HOW IS POWER USED IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH?
A CASE STUDY OF A GROUP OF MALE RELIGIOUS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MELBOURNE

Submitted by
Peter William Dowling TPTC, B.Sc., MS

A thesis submitted in total fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Social Science

School of Social Science
Faculty of Arts and Science

Date of submission: 1 July 2002

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees.

Signed: …………………………………….

Dated: …………………………………….

ABSTRACT

Aim

While there is much talk of an emerging interest in spirituality in Australia, there is evidence of a declining affiliation with the established Churches. The impact of mainstream Christianity in these circumstances would appear to be waning. The continued attention given to the Church in the wake of these realities and that of the Church's dealing with situations of sexual abuse has often focussed around the way in which the Church has used its power and influence. While undoubtedly there is much evidence of the Church's service and care for its members and those most in need, more questions are being asked about the accountability of those who minister within the boundaries of Catholic Church structures, and the healthiness of those very structures for helping the Church to live out its mission with integrity. Further questioning has often been around the perceived intent of Church authorities, as seen by many, to return the Church to times prior to the Second Vatican Council when clerical authority was unquestioned. There are divergent viewpoints as to whether the call of the Council for wider involvement of lay people in Church decision-making and structures is in the process of being reversed.

The researcher, coming from his experience as a member of a Catholic Religious Congregation of Men, is interested in looking broadly at the issue of how power is used in the Catholic Church, with a particular focus on a case study of one Group of Male Religious in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. The aim of the study is to provide further insight into use of power in the Catholic Church, and to offer some recommendations for future use of that power in a healthy and constructive way for the benefit of the Church and, ultimately, all of society.

Scope

A Literature Review was carried out to investigate the broader issues of how power may be defined. A multitude of answers emerged, resulting in a rich understanding of power and some specific related factors: gender, hegemony, patriarchy, authority, leadership, empowerment and networks. Following these explorations around how use of power may

be understood, examination of issues relating to abuse of power took place. Given this background, attention was then given to issues of power in relation to Church structures.

With these learnings, the researcher conducted five focus groups of people who had relevant knowledge of the male Religious Congregation in Melbourne, which was the specific case study for this research. The groups included current members of the Congregation, former members, staff members in schools run by the Congregation, former students and a women's group. The study was restricted to one specific Congregation, the 'Brothers of St Charles' [fictitious name], in Melbourne, in order to provide a particular and manageable focus. While limited in scope, the study provides an analysis of the focus groups and a linking between this analysis and the Literature Review.

Conclusions

The study finishes with some reflections by the researcher on the learnings of the study and recommendations arising from the study. Central place is given to the quality of relationships of those engaged in ministry on behalf of the Catholic Church. An interplay of personal and Church/Congregational factors is proposed in order to provide some qualitative assessment of the effectiveness of such relationships.

In order for ministers to take up and use their power in an enriching way for themselves and particularly for those to whom they are called in service, recommendations are made around the need for learning about use of power as part of formation for Church personnel, around encouraging ongoing personal growth in those in Church ministry, around the importance of engaging in processes of healing where people have been hurt by past inappropriate use of power, and around the need to continually critique and challenge existing Church structures where there is injustice through lack of inclusivity.

CONTENTS

RESEARCHER'S NOTE:

The Congregation of Brothers studied has, for the purposes of this thesis, been given the fictitious name of the 'Brothers of St Charles'.

When the actual name of the Congregation has been used by a participant in a Focus Group or in a Focus Group question, the name of the Congregation has been put in parentheses, as [Brothers of St Charles].

The initials B.S.C.C. refer to 'Brothers of St Charles College' wherever they appear in the thesis, and they are put in parentheses, as [B.S.C.C.], if the reference specifically mentions the initials of the Congregation being studied.

PREFACE

I come to this study as a member of the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles, and since 1990, a member of the leadership team of the region of the Congregation which is centred in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. In that time, various religious groups, including the Brothers of St Charles, have had to face allegations of sexual abuse of children by some of their members and I have been a member of the team which has been responsible for responding to this situation. The response has required a genuine attempt to listen to those making allegations; offering support to them in their need for immediate therapy; setting up structures which encourage further disclosures; supporting Brothers who face allegations; dealing with general morale of the rest of the region; examining the protocols in our ministries relating to safety of all engaged in the enterprise and ensuring public accountability for this; and coming to grips with the type of culture in which such abuse was able to occur.

As I reflected on these issues, engaged in discussion with others and began to read around the topic, it seemed to me that there were wider questions to be asked. Power began to take a central place in my thoughts as I noted constantly that abuse was an expression of a disordered use of power, particularly within a Catholic Church context where religious people had always been given great respect and trust by the Catholic laity. So, while the sexual abuse factor may have been the triggering point for my investigations, it opened the door for a broader examination of how power has been understood and used in the Church. I was interested not only in the negative impact of the use/abuse of power, but also in seeing where power has been used to positive effect in the Church and Brotherhood as it was clear that those charged with sexual abuse were a minority of members of these organisations.

Such a topic would seem particularly relevant at a time when, given present world insecurity with its many associated human problems, company collapses due to questionable accountability standards and a general heightened feeling of the need for

transparency of action in all spheres of living, people are much more critical of structures which may have been so strongly entrenched in past times as to have been virtually beyond scrutiny. That scenario has changed and is likely to be increasingly challenged, particularly as the global view of domination by super-powers is being held up for greater examination and evaluation.

In this light, the time-honoured patterns of use of power and authority by the Catholic Church are also being exposed for investigation. I believe that such a process is very important so that the integrity of the Catholic Church is demonstrated by the ways in which it is seen to operate both at an official level and between its members. While this study offers a particular focus on the Brothers of St Charles as one group in the wider Catholic Church, the implications of the study may be of benefit for the wider Church.

I offer my reflections on the use of power in the Church in that light, and in the hope that they will be another small voice which calls the Church to remain faithful to the call of Jesus Christ to promote life to the full in all of its endeavours.

INTRODUCTION

The research begins with a Literature Review in Chapter 1 which looks at definitions of power and some related concepts and aspects of power. The issue of abuse of power is clearly one aspect which is looked at specifically, and then these matters are examined insofar as they relate to Catholic Church structures.

In order to relate the material in the Literature Review to the reality of life in Melbourne in the Catholic Church and in the Brothers of St Charles, I chose to engage in conversation with a variety of groups of people who had personal experience of the Brothers, either as current or former members, as staff members in the Brothers' schools, as past students of these schools, or as others with relevant knowledge of both Church and Congregation. Virtually all of these people, I believe, were raised in the Catholic religion, and most would see themselves as still affiliated with the Catholic Church in their adult life. This is not to say that all would agree on all aspects of Church teaching and functioning, but such people were very familiar with the culture of the Catholic Church in Melbourne and had some direct involvement with the Brothers of St Charles. As many of the above people were men, I was interested in hearing from women as well, particularly in a forum where they were free to express their opinions without any influence from men in the group.

I chose the use of Focus Groups rather than a series of interviews with individual people. One reason for this was the lack of my own time availability to conduct a large number of interviews of a one-to-one nature. The second and, in terms of my hopes, more important reason was that the telling of stories and memories by one person in a group could trigger responses and thoughts in others, the effect being that a richer understanding and teasing out of the issues became possible. I believe that this happened in each of the groups. After each group, I received comments that 'we could have kept talking about this for a long time!' While further groups would need to be held in order to have a greater sense that there were no more significant issues to be surfaced, the Focus Groups which were held offered an opportunity to explore the issues in a stimulating manner with people who were interested in the topic of research. The details of how people were recruited for each of the Focus Groups are contained at the beginning of Chapter 2, *Focus Group Analysis*. One

point worthy of note is that, while the greater time in each Focus Group was spent looking at the Brothers of St Charles, the underlying Catholic Church background and experience of the participants was the bedrock on which their comments were built.

Following this analysis, I have highlighted in Chapter 3 what seem to me to be the emerging issues coming from a marriage of the Literature Review with the Focus Groups. I have chosen to use the areas of definitions of power, related concepts and aspects, and abuse of power, and then to look again at these issues in relation to Church structures. In that sense, the format follows the structure of the Literature Review.

I conclude the research with Chapter 4, *Learnings and Recommendations*, in which I bring together the elements of earlier sections into a form where specific proposals are put forward as important if the use of power in the Catholic Church and in the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles is to be positive and growth-producing into the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my appreciation to the following people who have assisted me in the development of this thesis:

• Dr Bob Bessant, my supervisor, for his close reading of my drafts of ideas and his insights and encouragement at all stages of the process;

• The members of the Focus Groups who gave their time to engage in conversation because they were interested in the topic of use of power in the Church and Congregation of Brothers of St Charles, and whose enthusiasm was a source of stimulation for me;

• The Brothers of St Charles with whom I have been a fellow-member for many years for their key role in my own personal and professional development and for helping me to gain greater insights into how power is used in the myriads of interactions between people.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The Literature Review will be looked at under a number of headings as follows:

A   What is power?

      i   Definitions of Power

      ii   Some Related Concepts and Aspects

B   Abuse of power

C   Issues of Power in relation to Church Structures

A   What is power?

i   Definitions of Power

Power is one of the most elusive of concepts, with a wide variety of interpretations in both everyday understanding and the musings of many theorists on power. Davis (1988) highlights the degree of confusion which this myriad of understandings can produce when she says:

> Since the inception of sociology as a science, power has been rather standard fare for debate. Despite massive theorizing about the 'nature of the beast', there has been surprisingly little agreement as to how it should be defined. Lukes, himself a leading theorist on power, sums up some of the major differences in theories on power as follows:
>
> - Power is something which is *possessed*; it can only be *exercised*; it is a matter of *authority*.
>
> - Power belongs to the *individual*; it belongs only to *collectives*; power doesn't belong to anyone, but is a *feature of social systems*.
>
> - Power involves *conflict*; power doesn't necessarily involve conflict; power usually involves conflict, but doesn't have to.

> \- Power presupposes *resistance*; power is primarily involved in *compliance* (to norms); power is both.
>
> \- Power is tied to *repression* and domination; power is *productive* and enabling.
>
> \- Power is *bad*, *good*, *demonic* or *routine*.
>
> Is it any wonder that the reader feels confused? As Lukes notes: when it comes to power, apparently 'anything goes'. (Davis 1988, p. 70)

The ideas which follow will bear out the truth of what has been mentioned above! In this great mix of ideas, let us look at the definitions and theories of power offered by a number of writers in the field. Undoubtedly, one of the foremost in this area is Michel Foucault.

