiss Rogers, wanted councils to spend one-third of their time in prayer. They began to explore the many various forms of prayer available to councils.³³ To be sure, some were careful to point out that the pastoral council differs from a prayer group or small Christian community.³⁴ Councils must do more than pray. But writers who promoted a prayerful style in council meetings were registering changes in councils and expanding the meaning of the word pastoral.

It is easy to satirize the spiritual rhetoric of pastoral councils in the 1980s and 1990s. Their focus on prayer almost overshadowed their specific task, their emphasis on group process tended to obscure their product (i.e., sound advice), and their rhetoric of visioning seemed to render planning less precise. But a look at the motive for these changes makes satire unnecessary. Council writers of this period had begun to see that participation on a council touched the deepest chords of the Christian life. Pastoral matters included every theme from parish finances to the affective life, faith, and ecclesiology of parishioners. For that reason, writers recommended that council discussions sound a more profound note in a more refined style. They used the word pastoral to designate that style.

The Marriage of Planning and Councils

The destiny of the professional planning and council organizations, NPPC and PADICON, illustrates the popular transformation of the word pastoral. The two merged in 1989 to become a new organization. It was a merger not just of people but of values. The NPPC was a professional organization originally composed of experienced researchers and pastoral planners, many of whom had academic credentials in planning and related fields. PADICON was a network of council advocates with little formal training but a wide range of expertise and experience. Many of them (at least at first) did not see themselves as professionals. Although the two organizations held joint conventions from 1985-89, and although members of each organization frequently belonged to the other, nevertheless there was always tension between them.

A "white paper" written after an October 1, 1986 meeting of the steering committees of the two organizations described the tension. The white paper described the two groups as having different self-images—professional planners and practical council advocates. The planners emphasized the tasks involved in planning. The council advocates emphasized the importance of group process and the need to develop grassroots leaders for sharing responsibility. The planners saw consultation via councils as one aspect of planning. The council advocates regarded planning as one aspect of the council task. One planner recalled that the tension between the two was so great that, after the decision was made in 1984 to jointly sponsor the Baltimore convention, an NPPC steering committee member resigned. Despite the tension, however, the October 1 meeting ended with a commitment to further discussions about the possibility of merger.³⁵

The fashion of the times called for a thorough discernment of major decisions. Accordingly the NPPC and PADICON discussions were thorough and well-planned (and for some, exhausting). The organizations discussed the possibility at their 1987 joint convention and, in 1988, approved a process for reaching a decision. The process proved successful at the 1989 convention in Los Angeles, where on March 8 the members voted for the merger of the two organizations. The new organization was eventually called the Conference for Pastoral Planning and Council Development (CPPCD). Arthur X. Deegan, II, who was chairman of the NPPC in 1989, was elected the first chairman of the CPPCD.³⁶ He recalled that "There was an air of absolute relief that a final vote had been taken, with next to no opposition, although there were a few doubting Thomases."³⁷ Even the doubting Thomases, or at least most of them, remained with the new organization.

After his term as first CPPCD chairman expired, Deegan was chosen to be its executive director, the first and only salaried position in the CPPCD, NPPC, or PADICON. He served in that capacity from 1992 to 1997. During his tenure, the CPPCD gained a firm financial basis, published two books, and established awards to honor notable people in the fields of planning and councils. Deegan oversaw what he called the "wedding" of NPPC and PADICON with a minimum of tears and to great applause.³⁸

For our history of parish pastoral councils in the U.S., the creation of the CPPCD marked a watershed in the popular meaning of "pastoral." It shows how the pastoral council has come to mean a planning council

focused on the church's mission. Doubtless the word pastoral also refers to a style of decision making and to spirituality. But the planning function is paramount. Before the merger of NPPC and PADICON, some viewed pastoral planning as a broad endeavor within which councils played a minor role. Others regarded the work of councils as leadership development, with some attention to pastoral planning. But after the merger, the pastoral planning role of councils emerged with ever greater clarity. It was practical and realistic, and it harmonized with the church's official teaching.

To be sure, some of the doubting Thomases at the NPPC/PADICON wedding rightly believed that parish councils cannot possibly do the work of professional planners. One of the doubters was the NPPC veteran Robert G. Howes. The result of the merger, he wrote, "would be an emulsion in which the form and maturation of at least NPPC would be obscured and necessarily watered down."³⁹ Some things, Howes believed, should not be mixed. But even a doubting Thomas could see the logic of the planning role for councils. Howes devoted the 1990s to writing books about them and parish planning. Before 1980, councils saw planning as one among their many tasks. By the end of the 1990s, it was their main task.