Foucault's theory of power emphasises that power is neither given, nor exchanged, nor recovered but rather exercised, and it only exists in action. (Caputo & Yount 1993, p. 31) Consequently the question 'what is power?' is, for him, secondary to the question 'how is power exercised?' (Cousins & Hussain 1984, p. 227) Power is not an attribute of individuals and is not something which is possessed. It is in action that it is observed.

> Power is the thin, inescapable film that covers all human interactions, whether inside institutions or out. Institutional structures are saturated with sexual relations, economic relations, social relations, etc., and are always established of these power relations: relations between men and women, old and young, senior and junior, well-born and starved, colorless and colored, Occident and Orient. Institutions are the means that power uses, and not the other way around, not sources or origins of power. (Caputo & Yount 1993, p. 4)

In other words, power relations are embedded in the very heart of human relationships, coming into being as soon as there are human beings. Power is something which circulates, 'it is never localised here or there ... Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization.' (Caputo & Yount 1993, p. 31)

Power is not to be seen as something repressive and negative, the domination of one person or group over another. On the contrary, 'it must be considered as a productive network which runs through the entire social body much more than as a negative instance whose

function is repression.' (Morris & Patton 1979, p. 36) In this context, power is not simply what the dominant class has and the oppressed lack. 'Power, Foucault prefers to say, is a strategy, and the dominated are as much a part of the network of power relations and the particular social matrix as the dominating.' (Hoy 1986, p. 134) Power is exercised in the effect of one action on another action. 'Power can be explained only by understanding the "field of possible actions" in which the action occurs.' (Hoy 1986, p. 135) In other words, there are all sorts of variables which impact on people's actions, and how people act is not easily predicted.

For Foucault, power is 'power/knowledge'. He contends 'that knowledge is applied power. Knowledge is what power relations produce in order to spread and disseminate all the more effectively ... Psychiatrists and psychologists, criminal justice professionals and social workers, confessors and spiritual directors: all produce the knowledge they apply. They create the knowledge they require in order to fashion functioning, well-informed individuals.' (Caputo & Yount 1993, p. 6) Such knowledge appears to be imparted in the form of 'discourses' which become the accepted apologia of the professionals and generate what is regarded as 'truth' in the particular discipline. In time, that 'truth', which is the knowledge associated with the exercise of power, becomes the norm in the discipline.

A requirement for the exercise of power relations, for Foucault, is that there must be on both sides at least a certain form of liberty. 'Freedom is both the condition and the effect of power. It is a condition because power is only exercised on free beings, and it is an effect since the exercise of power will invariably meet with resistance, which is the manifestation of freedom.' (Hoy 1986, p. 139) Lack of freedom would, for Foucault, be an indication not of the use of power but of dominating imposition and possible violence.

Sawicki (1991) offers a good summary of Foucault's influence when she compares his theory of power with what she calls the 'juridico-discursive' model of power. This latter model is based on the assumptions:
•   power is possessed (for instance, by the individuals in the state of nature, by a class, by the people);
•   power flows from a centralised source from top to bottom (for instance, law, the economy, the state);

- power is primarily repressive in its exercise (a prohibition backed by sanctions).

Opposed to this, Foucault's model differs in these ways:

- power is exercised rather than possessed;
- power is analysed as coming from the bottom up;
- power is not primarily repressive, but productive.

Foucault thus broadens the 'juridico-discursive' model of power, which he sees as describing only one form of power, and enables the location of forms of power that are obscured in traditional theories. He thus enables the myriad of power relations at the microlevel of society to be seen as significant, and as 'mak[ing] possible certain global effects of domination, such as class power and patriarchy.' (Sawicki 1991, p. 23)

Another to offer a theory of power is Steven Lukes (1974) who proposes a three-dimensional view of power. Lukes offers a definition of 'mobilisation of bias' as: 'a set of predominant values, beliefs, rituals, and institutional procedures ("rules of the game") that operate systematically and consistently to the benefit of certain persons and groups to the expense of others. Those who benefit are placed in a preferred position to defend and promote their vested interests.' (Lukes 1974, p. 16) In this context, a one-dimensional view of power focuses on behaviour in the making of decisions on issues over which there is an observable conflict of interests - how people go about entrenching their own interests to the detriment of others.

A two-dimensional view of power involves examining both decision-making and nondecision-making, where a decision is a choice among alternative modes of action, and a nondecision is a decision that results in suppression or thwarting of a particular or possible challenge to the interests of the decision-maker.

> I conclude that the two-dimensional view of power involves a qualified
> critique of the behavioural focus of the first view (I say qualified because it
> is still assumed that nondecision-making is a form of decision-making) and
> it allows for the consideration of the ways in which decisions are prevented
> from being taken on potential issues over which there is an observable
> conflict of (subjectively) interests, seen as embodied in express policy
> preferences and sub-political grievances. (Lukes 1974, p. 20)

After considering these two views of power, he then puts forward a further proposition, which he refers to as the 'three-dimensional view of power'. He says about this view that it

> involves a *thoroughgoing critique* of the *behavioural focus* of the first two views as too individualistic and allows for consideration of the many ways in which *potential issues* are kept out of politics, whether through the operation of social forces and institutional practices or through individuals' decisions. This, moreover, can occur in the absence of actual, observable conflict, which may have been successfully averted - though there remains here an implicit reference to potential conflict. This potential, however, may never in fact be actualised. What one may have here is a *latent conflict*, which consists in a contradiction between the interests of those exercising power and the *real interests* of those they exclude. (Lukes 1974, p. 24)

A telling comment from Lukes is his judgement that the supreme, and most insidious, exercise of power is to get another or others to have the desires one wants them to have, to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires.

Another to speak of power is Burbules (1986) who bases his ideas on the work of Anthony Giddens. For Giddens, power within social systems involves reproduced relations of autonomy and dependence in social interaction. Such power relations are always two-way, but it is important to realise that even the most autonomous agent is in some degree dependent, and the most dependent party in a relationship retains some autonomy. (Burbules 1986, p. 97) Like Foucault, Burbules sees power as a web or a system of relations where there is a constant, dynamic, if at times subtle, interplay at work.

> The starting point of a power analysis is a background of conflicting interests. … Given this background conflict of interests, any relation which conceals, perpetuates, or legitimates that conflict is a power relation, even if the character of the relation is itself benign; more often, however, when the conflict of interests is apparent to the agents concerned, the relation necessarily takes on a coercive or manipulative character. (Burbules 1986, p. 104)

Because of this, Burbules argues that, even with the best of intentions, one who decides that power is unavoidable in the present arrangements of society and hence seizes it and

attempts to use it wisely and for good purpose is likely to be adopting a self-defeating strategy. Burbules sees this as a deception - the belief that we use power, without considering how the power relation uses us. It involves the presumption that one knows the interests of others better than they do themselves. 'A habitual disregard for the consent of others, and the *presumption* of authority and privilege, inevitably tend towards the most pernicious manifestations of power. Both history and personal experience bear this conclusion out.' (Burbules 1986, p. 105)

Angus and Rizvi (1986) provide an overview of theories of power and break traditional theories into functionalist and pluralist theories. Functionalists assume a fundamental distinction between authority (the legitimate use of influence in an organisation) and power (the illegitimate or unauthorised use of influence). In this categorisation, power and authority are seen as mutually exclusive, with authority involving the potential to influence based on an organisational position, and power being the actual ability to influence in all kinds of other ways. Pluralist views focus more on observable behaviour in decision-making circumstances where there is actual and observable conflict over preferences among two or more groups, with no group being sufficiently powerful to dominate. Both of these traditional views assume that 'power is a property of *individual* persons, wielded *instrumentally* as a means to particular *intended* outcomes.' (Angus & Rizvi 1986, p. 5) Another way of seeing power is the *relational* view which is more that of Lukes, Foucault and Burbules. A relational conception of power emphasises that power is not simply chosen or avoided but made more or less necessary by the circumstances under which people come together. In these power relations, there is usually a tension between compliance and resistance.

> Instead of thinking of power in terms of a binary opposition between two parties, be they two classes or two people, as the foundation of power relations, the relational conception emphasises the multitude of micro-relations of force and influence within all cultural arrangements and practices which serve to support or challenge the status quo; within the family, at work and within other social milieux. This way of looking at power reverses the direction of traditional analysis and focuses attention

instead on major forms of domination as 'hegemonic effects' which emerge

from the multiplicity of micro-powers. (Angus & Rizvi 1986, p. 7)

I will return to the concept of *hegemony* later.

A realisation of the importance of language in how power is exercised is at the heart of the understanding of Pierre Bourdieu. (1991) The words we use are not meant solely to convey communication. In fact, Bourdieu would claim that this occurrence is rare. We sense in the variations of accent, intonation and vocabulary different positions in the social hierarchy. Words are loaded with unequal weights depending on the person speaking, the manner of speech and the circumstances. Words can be instruments of coercion, constraint, intimidation and abuse, as well as of politeness and condescension. In the day-to-day flow of social interaction, language occupies a central position and hence underscores the way in which we define our interactions with others. We develop patterns of relating based on the perceptions we acquire in life.

For Bourdieu, the concept of 'habitus' is important. The *habitus* is a set of dispositions which incline people to act and react in certain ways, and which generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are 'regular' without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any 'rule'. In practice, what happens is a product of the relation between the habitus and the specific social context in any particular interaction.   Given this understanding, Bourdieu uses 'the term "symbolic power" to refer not so much to a specific type of power, but rather to an aspect of most forms of power as they are routinely deployed in social life. For in the routine flow of day-to-day life, power is seldom exercised as overt physical force: instead, it is transmuted into a symbolic form, and thereby endowed with a kind of *legitimacy* that it would not otherwise have.' (Bourdieu 1991, p. 23) There is a subtlety to all of this. Bourdieu goes on to say:

> To understand the nature of symbolic power, it is therefore crucial to see
> that it presupposes a kind of *active complicity* on the part of those subjected
> to it. Dominated individuals are not passive bodies to which symbolic
> power is applied, as it were, like a scalpel to a corpse. Rather, symbolic
> power requires, as a condition of its success, that those subjected to it

believe in the legitimacy of power and the legitimacy of those who wield it (Bourdieu 1991, p. 23)

and offers a good summary of his views:

> It is only in exceptional cases that symbolic exchanges are reduced to relations of pure communication, and that the informative content of the message exhausts the content of the communication. The power of words is nothing other than the delegate power of the spokesperson, and his speech - that is, the substance of his discourse and, inseparably, his way of speaking - is not more than a testimony, and one among others, of the guarantee of delegation which is vested in him. (Bourdieu 1991, p. 107)

Burrell and Morgan (1979) come from a perspective of organisational analysis and look at how power is seen in a number of sociological paradigms. Their definitions of power are reminiscent of some of Lukes' different dimensions of power. A 'unitary' view of power largely 'ignores the role of power in organisational life. Concepts such as authority, leadership and control tend to be preferred means of describing the managerial prerogative of guiding the organisation towards the achievement of common interests.' (Burrell & Morgan 1979, p. 204) As opposed to this, the pluralist view 'regards power as a variable crucial to the understanding of the activities of an organisation. Power is the medium through which conflicts of interest are alleviated and resolved. The organisation is viewed as a plurality of power holders drawing their power from a plurality of sources.' (Burrell & Morgan 1979, p. 204)

Some important questions are raised in this pluralist perspective. The following are not exhaustive: Is power separate from processes of social control? Does power benefit one group at the expense of another (zero-sum), or is it something which can benefit everyone (non-zero-sum)? How does power become legitimised in the form of authority? Can power be seen in its potential to achieve ends as well as in what it actually accomplishes?