If planning is the main task of parish pastoral councils, then other tasks are subordinate to it. How do the other tasks commonly assigned to the pastoral council, such as the coordination of parish standing committees, fit into the planning paradigm? And if planning is the council's main task, how do we attract council members who are good at it? These are among the questions we will treat in this book's final part, "Building an Effective Council."

and experiments." Kim (p. 44) states that the Code "ends experimentation on ecclesial structural changes for a while, including parish councils."

20. Keating (p. 264), Griese ("The New Code," p. 49), Dalton (p. 170), Kim (p. 46), and Renken (p. 153) also emphasize the consultative as opposed to legislative role of the pastoral council.

21. Dalton (p. 172); Griese ("The New Code," p. 48).

22. Keating (p. 264), Griese ("The New Code," pp. 51-2), Kim (p. 48). The same point of view was endorsed by Loughlan Sofield and Carroll Juliano, "Developing a Pastoral Council," pp. 17-19.

23. Most pastoral council pioneers viewed the Laity Decree, no. 26, as a source for councils. See Broderick, p. 2, Lyons, p. 31, O'Neill, p. 18, the NCCM, p. 2, and Francis X. Legrand, "The Parish Council: Reflections on Their Principal Purpose," *Christ to the World* 14:2 (Nov. 2, 1969): 118-120. Many canonists also viewed Laity 26 as a source. Dalton (1988), p. 177 and Renken (p. 141, footnote 3) themselves concede this point. Renken refers to the "coetus" or discussion of April 19, 1980 by the commission preparing the new Code, noting that it cited the Vatican II Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People, no. 26, as a source for parish pastoral councils (he cites the record of the *coetus* or discussion in *Communicationes* 13 (1981): 146). Among other canonists who view Laity 26 as a source for parish pastoral councils, see the following: Robert J. Ahlin, "Parish Councils: A Theological and Canonical Foundation," Dissertation for the Degree of Licentiate in Canon Law (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1982), pp. 78-79. E. Caparros; M. Thériault, and J. Thom, Editors, *Code of Canon Law Annotated*, Latin-English edition of the Code of Canon Law and English-language translation of the 5th Spanish-language edition of the commentary prepared under the responsibility of the Instituto Martín de Azpilcueta (Navarra), "A collaboration of the Faculties of Canon Law of the University of Navarra in Spain and Saint Paul University in Canada" (Montréal: Wilson and Lafleur Limitée, 1993), esp. the commentary on Canon 536 by J. Calvo. Mark S. Mealey, "The Parish Pastoral Council in the United States of America: Applications of Canon 536," Doctor of Canon Law Dissertation (Ottawa: St. Paul University, 1989), p. 163. Joseph A. Pereira, "The Juridical Status of the Parish Council," Dissertation for the Degree of Licentiate in Canon Law (Rome: Pontifical Urban University, 1982), reportedly speaks of Laity 26 as a source for parish pastoral councils (at pp. 68 ff.), according to a summary of his paper by Kim (at p. 41).

24. Roch Pagé, *The Diocesan Pastoral Council*, p. 2. The relevant texts are examined by Egidio Miragoli, "Consejo Pastoral Diocesano – Lombardia," *Tesi gregoriana, Serie Diritto Canonico*, no. 43 (Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2000), pp. 35-37.

25. Vatican Council II, "Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity," no. 30, in Vatican II, *The Documents of Vatican II*, Flannery, General Editor, p. 847.

26. Sacred Congregation for Bishops, *Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, states that the optimum parish is one in which the laity "take part in the parish pastoral council and take charge of the works of the apostolate proper to themselves" (no. 179). The "apostolate" was hitherto the concern of "apostolic" councils as described in the Laity Decree, no. 26.

Chapter Thirteen: Popular Meanings of the Word "Pastoral"

1. On DPCP, see Chapter Eleven. From 1979 to 1983, DPCP held "back-to-back" conventions with the National Pastoral Planning Conference. One group's meeting was immediately followed by the other in the same hotel, so that members of one group could easily attend both meetings. In 1984, the first convention of the newly formed PADICON was held in Houston. Susan Stromatt was the first Chair, followed by Eileen Tabert (1985), Richard Krivanka (1986), Michelle Jones (1987), Mark F. Fischer (1988), and Mary Kay Bailey, O.P. (1989). In Houston the PADICON meeting was not only "back-to-back" with the NPPC, but one day (Wednesday, March 14) was designated a "shared skills" day, attended by both PADICON and NPPC members. The March 10-14, 1985 convention in Baltimore of PADICON and NPPC was the first of five annual "joint" conventions, planned and executed by the steering committees of both organizations. It was followed by conventions in San Francisco (1986), Nashville (1987), New York (1988), and Los Angeles (1989).

2. The Archdiocese of Milwaukee's *Parish Committee Ministry* (1991) states that the finance committee "does not decide priorities for the parish—that is the responsibility of the parish council" (p. 46). The Diocese of Harrisburg's *Parish Council Policy and Guidelines* (1985) state that financial administration is one of the "missions" of the parish, and that the parish council "supersedes every other parish organization, board, and committee" (p. 8), including the finance council. For a further discussion, see Mark F. Fischer, "Should Finance Councils Answer to Parish Councils?" *Today's Parish* (March 1994): 21–23, 32.

3. Marliss Rogers called councils in the 1980s the "second generation" in an article called "Renewing Parish Councils: Five Rules for the Second Generation," *Church 1:1* (Spring 1985): 34–36. See also Natalie Cornell, "The Parish Council 20 Years After," *Today's Parish* (January, 1986): 26–27. Offering another historical perspective, Bishop Howard Hubbard of Albany said that collaborative lay-pastor relationships were developing from "infancy" to an "adolescence." See his address to the NPPC entitled "Planning in the Church: The People, the Tasks," *Origins* 12:45 (4/21/83): 729, 731–737.

4. See the discussion in Chapter Eleven of the Sacred Congregation for Bishops, *Directory on the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, no. 204.

5. See Chapter Eleven's discussion of the functions of parish councils in the 1976 guidelines of the Archdioceses of St. Paul and of Louisville, the 1976 address by Providence Bishop Louis Gelineau ("Reflections on Pastoral Planning"), and the 1975 article by Robert G. Howes, "Guide for Parish Council Members."

6. Harms, *Who Are We and Where Are We Going*, esp. p. 21.

7. Rademacher and Rogers devoted one chapter out of thirteen to pastoral planning in their 1988 *New Practical Guide*. Thomas Sweetser, *Successful Parishes: How They Meet the Challenge of Change* (San Francisco: Winston Press, 1983), showed that councils were doing many kinds of planning activities without calling them "pastoral planning," activities such as prioritizing parish activities (p. 81), restoring the RCIA (pp. 109–112), and coordinating with neighboring parishes (p. 128).

8. An exception is Robert R. Newsome, *The Ministering Parish*, who wanted to see councils function as research and development (i.e., planning) bodies.

9. Richard A. Schoenherr and Eleanor P. Simpson, *The Political Economy of Diocesan Advisory Councils*, Comparative Religious Organization Studies Respondent Report no. 3 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1978), p. 98.

10. The distinction between decision making and choosing was suggested in the 1980 article by Robert T. Kennedy, "Shared Responsibility." In 1978, David F. Wall had discovered that supportive leadership by the pastor was a source of high satisfaction for council members, even when they did not have the final decision in pastoral matters. See "Parish Councils in the Catholic Church: Participation and Satisfaction of Members," Unpublished Ph.D. [sociology] Dissertation (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1978), pp. 211–213. Collaboration in decision making is a means to "real power," said Edmund Flood, *The Laity Today and Tomorrow* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1987), pp. 48–49.

11. Renken, "Pastoral Councils."

12. Bertram J. Griffin, "Diocesan Church Structures," in James H. Provost, Editor, *Code, Community, Ministry: Selected Studies for the Parish Minister Introducing the Revised Code of Canon Law* (Washington, D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1983), p. 62. See also Bertram F. Griffin, "The Parish and Lay Ministry," *Chicago Studies* 23 (1984): 45–61, esp. pp. 58–59.

13. One of the earliest arguments for the planning council and against the coordinating council was articulated by Loughlan Sofield and Brenda Hermann, *Developing the Parish as a Community of Service* (New York: Le Jacq Publishing, 1984), p. 13. William J. Bausch, in *The Hands-On Parish*, also envisioned councils that aimed at the discernment of mission more than the coordination of a committee structure (p. 89). The most articulate advocate of the planning council in the 1990s was the veteran pastoral planner, Robert G. Howes. See his *Creating an Effective Parish Pastoral Council; Parish Planning: A Practical Guide to Shared Responsibility* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1994); and *Bridges: Toward the Inter-Parish Regional Community . . . Deaneries, Clusters, Plural Parishes* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998). For an account of how a parish council became a pastoral planning council, see Philip

P. Conley, "The Parish Council: Planning the Mission, Implementing the Vision," Doctor of Ministry Paper (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1994), esp. Chapter III, "A New Vision for Parish Councils," in which Conley describes what he and Mary Ann Pobicki accomplished at Holy Family Parish in Poland, Ohio.