Davis, quoted at the beginning of this review, also draws upon the work of Anthony Giddens which focusses on power as a process:

> Relations of power involving domination and subordination are constructed ongoingly in the course of interaction by means of the same sorts of

reflexive procedures employed by actors to sustain and maintain any situation. Power becomes integral to any social encounter, even the most casual or intimate one. It is exercised at the micro-level of interaction as well as being implicated in institutions or social systems. The exercise of power is not a matter of straightforward, top-down, or repressive forms of control. Far from being openly authoritarian or coercive, it can be enabling or productive. Power has a Janus-face. The exercise of power is simultaneously routine, processual and multi-dimensional. (Davis 1988, p. 91)

Davis reminds us that power relations are always seen in concrete situations; they are always and everywhere embedded in specific contexts, involving specific actors or groups of actors drawing upon specific rules and resources which are organised in specifically structured ways.

Coming from the background of critical social science, Fay (1987) highlights the dyadic nature of power, putting particular emphasis on the power of the powerless or oppressed. He sees that the crucial role of power in social life requires the involvement of both those being led or commanded as much as those leading or commanding. It is from the interaction of the powerful and the powerless that power arises, with both sides contributing something necessary for its existence. Fay is interested in how the 'power of the oppressed' may be used in the process of social transformation:

This sort of power relationship is particularly amenable to a critical theory intent on fomenting radical social change. Since consent is the basis of this sort of power, the removal of consent occasioned by the followers coming to have new self-understandings can be an effective weapon against the power of the leaders. In a leadership relationship, the powerless are in a fundamental sense not powerless because they share with the powerful in the creation of power. It is this implicit power of the oppressed which a critical social theory can tap into in order to be a practical instrument of social transformation. (Fay 1987, p. 121)

From a feminist perspective, Hartsock (1974) recognises the associative links between ideas of manliness and virility on the one hand, and domination, conquest and power on the other, and sees these links as strong and pervasive in Western culture. She speaks of two ways of looking at power - power which requires the domination of others, that is, power over others, which she would regard as a particularly masculine way of looking at power; and power understood as energy, strength, and effective interaction: for example, 'any activity where there is accomplishment, satisfaction of needs, mutual attainment of goals not distorted by … thwarting ... experience.' (Hartsock 1974, p. 15)   She is interested in social transformation, like Fay, and sees women as particularly able to take a lead in this process: 'Our [women's] strategies for change must grow out of the tension between using our organizations as instruments for taking and transforming power in a society structured by power understood only as domination, and using our organizations to build models for a new society based on power understood as energy and initiative.' (Hartsock 1974, p. 23) The domain of gender is one to which I will return in the next section.

Krausz (1986) looks at how power and leadership are related in organisations. She defines power as the ability to influence the actions of others, individuals or groups. Leadership, she believes, is the way power is used in the process of influencing the actions of others. Leadership, then, is not an entity in itself, but a way of relating to others. Krausz refers to organisational and personal power: organisational power is directly related to an individual's status and function in a structure, and the influence which that status assigns by applying formal norms as a way to trigger certain actions by the members of the organisation; personal power refers to specific characteristics, experiences, knowledge, expertise and ways of relating to others.

Pinderhughes (1989) offers a definition of power and then speaks of the significance of powerlessness on human behaviour:

> Power may be defined as the capacity to produce desired effects on others; it
> can be perceived in terms of mastery over self as well as over nature and
> other people. It involves the capacity to influence, for one's own benefit, the
> forces that affect one's life. Powerlessness thus is the inability to exert such
> influence. Power is gratifying. Siu has suggested that 'power is the
> universal solvent of human relations.' Basch has stated that 'the feeling of

controlling one's destiny to some reasonable extent is the essential psychological component of all aspects of life.' This means that a sense of power is critical to one's mental health. Everyone needs it. Furthermore, powerlessness is painful and people defend against feeling powerless by behavior that brings them a sense of power. (Pinderhughes 1989, p. 109)

This last comment is particularly relevant when one looks at the way in which church personnel, while in situations of power over others, often are not aware of and do not feel that power. This is a point to which I will return.

Poling (1991) is reminiscent of Foucault when he refers to power as exercised in relational webs. He notes that our ability to act in effective ways depends on our connections with other persons, and with the institutions and ideas that form the basis of our experience. He says further:

Power ... has both a personal and a social dimension. At the personal level, there is a drive for power to actualize the self through the relational web. This power can be denied by the person's set of circumstances or it can become distorted toward evil. But choices for the individual derive from social institutions and ideologies as these are sanctioned by religious assumptions and world views. (Poling 1991, p. 26)

Following on from this, Poling then comments on what he would see as abuse of power:

Abuse of power for the individual is motivated by fear and by the resulting desire to control the power of life. This fear and arrogance are then used to create societies in which structures of domination create special possibilities for the privileged at the expense of shared power for all persons. The power that is intended by God for everyone who lives is used to destroy relationships in exchange for control. Rather than live in insecurity, some persons choose to create structures that dominate and control others for personal gratification and false security. (Poling 1991, p. 27)

One who speaks of power from a postmodern perspective is Gergen (in Reed & Hughes 1992, ch. 11). His ideas of organisation life emphasise the importance of mutuality, of cooperation in achieving the goals of the organisation, rather than of the more traditional

understanding of power being from the top down. He postulates two features as necessary for power to exist:

> Let us begin by defining power roughly as the capacity to achieve specified ends. If we do so, then we find at least two components essential for the existence of power. First, it is necessary to articulate criteria for the achievement of power. The achievement of this initial component is inherently social, requiring coordinated agreements among participants. In effect, there is a mutual agreement regarding the containment of the signifiers. As a second component of power, a range of activities must be coordinated around the achievement of these locally defined ends. Such activities will include both discourse and other forms of action. This is to say that participants must generate constraints over the free play of signifiers, and confine their activities to those which fit the language so constrained. In effect, then, power is inherently a matter of social interdependence, and it is achieved through the social coordination of actions around specified definitions. (Reed & Hughes 1992, p. 220)

Such a view will become an important one for future reference when consideration is given to Church structures which, while articulating the importance of more inclusive involvement, tend to be in practice resistant to opening up to new ways of operation.

An interesting corollary of Gergen's thought is that power in an organisation can be seen as self-destructive.

> As social units achieve power, so do they simultaneously architect its undoing. This is chiefly so because the achievement of coordination within a group erects a barrier between it and adjoining communities of signification. Not only are its own signifiers prevented from escaping, or playing into the surrounding languages, but the languages of the surrounding milieu fail to enter the coordinated unit. In this sense the unit fails to achieve the kinds of supplementarity in meaning that would enable its self-contained definitions to be honored from without, and it fails to supplement the meanings of others in ways that would invite reciprocation and further coordination. ... In effect, as each unit becomes increasingly powerful within

itself, so is the organization as a whole disenabled - with the ultimate end
being the destruction of all. (Reed & Hughes 1992, p. 221)

Gergen finishes with the sobering comment: 'If everything is running smoothly, the organisation is in trouble!' (Reed & Hughes 1992, p. 222) These thoughts leave us with a clear understanding that in the postmodern world, power must be both an integrating and coordinating factor in an organisation, and simultaneously must encourage a conversation with elements outside the organisation to support its overall health.

Another who speaks of power specifically in professional relationships is Rutter (1989).

Power ... refers to a difference in degree of personal and social freedom between two people that leads to one imposing his will on the other. This will is usually imposed psychologically, but it can also have physical manifestations, such as the development of sexual intimacy. The power differential begins when a person with a specific need looks for help from someone more knowledgeable, trained, or competent. Once the relationship begins, the power to impose the will grows immeasurably, because the more powerful person can threaten to abandon the relationship. (Rutter 1989, p. 42)

This is a definition which gets to the heart of professional relationships. One of the issues it raises is the degree to which church personnel consider their relationships as professional: what is the difference, if any, between professional, pastoral and personal? These are very practical considerations in looking at the way in which such people are conscious of their exercise of power.

Brown and Bohn (1989) make a distinction between masculine and feminine power.

Views of power are closely linked to stereotyped masculine and feminine self identities. Power is how the self feels itself present, alive, and sustained in the world. The possession and use of power is yoked to self-esteem and self-protection. David McClelland notes that the male experiences power as something he gains, drawing more and more to himself and using the acquired power to gain more over against others who threaten his power. Involvement with others is tied to a qualification of power and identity. Strength is the ability to control things external to the self. This view of

power is inherently competitive and hierarchical, essential to capitalism and the nuclear arms race. McClelland found a different experience of power in traditional females, one based in their childrearing roles. Feminine power involves the need to nurture others. In giving of herself to others to facilitate and empower their growth, the female feels powerful. Hence the feminine view of power is grounded in generosity, empathy, yielding, and relinquishment. (Brown & Bohn 1989, p. 43)

Brown and Bohn see the two views of power as requiring each other, but in the exploiter male and exploited female duality, the seeds are present for such exploitation to result in the production of unhappy people.

From a Jungian perspective, Hillman (1995) believes that the power of ideas is the most significant in determining human action.