14. Ensuring the coordination of volunteers was emerging as a ministry in itself. See William J. Bannon and Suzanne Donovan, *Volunteers and Ministry*; and Marlene Wilson, *How to Mobilize Church Volunteers* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1983). One of the best ways to ensure participation was through the liturgy, and so the 1980s coincide with the rise of the liturgy committee. See Stephanie Certain and Marty Mayer, *Goal Setting for Liturgy Committees* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1981); Baker and Ferrone, *Liturgy Committee Handbook*; and Yvonne Cassa and Joanne Sanders, *How to Form a Parish Liturgy Board* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1987). By the late 1990s, there was evidence that the liturgy offers more opportunities for participation than does consultative ministry. See Robert E. Schmitz, "Volunteerism: Increasing Sophistication and Complexity," in Ruth T. Doyle et al., Editors, *Laity, Parish, and Ministry* (New York: Archdiocesan Office of Pastoral Research and Planning, 1999), pp. 34-43, esp. 37-40.

15. Pope John Paul II, "Christifideles Laici, Apostolic Exhortation on the Laity," January 30, 1987, *Origins* 18:35 (February 9, 1989): 561, 563-595; see no. 25, p. 573 (about diocesan councils); compare no. 27, p. 574 (about parish councils).

16. Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, "Private Letter on 'Pastoral Councils,'" in O'Connor, editor, *The Canon Law Digest*, Vol. VIII, pp. 280-288. The letter was also published in *Origins* 3:12 (9/15/73): 186-190. See esp. no. 7.

17. This is the viewpoint of Leonard Doohan, who insisted that leadership is not the province of the clergy alone, and so the chairperson of the council can truly be called a "leader." See his *Grass-Roots Pastors: Handbook for Lay Ministers* (San Francisco: Harper, 1989). Doohan described councils as "new forms of leadership," decentralized and interactive, in his *The Lay-Centered Church: Theology and Spirituality* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1984). The leadership role of the council emerges in Ellen Morseth, *Call to Leadership: Transforming the Local Church* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1993). Baltimore Archbishop William Borders stated that a collegial decision has an authority all its own. See William Borders, "Collegiality in the Local Church," *Origins* 9:32 (January 24, 1980): 509, 511-13.

18. James D. and Evelyn Eaton Whitehead emphasize the charismatic dimension of leadership. They say that lay leaders may lack ordination, but prove themselves dedicated and competent, in *The Emerging Laity: Returning Leadership to the Community of Faith* (New York: Doubleday, 1986). Robert G. Duch also stresses charismatic leadership, but sees the pastor as the one who "selects the right people to be members of the problem solving leadership team," in *Successful Parish Leadership: Nurturing the Animated Parish* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1990), p. 162.

19. See in Chapter Seven the discussion of Leege, "Parish Life Among the Leaders," Report no. 9 in Leege and Gremillion, Editors, *The Notre Dame Study*, pp. 2, 7, and 14.

20. This was clearly laid out by Dean R. Hoge, *The Future of Catholic Leadership: Responses to the Priest Shortage* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1987); and by Richard A. Schoenherr and Lawrence A. Young, with the collaboration of Tsan-Yuang Cheng, *Full Pews and Empty Altars: Demographics of the Priest Shortage in United States Catholic Dioceses* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

21. See Philip J. Murnion et al., *New Parish Ministers: Lay and Religious on Parish Staffs* (New York: National Pastoral Life Center, 1992); and Mary Beth Celio, "Parish Pastoral Staffing: A Case Study," in Ruth T. Doyle et al., editors, *Laity, Parish, and Ministry*, pp. 44-68. See also Philip J. Murnion and David DeLambo, *Parishes and Parish Ministers* (New York: National Pastoral Life Center, 1999); and National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Lay Ministry Subcommittee of the Committee on the Laity, "Lay Ecclesial Ministry: State of the Questions," *Origins* 29:31 (January 20, 2000): 497, 499-512. The NCCB, citing Murnion and DeLambo, states that, in 1992, Murnion "estimated that in parish ministry alone, 21,500 laypersons (including vowed religious) worked full or part time in formal pastoral roles (as distinct from support staff and maintenance roles). . . . A follow-up study titled "Parishes and Parish Ministers" (Philip J.