What may have an effect more powerful than heaven above, the intercession of angels and the magic of demons are the ideas that inhabit our minds and go unnoticed in our daily conduct. Of all the little and big forces that subordinate our actions to superior powers it is ideas that hold the most direct and immediate sway. More than the figures of myth, more than the political state, more than the unconscious complexes of emotions, we are subject to ideas through which we filter and by which we form the powers of religion, politics and psychology. (Hillman 1995, p. 249)

The subtlety of the power of ideas comes through his writing. In the Western world, the overwhelming emphasis on the importance of action, efficiency and growth has led to the idea that we must be 'dominators' (in the image of God as 'Dominus'). Such a notion that 'pure activity is the essence of divinity gives spiritual impetus to the Western worship of productivity, and also to Western machismo, racism, and paranoia.' (Hillman 1995, p. 100) We are challenged by the question: what are we living which we are not recognising? where an inability to be in touch with the power influences inside and all around us can result in power becoming abusive.

ii   Some Related Concepts and Aspects

The above definitions indicate the significance of a number of related concepts which I wish to address further. It is often not possible to separate these concepts clinically from each other as there is a dynamic interplay between them.

One area in which the study of power is considered to be an essential element of discussion is in the field of relationships between men and women. In this regard, I would like to begin by looking at the areas of gender, hegemony and patriarchy. There will follow further comment on the areas of authority, leadership, empowerment and networks.

Gender

Archer and Lloyd (1982, p. 153) refer to the work of Henley who has maintained that there is ample evidence of a power imbalance between men and women in society and that it can be seen in their behaviour. Her focus is on the nonverbal messages exchanged through smiles, frowns, glances, gestures, movements toward and away from others, and she believes that they are indicative of the dominance of men and the submissiveness of women.

They also look at the work of Lukes, already noted above, who argued that there are three different ways of looking at asymmetric power relations, with all three usually involving conflict and resistance:

> The first view is in terms of compliance: The powerful person or group can impose its decision or will on the less powerful... In biological accounts, the larger size and greater aggressiveness of men is used to explain the subjugation of women. A second view sees power as being exercised through dependence: Power relations that arise from conditions of economic dependence between industrial nations and producers of raw materials are of this type. This view can also be applied to the economic dependence of women on men and to the psychological training of boys and girls: Males are trained to be dominant and females to comply. The third view of asymmetric power relations is in terms of material and social rewards.

Feminist anthropologists and sociologists have pointed out numerous ways in which women are kept in low-paid jobs, encounter difficulty in career advancement, are excluded from certain occupational roles, and are assigned primary responsibility for child care. Inequality of access to rewards is seen in all these examples. (Archer & Lloyd 1982, p. 149)

From an organisational perspective, Sims et al (1993) believe that gender issues and sexuality often become enmeshed with organisational politics in which, almost invariably, men have greater power than women. 'On the whole, the controls placed on female sexuality and homosexuality are tighter and more inhibiting than those placed on what are seen as "traditional masculine" traits.' (Sims, Fineman & Gabriel 1993, p. 157) In similar fashion, Fineman and Gabriel (1996) note how language, 'notably the language of senior executives, systematically and invisibly disadvantages women, by incorporating covert assumptions of a discriminatory nature.' (Fineman & Gabriel 1996, p. 98) In another work, Fineman (1993) also comments on the way in which the gendered nature of management generates an emotional climate as do other oppressive aspects of management structures. 'Groups oppressed by class, gender, age, sexuality, ethnicity or disability find this oppression mediated through management structures. In rational terms management should be fair, impersonal and impartial, whereas in reality management structures reflect wider power structures with a different "emotional atmosphere" depending on whether one is one of the oppressed or one of the oppressors.' (Fineman 1993, p. 174) Fineman then argues that in confining knowledge to certain discourses, male management invariably uses 'mobilisation of bias' to keep certain issues such as gender, sexuality and emotions off the organisational agenda (Fineman 1993, p. 181).

Willerscheidt et al (1997) refer to Max Weber's definition of power as the likelihood a person may achieve personal ends despite possible resistance from others. 'Since this definition views power as potentially coercive, Weber also considered ways in which power can be achieved through justice. Authority, he contended, is power which people determine to be legitimate rather than coercive. As a group, women are at a distinct disadvantage when considering both power and authority.' (Willerscheidt et al. 1997, p. 3) The authors then highlight that men have more legitimate power at their disposal (based on rank or position, as shown by such things as status, resources, experience and self-

confidence) than do women. This feminist perspective is an important one to be aware of in that, for those in authority in the Catholic Church - by definition, men - their failure to acknowledge such possibilities can lead to a lack of understanding of the way in which they are relating to people and the influence which they are exerting.

Hegemony

Given the strong belief that men are, in general, culturally and sociologically conditioned to have more power than women, the concept of 'hegemony' becomes an important one. Hegemony embraces concepts of leadership and domination, the assertion of authority and prestige, be it in the areas of economic, social or cultural affairs. The concept of hegemony attempts to explain how a ruling elite exercises power and maintains social control, without using force to produce consent. The ruling elite attempts to engineer consent by legitimating a certain cluster of values. The range of values becomes hegemonic when it is widely promoted and accepted as describing 'the way things are', inducing people to consent to practices and institutions dominant in their society and way of life as ordinary common sense, an unquestioning belief that this is the way things are or are supposed to be, with no need for justification. Such ascendancy of one group over others is not achieved by violence or threat, but 'is embedded in religious doctrine and practice, mass media content, wage structures, the design of housing, welfare/taxation policies and so forth.' (Connell 1987, p. 184) Indeed, there seems a clear indication from theorists that the use of force is often an indication of a shallow and unstable power base, evidence of a lack of power. (cf Sawicki 1991, p. 21) As such, force is not a concept which sits comfortably with hegemonic operation.

In relation to the comments above on how men hold power sway over women in a hegemonic manner, Connell (1995) asserts that identifying different ways of expressing masculinity is key to understanding the dynamics of power imbalance between the genders. I would like to include a lengthy quote from his work to expound his views:

> Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women.

This is not to say that the most visible bearers of hegemonic masculinity are always the most powerful people... Individual holders of institutional power or great wealth may be far from the hegemonic pattern in their personal lives...

Nevertheless, hegemony is likely to be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideal and institutional power, collective if not individual. So the top levels of business, the military and government provide a fairly convincing *corporate* display of masculinity, still very little shaken by feminist women or dissenting men. It is the successful claim to authority, more than direct violence, that is the mark of hegemony (though violence often underpins or supports authority).

I stress that hegemonic masculinity embodies a 'currently accepted' strategy. When conditions for the defence of patriarchy change, the bases for the dominance of a particular masculinity are eroded. New groups may challenge old solutions and construct a new hegemony. The dominance of *any* group of men may be challenged by women. Hegemony, then, is a historically mobile relation. (Connell 1995, p. 77)

Connell also notes that much of the critical work of feminism and gay liberation has necessarily been devoted to contesting cultural power, for instance, cultural definitions of women as weak, or of homosexuals as mentally ill. (Connell 1987, p. 107)

Tulley (1997), who looks at how violence is often part of the living out of hegemonic masculinity, makes the point that this dominance of men comes at a cost not just for those who are the recipients of such behaviour and attitudes, but also for men themselves who behave and believe in this manner. 'Hegemonic masculinity has costs in relation to the victims of physical, emotional, psychological, and sexual abuse but the victims must also include the perpetrators of the abuse because their understanding of their identity as males includes the abuse of power and the need to control others. In a perverse way they are also the "losers".' (Tulley 1997, p. 4)

Since this study of power is in relation to its use in the Catholic Church, it is appropriate to refer again to Fineman who looks at the reality of white male hegemony and links it with a

series of dualities, many of which are relevant when considering traditional church structures and theologies. He states:

> White male hegemony extends not only to occupation and control of positions of leadership, power and authority but to control of sexuality and emotional climates. The persistence of spurious dualities around public/private, sexual/asexual, rational/irrational, male/female, task/process, unemotional/emotional, are part of this hegemonic control. The development of postmodernism, post-feminism and poststructuralism can also be perceived as the control of theory when the real message is the medium which persistently remains white, male and middle class. (Fineman 1993, p. 187)

The promotion of the dualities referred to hints at the classic dualities of spiritual/temporal and body/soul which are so much a part of the Christian story.

Angus (1986) speaks of a case study in the early 1980s of a specific but fictitiously-named [Brothers of St Charles] College and its style of operation and management.

> The concept of hegemony allows an understanding of how, despite the fact that 'at any time, forms of alternative or directly oppositional politics and culture exist as significant elements in the society ... the decisive hegemonic function is to control or transform and even incorporate them' (Williams 1977, p. 113). This is because the hegemony presents a universal and 'natural' view of the world which includes common-sense or taken-for-granted perspectives of 'the way things are'. Thus, even movements of resistance are likely to be steeped in the common-sense, hegemonic 'reality'. (Angus 1986, p. 42)

Speaking more specifically of the particular College studied, Angus goes on to state:

> The reproduction of social and economic privilege over generations is far from absolute, however, and an important point is that [B.S.C.C.] is perceived to have contributed to a real improvement of the relative social positions of its clients over time. But such status improvement, although genuine, is achieved by individuals in an institution which assiduously grooms candidates for advancement and which, moreover, does this in a way

that also fulfils the school's ideological function of legitimation of predominant political and economic values. The particular education that is offered is misrecognised as being 'neutral'. This is a further illustration of Bourdieu's notion of 'symbolic violence'.

Symbolic violence acts especially through the hegemonic curriculum and in the manner in which 'achievement' is measured within the confines of that narrow selection of knowledge that counts as valid. Curriculum controls the content of formal schooling, and evaluation ensures the compliance of all those pupils who trust that their individual life chances will be enhanced by the accumulation of satisfactory reports and marks that indicate mastery of curriculum content. Such an approach to curriculum and evaluation encourages the individual commitment of pupils to competition with their peers for academic success and advancement. (Angus 1986, p. 55)

I have considered the length of the above quotation as justified because it refers to a specific school conducted by the Brothers of St Charles. While it may not be possible to generalise from this one study, some pointers for further consideration are offered, particularly in relation to the dominant hegemony in operation.

Patriarchy

The discussions of gender and hegemony issues have already referred to patriarchy. Whereas hegemony relates to the domination of one group over others through social control, patriarchy is concerned with the way in which men set the standards and parameters around which life is valued and determined. Clearly, it is related to the concepts of gender and hegemony.