Murnion and David DeLambo, New York: National Pastoral Life Center, 1999) now estimates that this same group of lay ministers has grown to 29,145—an increase of 35 percent (*Origins*, 29:31, p. 499).

22. Chancery staff members are more ambivalent than bishops about the helpfulness of diocesan pastoral councils. See Froehle, *Diocesan and Eparchial Pastoral Councils*, p. 2.

23. See Loughlan Sofield and Carroll Juliano, *Collaborative Ministry: Skills and Guidelines* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1987); Norman P. Cooper, *Collaborative Ministry: Communion, Contention, Commitment* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1993); and Howard J. Hubbard, *Fulfilling the Vision: Collaborative Ministry in the Parish* (New York: Crossroad, 1998).

24. Robert G. Duch, *Successful Parish Leadership*, pp. 155-156.

25. These are the positions of, respectively, McKinney, *Sharing Wisdom*, p. 16; Rademacher with Rogers, *The New Practical Guide*, p. 140; Thomas F. Penderghast, "Parish Council: Barriers to Groupthink," *Church* 6:2 (Summer, 1990): 42-44; and Heaps, *Parish Pastoral Councils*, pp. 27-28.

26. The argument for parliamentary procedure as the normal way of making decisions is advanced by Robert G. Howes in his books *Creating an Effective Parish Pastoral Council*, p. 50, and *Parish Planning*, pp. 144-47. The dangers to effective ministry from a time-consuming search for consensus are outlined by Loughlan Sofield, Rosine Hammett and Carroll Juliano, *Building Community: Christian, Caring, Vital* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria, 1998), p. 113.

27. One of the earliest books in this period on discernment was Thomas H. Green, *Weeds among the Wheat. Discernment: Where Prayer and Action Meet* (South Bend, IN: Ave Maria, 1984). Benedictine Sister Mary Benet McKinney was the most eloquent writer on council discernment. She said that service on the council is a ministry with a definite call and the need for formation, and she advised parishes to discern council members in *Sharing Wisdom* (pp. 36-38 and Chapter Eight). Rademacher with Rogers, in *The New Practical Guide*, viewed discernment as an alternative to election, pp. 128 ff. Three meetings of discernment and four meetings of formation are recommended in Michael Parise, "Forming Your Parish Pastoral Council," *The Priest* 51:7 (July 1995): 43-47.

28. On the council of ministries, see Sweetser and Holden, *Leadership in a Successful Parish*, pp. 126 ff.; and Debbie Morrow, "A Parish Council of Ministries," *Church* 6:1 (Spring 1990): 42-44.

29. Bernadette Gasslein, *Parish Council: New Parish Ministries* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1983), p. 10. The first edition was published in Ottawa by Novalis in 1982.

30. Roch Pagé, "The Parish Pastoral Council," p. 48.

31. See Enda Lyons, *Partnership in Parish: A Vision for Parish Life, Mission, and Ministry* (Blackrock, County Dublin: Columba, 1987); David L. Vaughn, "Implementing Spirituality in Catholic Parish Councils," thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for certification in the National Association of Church Business Administration at the University of St. Thomas (St. Paul, MN: University of St. Thomas, 1994); and Olsen, *Transforming Church Boards*.

32. On Scripture, see Gasslein, p. 9; on planning as ministry, see Constance Gilder, *The Ministry of Pastoral Planning: A Planning Guide for Parishes in the Archdiocese of Baltimore* (Archdiocese of Baltimore: Division of Planning and Council Services, 1993); on clarification of the mission, see Marie Kevin Tighe, "Council Spirituality: Foundation for Mission," in Arthur X. Deegan, II, Editor, *Developing a Vibrant Parish Pastoral Council* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1995), pp. 88-99.

33. For the contrast between the council as an institutional commitment and the council as a life expression, see Klemens Schaupp, *Der Pfarrgemeinderat. Eine qualitative Interview-Analyse zum Thema "Biographie und Institution,"* Innsbruck Theological Studies, Volume 26 (Innsbruck and Vienna: Tyrolia Verlag, 1989). On the variety of processes for councillors, see Olsen, *Transforming Church Boards*, chapters 3-6. On the various forms of prayer, see Kathleen Turley, "The Parish Pastoral Council and Prayer," in Deegan, *Developing*, pp. 100-106; and Marliss Rogers, Editor, *Weekly Prayer Services for Parish Meetings: Lectionary-Based for Cycle C* (Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1994).