Brown and Bohn's definition of patriarchy is: 'Patriarchy is the complex of ideologies and structures that sustains and perpetuates male control over females.' (Brown & Bohn 1989, p. 62)

Horst (1996), after speaking about the way in which patriarchy is experienced by men and women, says that we all have a deeply ingrained belief that what men want matters more

than what women want. She goes on to give her definition of patriarchy, or rather her series of definitions, as:

> Patriarchy is a lens that keeps certain things out of focus. It is etiquette disguised as ethics, a system of more or less arbitrary values masquerading as the natural and right order of things. It defines men as the standard for humanity and women as something slightly less than that, and therefore robs us all of our full humanity. Patriarchy is what makes women believe that they are supposed to serve the needs of men, and encourages men to accept this as their due. (Horst 1996, p. 4)

Kenway (1995), looking at how masculinities are expressed in the Australian school system, comments:

> Hegemonic masculinity is associated with the hard, the dry and the strong: femininity with the soft, the wet and the weak. More particularly, masculinity mobilises around physical strength, instrumental skills, public knowledge, discipline, reason, objectivity, rationality and competition. In contrast, femininity is associated with physical weakness, expressive skills, private knowledge, creativity, emotion, subjectivity, irrationality and co-operation. These dualities are usually arranged in hierarchies of esteem with the male pole claiming greatest merit. (Kenway 1995, p. 63)

Such hierarchies of esteem are the living out of patriarchal attitudes in society.

It would seem fair to say that the way in which men understand themselves as men, their *masculinities*, is formed by patriarchy, and men through the exercise of their power relations continue to be formulators of patriarchy in turn. Pryce (1998), while noting the comments of feminist writers, believes that domination, rather than misogyny, is at the heart of patriarchy.

> Though it is largely women whom this patriarchy works to dominate, it is domination - the inequality and abuse of power - which is the life-blood of patriarchy rather than misogyny. Those designated 'greater' will seek power over those whom they designate 'lesser', so that children and many other men - men who are poor, gay men, black men - will also be exploited and marginalized within certain structures. And these men may, within different

structures, seek to dominate others. Patriarchy thrives on hierarchies of control in the exploitation of injustice. Misogyny, racism, homophobia - prejudices and phobias of all kinds - these are the ideologies of domination which sustain injustice. Masculinities may function in support of these various relationships of domination, or may be developed in response to them, or in subversion of them. Men's ways of being men are expressions of power and powerlessness in relation to other men as well as in relation to women. (Pryce 1998, p. 310)

This is strongly reminiscent of Foucault's concept of the web of power at work and constantly interacting in all relationships. When domination is in play, consciously or not, the potential is there for abuse because the power inequalities will result in the 'lesser' having to capitulate to the 'greater'. As Brown and Bohn (1989) state: 'The social power structures of male dominance make the control of those less powerful a norm in human interactions.' (Brown & Bohn 1989, p. 47)

The rationale for patriarchy is taken up by Connell as follows:

The 'justifying' ideology for the patriarchal core complex and the overall subordination of women requires the creation of a gender-based hierarchy among men. (I stress 'gender-based' because discussions of power relations between men have commonly stopped after identifying divisions of class and race.) As gay liberation points out, an essential part of this process has been the creation of a negative symbol of masculinity in the form of stigmatized outgroups, especially homosexual men. In general, then, a hierarchy is created with at least three elements: hegemonic masculinity, conservative masculinities (complicit in the collective project but not its shock troops) and subordinated masculinities. (Connell 1987, p. 110)

This delineation of accepted and stigmatised groups is of relevance in church circles where traditional Christian morality has been strong in asserting which forms of sexual activity are acceptable; clearly, gay sexual activity has been looked upon as contrary to Christian teaching. Whereas other Christian traditions may be modifying their views in this matter, such does not appear to be the case in the Catholic Church.

From this church perspective, Brown and Bohn would say that there is a theological underpinning for the position of patriarchy. 'Theologically, the patriarchal family has been and continues to be a cornerstone for christological doctrines, especially in father-son imagery and in the unquestioned acceptance of benign paternalism as the norm for divine power.' (Brown & Bohn 1989, p. 42) They go on to analyse from a feminist perspective the implicit structure of parent-child relationships in patriarchal families and problems with theological doctrines based on the social structures of a patriarchal society. Ranson (1997, p. 2) would agree that patriarchal language about God is also an element in understanding the way in which power has been abused in church settings.

Men are entrenched in their acceptance of patriarchy as 'the way things are' and, because of the advantage which they gain from this understanding, they do all they can to maintain the status-quo. Even when male use of power results in that power being abused, Ferguson and Arthurs (1996) state that 'it is the complicity amongst men in tolerating the routine abuses of power by other men which underpins the survival of patriarchy.' (Ferguson & Arthurs, p. 10) Rutter goes further in asserting about patriarchal authority: 'The effort to maintain [patriarchal] authority takes precedence over truth, both emotional and factual. Suppression of truth is seen as necessary to preserving order, and lying becomes an acceptable mode on personal and eventually national and global levels. Without the truth, we become helpless to change anything in our lives and in our world.' (Rutter 1989, p. 102)

Such words paint a sombre picture of the legacy of patriarchy in our world. Two quotes from Connell will, however, indicate that all is not well for patriarchy at the present time. The assumptions behind patriarchy are continually being challenged and new understandings are gradually coming to be accepted:

> The main axis of power in the contemporary European/American gender
> order is the overall subordination of women and the dominance of men - the
> structure Women's Liberation named 'patriarchy'. This general structure
> exists despite many local reversals (e.g., woman-headed households, female
> teachers with male students). It persists despite resistance of many kinds,
> now articulated in feminism. These reversals and resistances mean
> continuing difficulties for patriarchal power. They define a problem of

legitimacy which has great importance for the politics of masculinity.
(Connell 1995, p. 74)

and later:

> *Power relations* show the most visible evidence of crisis tendencies: a
> historic collapse of the legitimacy of patriarchal power, and a global
> movement for the emancipation of women. This is fuelled by an underlying
> contradiction between the inequality of women and men, on the one hand,
> and the universalizing logics of modern state structures and market relations,
> on the other. (Connell 1995, p. 84)

Some danger signs are pointed out by Tacey (1990) who brings a Jungian perspective to the situation. He argues strongly for the need to differentiate masculinity from patriarchy, and unless this occurs 'both will go down the drain together.' (Tacey 1990, p. 783) Tacey sees patriarchy as only one undesirable and extreme version of masculinity, and fears that, if that understanding is not recognised, with the needed overthrow of patriarchy, masculinity will be robbed of its heart, with potentially serious consequences. 'Post-Jungians work from a basically androgynous psychological model or ideal, always encouraging both masculine and feminine elements in the psyche, and are disturbed when either side predominates or when one principle seizes power to the exclusion of the other.' (Tacey 1990) Tacey admonishes:

> Differentiate the various forms of masculinity from this monolithic
> conglomerate called patriarchy. The archetypal forms of masculinity are as
> diverse as the mythological representations of masculine gods. An
> awareness of masculinity as a spectrum of forces, a range of styles and
> differing modes, may be what is required in order to move out of our present
> cultural impasse. It is our own fixed image of masculinity that imprisons us,
> not masculinity itself. (Tacey 1990, p. 789)

Authority

The concept of authority in relation to power has surfaced sufficiently in what has been written to indicate that it needs some further comment. As mentioned previously, one notion (the functionalist theory) of the connection between authority and power is that they are mutually exclusive. Authority is seen in this theory as the legitimate use of influence in

a rationally defined formal organisation, whereas power is viewed as the illegitimate or unauthorised use of influence. Authority is thus very much concerned with the proper functioning of the organisation as it is clearly designed and power is the mechanism of destabilising the structure to bring about new possibilities.

> In all these accounts, the moral legitimacy of the organisation's formal structure has been presumed as given. In examining power, the focus of investigation has been on the *deviations* from the formal structure which appears as framing the initial state of rest, of equilibrium, from which power deviations could be measured... It follows that any attempt to change the functional equilibrium, the *status quo*, is regarded as an exercise of power, whereas maintaining organisational rules is deemed legitimate, as an exercise of authority. (Angus & Rizvi 1986, p. 2)

There is thus an oppositional quality to the relationship between authority and power.

Burbules expresses the relationship differently in believing that, since Weber, authority has been thought of as the legitimate cousin of power: where power coerces, authority persuades. (Burbules 1986, p. 107) Such a concept is a development of the previous antagonistic one and raises the question: how does power, if thought to be non-legitimised activity, become legitimised in the form of authority?

One answer to this question is that authority is legitimised through an effective hegemony whereby power does not have to be imposed through force or even violence, but has become respected and accepted by the members of society. This is strongly reminiscent of Lukes' comment about the supreme exercise of power being in getting others to have the desires one wants them to have, and to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires. At this stage, the hegemonic agenda of the group in power has been accepted and their authority is recognised as legitimate. Only when other groups find ways to challenge the assumptions behind the dominant hegemony will the legitimacy of the authority come under question.

Burrell (in Reed & Hughes 1992, ch. 9) indicates a significant change in the way authority is being seen in organisational thinking. The period up to the 1960s and beyond contained *strong power controls*, which used large amounts of energy relative to the processes they

controlled. The classic form of a strong power control where control consumed much time and energy was bureaucracy. Organisations were structured as pyramids and depended on vertical lines of authority and accountability. Communication was mainly vertical, with authority being derived from position rather than knowledge, and formal rules governed behaviour.   Since then, a shift has occurred to more flexible forms of organisation, something which the author sees as of 'epochal' importance:

> *Weak power controls* are now in the ascendancy at the cost of the bureaucratic form. These are decentralized without a single point of leadership; communication is horizontal, structures are cellular rather than pyramidical. Units control and regulate themselves. They thrive on fluidity, change and the creative use of chaos. Energy is directed outwards rather than towards the internal sustenance of a fixed structure. (Reed & Hughes 1992, p. 172)

Jones (1993) points to the traditional understanding of authority as being very 'rational'. 'Those who are "in authority" are perceived as being so because they exhibit characteristics of office, knowledge, judgement, and will associate objectively and formally with the practice of ruling.' (p. 104) Her belief is that this focus on authority makes it, in fact, distant, dispassionate and disciplinary. 'The modern normalization of authority as a disciplinary gaze represents ... the masculinization of this aspect of being in authority; it normalizes an androcentric view of authority. Although it comes to be associated with systems of rule that are themselves genderless, this form of ordering social behavior is at least arguably "masculine".' (p. 144) In fact, what is construed as being in authority actually privileges masculinity.

Given that 'authority' derives from *augere* (to augment), Jones sees authority as an activity of growth, not decay. However, 'the dominant forms of authority in modern life are destructive precisely because they lack the capacity for nurturance and compassion.' (p. 161) The inadequacy of such conceptions of authority is that they deal with the imposition of rules that can never represent the world in all its complexity. They fail to give weight to the importance of human interaction when authority is exercised. Jones' concept of 'compassionate authority' has, she asserts, the 'potential for humanizing authority.' (p. 182) Rather than dominating, compassionate authority 'can respond to the gesture of those

who are inarticulate.' (p. 175) It is not a command but a connection: the 'imaginative taking up of the position of the other is what is at work in the concept of "compassionate authority".' (p. 147) 'A more fruitful, more humane practice of authority will follow the cues offered by the return to a consideration of authority as the relationship that founds the meaningfulness of a political community not in terms of command-obedience structures of imposed interpretations, but by weaving stories together that invite dialogue across our differences.' (p. 245)

While Jones is clearly writing from a feminist perspective, her reflections on authority strike many a chord with Catholics today who wish to find newer understandings of authority in the Catholic Church, in particular the relationship between those established as the hierarchy (by definition, male) and lay people, increasingly well-educated, whose opinions have traditionally carried less weight. There appears some movement afoot to redefine these relationships. At the same time, compassion is seen as one of the hallmarks of Christianity and would be expected to find expression in the authority structures of the Church.

Angus (1986), in the study of a [Brothers of St Charles] College referred to earlier, looks at the style of the College principal, Brother Carter [fictitious name] and observes:

> [W]hat appears superficially in [B.S.C.C.] as order and stability – an essential aspect of 'the Brothers' system' in which units fit neatly into the school's collective organisation – shrouds 'the possibility of illegitimate power by assuming consensus where there may only be compliance' (Knights & Roberts 1982, p. 47) that is gained by a form of coercion in which superiors view subordinates in an instrumental fashion. Brother Carter, in the belief that he is maintaining the tradition of being 'a good strong boss', crosses well over the boundary between legitimate authority and arbitrary power. (Angus 1986, p. 65)

and

> Brother Carter clearly views his power as principal, not as something that arises out of the quality of his relationship with his staff, but as a property simply of his position in a hierarchy of control. Despite his claim that his 'door is always open', Brother Carter's *personal* distance from most of his

staff precludes any possibility of his developing what Knights & Roberts (1982, p. 55) call *authoritative* rather than authoritarian power relationships. (Angus 1986, p. 65)

In this last comment, authoritative power relationships require a personal relationship between administrator and staff in which there is commitment to a form of practice which generates through dialogue an acceptance rather than a self-defeating avoidance or denial of the interdependence of action. In other words, the authority of the principal is real to the extent that the principal engages personally with staff and enables the possibility of consensus and shared commitment rather than imposed control.

These considerations lead us to appreciate that authority is seen in different ways, depending on the understanding of power we choose to take. The concept of authority is one to which I will return when looking at power in relation to Church structures.

Leadership

What is the distinction between power and leadership? Krausz (1986) puts forward the suggestion that power is the ability to influence the actions of others, individuals or groups; leadership is the way power is used in the process of influencing the actions of others. In other words, leadership is more of a process. 'Leadership is *how* power is implemented by the influencer acting as a person and/or as a member of a group or an organization. Leadership is not an entity, but a way of relating to others.' (Krausz 1986, p. 86) Krausz then puts forward four basic styles of leadership as the ways in which leaders relate to followers: coercive, controlling, coaching and participative. She analyses these to evaluate the relative merits of their effectiveness. Leadership as empowering of people by calling forth their participation in decision-making is seen as most effective since it uses various kinds of power and obtains high results with a lower amount of energy use. Sims et al would echo these thoughts when they say that leaders now have to rely less on hierarchical power, since other ways of managing people are seen to be more effective. (Sims, Fineman & Gabriel 1993, p. 117)

When looking at leadership, Janda (1960) asks why anyone accepts the influence of another. He answers the question by asserting that some individuals can motivate others to

perform specific acts of behaviour. The ability to motivate is seen as at the heart of leadership, and hence the holding of power over another. He goes on to highlight the association of leadership with a particular type of legitimate power, for legitimacy itself stems from different sources. He quotes French and Raven's three sub-bases for legitimate power: cultural values which constitute a common basis for the legitimate power of one individual over another; acceptance of the social structure as a basis for legitimate power; and, formal designation by a legitimising agent.

Fay (1987) would agree with Janda that the acceptance by followers of the leader's legitimate power is central to the leader's ability to lead.

> Power is fundamentally consensual. Leaders get others to act in a particular
> manner because followers agree to do what the leaders ask of them. This
> agreement may derive from the followers' judgment that the leaders occupy
> a position which gives them the right to command a course of action, or that
> they possess the requisite personal characteristics of leaders, or that they
> seek an action which is correct or justifiable. Power in this case is not
> something which an isolated person can have: it depends on the willingness
> of the followers as much as the characteristics of the leaders, and devolves
> to leaders in so far as they are able to call forth the support of those whom
> they lead. In this sort of relationship, the self-understandings of the led play
> a crucial role in the constitution of power. (Fay 1987, p. 121)

Blackmore examines how feminist leadership has been seen over the years and finds that 'various mythologies have portrayed women as incapable of leadership'. (Blackmore 1998, p. 1004) These include biological factors, psychological deficiencies, lack of career ambition and low self-esteem. However, she believes that women's limited opportunities for leadership have been related less to lack of merit or aspiration than to structural and organisational discrimination. Blackmore sees that there is a 'dominant masculinism embedded in leadership models' and offers an alternate feminist reconstruction of leadership focussing 'upon relationality, power through rather than over others, care and democratic process.' (Blackmore 1998, p. 1006) In this context, her focus would also be more on leader/subordinate relationships rather than leadership removed from the relational sphere. Clearly these are significant contributions when one looks at the role of women in

the Catholic Church and their aspirations and encouragement to seek their place in leadership structures.

Leadership will be a significant area to which to return when I look later at issues of power in relation to Church structures.

Empowerment

As referred to earlier, Fay looks at the question of power from the perspective of social transformation. A crucial element of such change is the empowerment of oppressed groups. Fay articulates the problem this way:

> The point of enlightenment is to lead to a transformation in the social relations and ways of behaving which have heretofore been oppressive and frustrating for a group of people. But how is this transformation to take place? Most particularly, how is it to take place if the oppressed are dominated by another group which has power over them and which profits from this power? Oppressed groups can liberate themselves only by becoming empowered to do so; and such empowerment must be possible in the face of the power of the oppressors. (Fay 1987, p. 115)

As mentioned above, after referring to different types of power and styles of leadership, Krausz looks at the ways in which organisations change:

> Organizational change may be accomplished when people change. One of the prerequisites of change is personal power. Empowering people may be understood as the process of enhancing individuals' abilities to act with options. The more options a person has, the more powerful he/she tends to be. Certain types of power, when used, tend to expand the quality and quantity of options of the persons involved. Others inhibit possible options... Being powerful often brings with it the tendency to share organizational power more effectively, as well as to stimulate the use of personal power in the group. (Krausz 1986, p. 93)

Sims et al relate empowerment of people to the style of leadership. Given the freedom, scope and resources to achieve organisational goals, people will, in effect, lead themselves if it is in their interests to do so.

> Leaders, therefore, do not *tell* others what to do, or attempt to *sell* their ideas
> to them. Rather, the leader's role is to help others achieve their own ends
> creatively by helping them to discover their own potential, and clearing a
> pathway for them. The leader, in this way, gives power, to his or her
> followers. The leader is a facilitator of other people's action. Empowerment
> is an extension of democratization in management, and the fading of the
> authoritarian leader. (Sims, Fineman & Gabriel 1993, p. 246)

A further approach to empowerment is taken by Wilson (2000) who sees that those who are engaged in working for a particular organisation gain the benefits of the corporate power of that organisation. Their efforts are more than their own; they are enhanced by the building up of the organisation which has occurred prior to their involvement. By virtue of the name of the corporation, the individual enjoys genuine potential he/she would not have possessed without their association with the name. In this sense the individual is empowered beyond personal levels and hence what is done by him/her will affect the level of empowerment granted to those who will bear the name afterwards. This view pays tribute to the sense of history, tradition and corporate values which are important factors in empowering the members of the organization. (Wilson 2000, p. 8)

Networks

I wish to highlight the concept of 'network' as a useful and significant one in order to broaden the understanding of power:

> The notion of 'network' was introduced into social science in the 1950s by
> Elizabeth Bott who referred to the special informal relationships that some
> people develop to help each other out. In organizations, informal networks
> are revealed to be a potent force in how resources are allocated, and how
> people gain influence and power... Networking with 'in' groups can be both
> destructive and constructive... Networks, coalitions and friendships create
> sources of power. (Fineman & Gabriel 1996, p. 133)

This quote indicates something very important which we all know as being of significance when talking of power. Comments such as: 'it's not what you know but who you know!'; 'the old school-tie network'; 'she/he has worked hard to build up their connections' all draw attention to the fact that often in organisations, decisions are not necessarily made on the basis of objective information, but on much more subjective elements. In other words, the development of good networks is a significant factor in building up influence and power, and informal associations and networks must be taken into consideration when examining where power really resides in any organisation.

Another view of networks is provided by Sawicki, who would say that, based on Foucault's work, it is the mechanisms of power at the microlevel of society which have become part of the dominant networks of power relations. As an example, she says: 'Disciplinary power was not invented by the dominant class and then extended down into the microlevel of society. It originated outside this class and was appropriated by it once it revealed its utility.' (Sawicki 1991, p. 23) This reminds us that it is from the grass-roots that the networks of power develop and it highlights again the all-pervading nature of power and how the seeming-dominated play as important a role in the production of power relations as the seeming-dominators.

B   Abuse of Power

Having gained some understanding of the nature of power, however varied, from the multitude of ideas of the theorists, I turn my attention to what might be seen as constituting abuse of power. Such abuse may be seen in systems and organisations, or it may be seen more on an individual level. Even in this latter case, it is reasonable to ask the extent to which the organisations to which an individual power abuser belongs may have an impact on his/her abusing behaviour. As with the various interpretations of what power is, there are equally many ideas as to what makes up abuse of power.

When one looks at how systems and organisations use their power in abusive ways, relevant concepts include those of 'closed' or 'turbulent' systems and a 'Group-Think' approach.