34. Unlike a Small Christian Community, the pastoral council is a ministry with a specific interest. SCCs have no other focus than to be an expression of Church for their members. See Arthur R. Baranowski, in collaboration with Kathleen M. O'Reilly and Carrie M. Piro, *Creating Small Faith Communities: A Plan for Restructuring the Parish and Renewing Catholic Life* (Cincinnati: St. Anthony Messenger Press, 1988), pp. 38, 41. Others argue that every ministerial group is potentially a small community. See Patrick J. Brennan, *Re-Imagining the Parish: Base Communities, Adulthood, and Family Consciousness* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), p. 18.

35. The "White Paper" was a six-page typescript, written by Mark F. Fischer, that was eventually distributed to the members of both organizations.

36. Subsequent chairs of the CPPCD were Dennis O'Leary (1991), Mary Kay Bailey, O.P. (1992-93), Robert J. Burke (1994-95), Kathleen Turley (1996), and Rev. Eugene Costa (1997-98).

37. Letter of Arthur X. Deegan, II, to Mark F. Fischer, July 1, 1991.

38. From 1992 until his retirement in 1997, Deegan boosted the CPPCD income from \$34,420 to \$114,316, having helped secure a number of grants. During his time the CPPCD published two books, one edited by Deegan, *Developing a Vibrant Parish Pastoral Council*, and the other edited by John P. Flaherty, *Diocesan Efforts at Parish Reorganization* (Clearwater, FL: CPPCD, 1995). The Deegan era also saw the establishment of the Lumen Gentium Award, recognizing excellence in pastoral planning and council development by those outside the CPPCD membership, and the Yves Congar Award, recognizing excellence within the membership. Lumen Gentium Award winners include Archbishop William Borders of Baltimore (1993), the Planning Office of the Archdiocese of Seattle (1994), Richard S. Krivanka (1995), Cardinal Joseph Bernardin (1996), Br. Loughlan Sofield, S.T. (1997), and Bishop Howard Hubbard (1999) and Bishop Kenneth E. Untener of Saginaw. Yves Congar winners include Eileen Tabert (1996), Sr. Rosalie Murphy, S.N.D. (1997), Arthur X. Deegan, II (1998), Rev. Philip Murnion (1999), and Sr. Mary Kay Bailey, O.P. (2000). See "Deegan Receives Yves Congar Award," *Conference Call*, the newsletter of the CPPCD, vol. 9:1 (July, 1998), p. 1. Sr. M. Frances Schumer, A.S.C. succeeded Deegan as Executive Director on July 1, 1997. Maria Rodgers O'Rourke succeeded her in July of 2000.

39. Letter of Robert G. Howes to Mark F. Fischer, July 24, 1991. For references to Howes' three books in the 1990s, see footnote 13 above.

Chapter Fourteen: Problems with Selecting Councillors

1. The concept of representation is explained in the Vatican document entitled "Circular Letter on 'Pastoral Councils.'" It stated: "As far as the composition of the pastoral council is concerned, although the members of the council cannot in a juridical sense be called representatives of the total diocesan community, nevertheless, as far as possible, they should present a witness or sign of the entire diocese, and, therefore, it seems extremely opportune that priests, religious and laity who expound various requirements and experiences take part in the council. The persons, then, appointed to the pastoral council ought to be selected in such a way that the entire composition of the People of God within the diocese is truly represented." See Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, "Circular Letter," no. 7.

2. Pope John Paul II, *Code of Canon Law*, Latin-English Edition, Canon 512, §2.

3. Canon 512, §2 states that DPC members are "appointed" by the bishop, even when they have been "elected" by deanery councils (as in the Archdiocese of Newark), by regional councils (as in the Archdiocese of Baltimore), or even by parish councils (as in the Diocese of Baker, where the DPC is an assembly of parish representatives). Popular elections are not the norm, however, for selecting DPC members. More commonly, DPC members are nominated and then screened by a committee. Nominations may come from pastors (e.g., in Brooklyn), by deans (e.g., in New Orleans), by vicars (e.g., in Tucson), by parish councils (e.g., in Superior), or by the Catholic population in general (e.g., in Sacramento). Once potential members are nominated, there are a variety of ways to evaluate and screen them. Usually a committee does this. In some cases, the bishop may ask a dean or vicar to review nominees. Bishops generally rely upon the good judgment of a committee or a trusted priest to review nominations and