White (in Gonsiorek 1995, ch. 16) has looked at issues related to the propensity for abuse to occur within a particular kind of organisational setting and process. He applies family systems theory to organisations and notes that open systems are healthy ones but there is extreme disruption of personal and organisational health associated with sustained organisational 'closure'. He sees that an incestuous dynamic is described that results from this closure - a stage in life of the organisation is reached which is marked by increasing numbers of staff meeting most, if not all, of their personal, professional, social, and sexual needs inside the boundary of the organisation. Organisations are dynamic and constantly changing, so that if an organisation is moving progressively towards closure over a number of years, the following elements are predictable:

- Emergence of organisational dogma - a rigid and unchallengeable belief system;
- Centralisation of power and preference for charismatic styles of leadership (the emergence of high priests/priestesses);
- Progressive isolation of the organization and its members from the outside professional and social world;
- Homogenisation of the workforce by age, race, sex, religion, or values via a tendency to isolate and expel that which is different;
- Excessive demands for time and emotional energy of workers;
- Development of a work-dominated social network by organisational members;
- Intense focusing on the personal and interpersonal problems of staff;
- Disruption of team functioning from problems arising in worker-worker social and sexual relationships;
- Projection of organisational problems on an outside enemy or scapegoating and extrusion of individual workers;
- Escalation of interpersonal and intergroup conflict to include staff plots, conspiracies, or coups against organisational leadership;
- Emergence of a punitive, abusive organisational culture;
- Fall of the 'high priest/priestess' and a contagion of staff turnover (breakup of the system). (Gonsiorek 1995, p. 190)

White also notes that in closed systems there is a higher incidence of sexual harassment and sexual exploitation than more open systems. He goes on to state:

The potential for abuses of power in closed systems and the intensity of abuses in such organizations is magnified by the following:

•   The violation of the boundary and balance between one's work life and one's personal life;

•   The loss of outside sources of personal, professional, social, and sexual replenishment;

•   The progressive depletion (physical and emotional exhaustion) of personal and group health resulting from excessive demands on worker time and emotional energy;

•   The distortion of organizational values resulting from the loss of external feedback and external mechanisms for reality testing with the outside social and professional community. (Gonsiorek 1995, p. 191)

The title and sub-title of White's important work reveal clearly what he sees as the dangers associated with closed systems. His work is called 'Incest in the Organizational Family - The Ecology of Burnout in Closed Systems'. (White 1986) White maintains that, at its worst, in such a closed system, on top of other forms of exploitation of members, sexual exploitation can be institutionalised as an element of the culture of the system. All of this highlights the centrality of the health of organisational culture for the quality of life of the members of the system, and also the subtle nature of the power manipulations which can shift that system towards becoming more closed and unhealthy.

Jenkins (1996) refers to the speech-communications concept of 'Group-Think' to demonstrate the way in which the decision-makers in organisations can effectively filter out pressures or information that might deter them from risky or disastrous strategies. Jenkins states: 'As originally formulated, the theory proposes a number of characteristics for the group in question, including an illusion of invulnerability; belief in the inherent morality of the group; collective rationalization; negative stereotyping of outsiders; the illusion of unanimity; and pressures on participants to conform to group attitudes.' (Jenkins 1996, p. 38) In fact, this is another way of looking at a closed system which, in its reluctance or inability to interact with wider and hence more encompassing reality, of necessity brings about abuse of people as their personal integrity is compromised to serve the needs of the

system. Sometimes such people are not aware of what is happening, but in time, feelings of anger or frustration often intuitively tell them of the lack of health of the organisation.

Patriarchy and hegemony may be seen as generalised aspects of 'Group-Think'. When men assume certain understandings and privileges at the expense of women or of other men outside the dominant paradigm of masculinity, then the aspects referred to above by Jenkins are immediately obvious. How such attitudes can lead to abuse is indicated well by Poling (1991), who highlights that awareness of such abuse is often lacking by men because their frame of reference does not emcompass that possibility:

> The discussion about whether or not abuse of power exists in a community
> cannot depend on the perception or honesty of the powerful because the
> powerful tend to justify themselves at the expense of others. Those who are
> vulnerable must be given authority to testify about their perceptions of abuse
> of power. There must be policies and procedures for hearing the testimony
> of potential victims and norms against which to judge whether abuse of
> power has occurred. (Poling 1991, p. 151)

In similar vein, it is interesting that Colton and Vanstone (1996) place the stories of men who have committed sexual offences within an understanding of the heterosexual, white, male hegemony that dominates the social and professional settings within which their offending occurred. (Colton & Vanstone 1996, p. 176) One may deduce from this that the likelihood of abuse of power is also related to such understandings of masculinity and their relationships with other masculinities and femininities.

Much has been written of power in the professional setting. It is clearly understood in the ethical standards of the many professions that the professional must set appropriate boundaries in his/her interactions with clients. It is the responsibility of the professional to do this because that person has the greater ascribed power in the relationship, and with that greater power comes the responsibility to ensure that the relationship is one of integrity. Gonsiorek speaks of therapists, but he might equally be referring to those of other professions:

> Creating a contained space for therapy also means a recognition of power.
> Power is conferred by mandates, by licensing agencies, by others in the

community, by the therapist, and by the client herself. 'Those who wear the cloak of professional authority and responsibility are expected to be ethical and trustworthy. Because of this, a person requesting professional services is especially vulnerable.' (quoting Nestingen & Lewis). When the cloak of power is worn unconsciously, it is dangerous for the client. A therapist has a moral, ethical, and spiritual obligation to understand the extent and limits of power. (Gonsiorek 1995, p. 87)

Such ethical dimensions will be referred to again later when I look further at the use of power in religious organisations. In such institutions, a critical question will be: how do those in authority understand the extent and limits of their power?

Abuse of power will be seen in many different ways. What may not even be noticed by some will be seen by others as distinctly abusive. Even when abuse of power is expressed in a sexual way by someone with greater power and authority, there may be different understandings. In this light, Rutter observes: 'The medical, psychotherapeutic, pastoral, and legal professions have long insisted on policing themselves about ethical matters. At this stage, however, men in these professions need the help that widespread public scrutiny and growing public understanding can bring to this problem.' (Rutter 1989, p. 63) While commenting on the ethical codes imposed on professionals, the 'problem' he refers to is the expectation that men in power will effectively prevent their colleagues' sexual exploitation. Rutter is agreeing with what many women would say when he contends: 'As long as cultural values implicitly forgive - even admire - those who engage in sexual misconduct, men will have little incentive to focus on their own wounds, concentrating their attention instead on how to cross over the next forbidden boundary.' (Rutter 1989, p. 91) Rutter is highlighting the problematic nature of enforcing professional ethical codes in largely male-controlled systems.

In organisations and relationships in which patriarchy is operating, a danger is clearly that the power imbalance between two individuals can become one of domination in the sexual arena. This is especially true if one of the individuals is male and/or is in an authority position, and by virtue of this can exercise considerable influence on the other person.

Hopkins (1994) notes that, in unequal relationships, power abuse may well be the fundamental and driving force:

> If compulsive or addictive behavior is essentially a shame-based activity, the temporary alleviation of that shame may be accomplished by asserting one's power over another; sexual activity then might become the means to that end and, perhaps, not even the primary motivator. A paradoxical element here is that often offenders do not feel powerful, just the opposite. In many cases, it is the attempt to regain some sense of personal power, often lost if one was an earlier victim of abuse, that causes an offender to act out. (Hopkins 1994, p. 358)

To put much of the above into a broader systemic context and to focus on the evolving understanding needed to address the issues, White notes:

> In summary, when we speak of sexual exploitation of clients by professional helpers, we are speaking of the abuse of power. We must eventually link our internal organizational efforts with broader movements seeking to confront the whole spectrum of abuses of power, in general, and the institutionalized violence against disempowered persons, in particular. If we see sexual exploitation only in terms of psychopathology or skill deficiency of the individual exploiter, we miss the broader social milieu that incites or fails to inhibit such behavior. Sexual exploitation of clients is part of a broader continuum of aggression and violence toward the culturally disempowered, particularly women and children. As we understand sexual exploitation within these broader frameworks, we can link ourselves to parallel resources and movements seeking to enhance the health of our clients, our organizations, our communities, and our culture. (in Gonsiorek 1995, p. 191)

Someone who takes a global view of the use of power is Morzone (2000). She particularly focuses on how the abuse of power is shown in violence. 'The most serious form of violence today is not the individual, the messy, the physically disturbing, the personally frightening. ... The far greater problem is the ... more global, more organized presence of violence on a massive and corporate pattern. Violence today is white-collar violence, the

systematically organized bureaucratic and technological destruction of humankind.' (Morzone 2000, p. 7)

She goes on to speak of the forms of this 'white collar violence' where violence has become institutional and systemic:

- economic violence, where more people die from starvation, malnutrition and lack of basic health services than from wars and catastrophes, and insatiable greed by wealthy nations in rape of the earth's resources;
- militarism and the arms trade, based on the belief that holds that one of the main ways of controlling society and of ensuring social stability is the use of organised violence and the use of force, with all the world conflict which follows from this belief;
- systemic exclusion of minority groups on the grounds of race and religion; and
- patriarchy and sexism, where she quotes from a UNICEF report that 'violence against women and girls is the most pervasive violation of human rights in the world today ... [but it] is so deeply embedded in cultures around the world that it is almost invisible.'

This element of patriarchy and sexism has resulted in women being victims of violence through war, with the rape and poverty which usually accompany it for women. (Morzone 2000, p. 7ff)

C   Issues of Power in relation to Church Structures

In this section I will return to some of the ideas mentioned in earlier parts of the Literature Review. While I am looking at the issue of power in relation to all churches, it is the Catholic Church in particular which will be my focus here.

Much of the literature today draws attention to the hierarchical nature of the Catholic Church, with its leadership still largely based on a male, clerical, celibate system. While the Second Vatican Council promoted the concept of the Church as the People of God and there has been some movement to devolve decision-making through parish pastoral councils and more involvement of lay people, in practice much of the power still rests in the clerical system. Rossetti notes change here, but also the slow pace of this: 'Since the Second Vatican Council, there has been a slow shift in power from the hierarchy to the

laity. Parish councils have emerged. Lay pastoral associates have engaged in regular, paid parochial ministry.   The expertise of the laity is being consulted increasingly in ecclesiastical decisions. I believe the phenomenon of public awareness of clergy sexual misconduct will escalate this shift in power.' (Rossetti 1996, p. 120) It is argued by some that the reason why clergy and religious sexual abuse is receiving so much attention these days is that lay people are becoming disenchanted with a system which is designed to keep power in the hands of those ordained, thus disenfranchising lay members of the Church.

Beal (1995) has studied the changes which have occurred in the Canon Law of the Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council.

> Questions about power in the Church – its nature, source(s), possession, and modes of transmission – have been the subject of heated debate at least among canonists during and since the Second Vatican council. In the post-conciliar debate sacred power has emerged as both a fundamental constitutional issue that touches on the theological nature of the Church and an eminently practical issue that determines the extent to which various persons can participate in the life and mission of the Church. (Beal 1995, p. 1)

Beal concludes that the debates about such issues will not be resolved in the foreseeable future. His particular interest is in the involvement of lay people in governance of Church structures. While the various arguments are based on different theological understandings about the power conferred on the Church by Christ, Beal notes that 'diocesan bishops, faced with increasing demands for pastoral care and declining numbers of ordained presbyters, must provide for the spiritual welfare of the particular churches entrusted to their care with the resources available to them.' (Beal 1995, p. 92) This seems to imply that the practical realities may play a significant role in determining answers to the future role of lay people in roles requiring the exercise of genuine power and authority in the Church.

Collins (1986), writing of the Australian Catholic Church, notes the two dominant models of Church after the Second Vatican Council - the hierarchical (decision-making through Pope and Bishops) and communial (People of God) models. While the latter is the model strongly promulgated by the Council, Collins draws what he refers to as 'several

inescapable conclusions' (Collins 1986, p. 58): the two models are incompatible; opting for the communial model brings to an end an era in the Church; the change to the new model will be slow; there will be considerable resistance, since old authorities will defend the power they will lose and the change goes against the most sacred convictions of some people; changing models will be more difficult because many of those entrusted with the process of change are often people most opposed to it; the community model does not allow the use of constraints or threats to remove obstacles, which is not a problem for the hierarchical model. He sees the present time as one of 'ecclesiological mutation, that is generating tremendous tension in the Church.' (Collins 1986, p. 58)

A focus on leadership is part of Collins' study. With the decline in numbers of the present clericalised priesthood, the way is left open for a more ministerial type of priestly leadership to emerge. 'This leadership will focus around the facilitation of the gifts of the members of the community.' (Collins 1986, p. 238) In another work, Collins (1991) argues that as the Church moves towards a participative model, the need for genuine leadership will increase. 'Any old bureaucrat can double as a hierarch and can more or less affectively administer the institution. But the gift of genuine leadership will be needed if more participative models of the church emerge.' (Collins 1991, p. 34) Two very significant groups for Collins in this push towards more inclusive models of leadership are those who have left the male celibate clergy, and women.

> Part of the church's leadership crisis can be traced back to the high attrition
> rates among the clergy, an attrition that is due largely to unfulfilled celibacy
> and to a lack of vocational satisfaction. The fact is that the Australian
> church has lost a whole group of men who would be natural leaders and the
> dearth of leadership in the church now reflects this. (Collins 1991, p. 28)

Speaking of women, Collins sees a great danger for the Church in younger women, who now accept unquestioned equality with men, being increasingly alienated by a Church which restricts their opportunities for ministerial leadership. As many women become at least as well, if not better, educated than many designated male clerical leaders in the Church, there will be ongoing momentum for the status quo to be overturned. This situation is part of the 'tremendous tension' of the present time. (Collins 1986, p. 240)

The Whiteheads ask what constitutes authenticity in religious leaders and indicate that three themes emerge as central in studies of pastoral leadership in interdenominational settings: 'Pastoral leaders are recognized as religiously authentic when (1) they are seen as personally genuine, (2) they adopt a leadership style that is nondefensive, and (3) they are willing to exercise spiritual leadership.' (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 81)

Sipe (1995) notes that the early days of the Church were marked by a more charismatic approach to living and ministry and it was only with the Roman Empire embracing Christianity that the Church became more institutional. A key figure was St Augustine who, in trying to combat various heresies, defended the orthodox power and the centrality of Rome. Thus developed an organisational structure which in time saw the Bishop of Rome as head of the Church, and a clerically-maintained leadership of dioceses under Bishops and parishes run by clergy. Sexuality became an important aspect of this system, and a dualistic approach to sexuality underscored the superiority of the spiritual over material, the soul over the body, and hence celibacy over married life and men over women (women being the ones who would lure men away from the true spiritual path). Sipe contends that the current crisis for the Church in relation to a significant number of its clerical and religious members engaging in sexually abusive activity is not related to celibacy itself, but to the system which it has created in the Church.

> The crisis is the claim to celibate privilege and authority not based on reality
> and religious service but dependent on law, ideal, and control in the service
> of economic, social, and political or sexual domination. Power perverted in
> the name of religion is the problem. The current crisis involves the exposure
> of the structure that underlies a power system using celibacy for the
> domination and control of others. (Sipe 1995, p. 162)

In another book, Sipe (1994) looks at candidates for such a system and notes the qualities which one might expect from those who seek seminary training:

> The celibate/sexual system of the Church favors those who have a high and
> unquestioning regard for authority, strong male bonds and male hero
> worship, and some disdain, no matter how benign, for women - with the
> preservation of the idealized mother figure and female virginity.
> Enthusiasm for the group, unquestioning idealism, conformity, spurts of

asceticism, and altruism make for a perfect candidate for celibate priesthood. This is also the profile of an adolescent. The system reinforces these qualities without significant efforts at penetrating or transcending their potential. Many priests are successful in solidifying their development at this level of adjustment. (Sipe 1994, p. 136)

In Sipe's understanding, the Church in effect becomes a closed system where many of the organisational features of such a system (as outlined earlier by White) are clearly in place. A rigid and unchallengeable belief system, centralisation of power, homogenisation of the clerical workforce (in this case through gender), excessive demands for time and emotional energy of workers (clergy), scapegoating of those who challenge the system and are seen as problems, development of a Church-dominated social network - all these are elements of such a closed system. It is not surprising therefore that other elements of closed systems are also now more publicly recognised: disruption in functioning from problems arising in clergy-lay person sexual relationships; scapegoating of those who present as victims of clergy; escalation of conflict between various groups in the Church; and the fall of status of those once held in esteem. Burkett (1993) in this regard notes: 'If there is a single truth on which virtually every expert on child sexual abuse agrees, it is that abuse thrives in hierarchical, authoritarian institutions - particularly sexually repressive ones. When experts describe such institutions, they seem to be characterizing the Catholic Church.' (Burkett & Bruni 1993, p. 231)

Willerscheidt et al (1997) express similar sentiments:

The power held by male clergy is increased by their gender and the political reality of patriarchy. Rather than acknowledging the privilege of their gendered status and using that privilege responsibly, male clergy are vulnerable to assuming the privilege as God given and hold women responsible, instead, for the aberrant behavior of the clergy. The maligning of women for their gender reinforces their lesser status and, in effect, directs and warrants their treatment as objects. (Willerscheidt et al. 1997, p. 5)

The recent Australian Catholic Church 'Report on the Participation of Women in the Catholic Church in Australia' (Macdonald et al. 1999) highlights similar statements to

those above. The Report, through extensive consultation with Australian Catholic women, speaks about their experience of being members of the Australian Church.

> The fundamental barrier concerned patriarchal attitudes and traditions, which were seen to be inconsistent with the person and message of Jesus Christ, and which failed to take into account developments in the social sciences and changes in the role of women in the wider society. It was felt that such attitudes had been reinforced by Pope John Paul ll and the Vatican bureaucracy in recent times to the detriment of the teachings and spirit of the Second Vatican Council. The structures of the Church were experienced as male-dominated, hierarchical and authoritarian. Authoritarian attitudes and the misuse of power and position were seen as serious barriers to women's participation. A fixation on rules and regulations, a rigid and unbending manner, and a lack of compassion and openness to dialogue were frequently cited characteristics of a Church in need of renewal. The negative attitude towards women on the part of some clergy, especially parish priests, was also experienced as a significant obstacle. (Macdonald et al. 1999, p. 381)

Morzone, mentioned previously re her global overview of violence as a form of abuse of power, quotes Dorothy Coxon: 'Institutionalized Christianity has fuelled male privilege at the expense of women, denigrating them as second-best; this has resulted in a violation of lives and self-esteem of women who have learnt the path of self-rejection via a religion whose central figure symbolizes liberation, not control or dependency; this is violence.' (Morzone 2000, p. 18)   Morzone sees nonviolence as the only way of effectively challenging the forms of institutionalised violence in the world, one form of which is found in institutionalised Christianity with its strong patriarchal emphasis. She highlights the importance of women's role in this quest:

> [The] goal [of Christian feminism] is not women's domination over men nor simply equal rights for men and women, but the liberation of humanity from oppressive patriarchal structures to create a society based on mutuality and cooperation. Nonviolence offers women a strategy by which they can break the pattern of complicity in their own exploitation and refuse to be passive victims any longer, without creating a new form of domination. Directed towards justice and reconciliation, it implies a commitment to address the

violent structures of sexism and patriarchy which foster aggression and lead to war. Feminism, in its true sense, and nonviolence are two expressions of the same vision. (Morzone 2000, p. 50)

Such an understanding provides a profound challenge for women in finding a dynamic to address and bring about change in entrenched male hierarchical structures in the Catholic Church. Morzone contends that nonviolence remains the only power capable of resisting violence without itself becoming corrupted and so ensuring the system's perpetuation. By 'nonviolent action', she means, 'a wide range of nonviolent response to conflict, from milder forms relying on compromise, negotiation and verbal persuasion to the more dramatic nonverbal activity of protest, noncooperation and intervention.' (Morzone 2000, p. 40)

All of this may seem to be painting a bleak picture of the Church when it is clear that many clergy (and religious) are people of great commitment and are psychologically well-adjusted. However, in looking at the broader systemic issues, it seems equally clear that the matters being raised at the present time will not go away. Organisations, and particularly church organisations, are under increasing scrutiny.

The Whiteheads (1991) examine the issue of authority from a religious leadership standpoint. The root meaning of 'authority' is *augment* – to make more of, where genuine authority expands life, making power more abundant. 'Religious authority succeeds by nurturing spiritual growth. This genuine religious authority calls us to greater responsibility, finally welcoming us as partners.' (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 27) However, the authors maintain that many have 'wounded attitudes to authority' which dispose them to externalising authority in others rather than accepting it themselves, hence effectively blocking their ability to become adult partners in faith. In effect such people see themselves either as children or victims, images which carry a judgement about themselves and an expectation about external authority. They feel vulnerable, while expecting that authority is dangerous. Such attitudes sabotage efforts to grow into mature adulthood in faith. The impact of such attitudes places a heavy burden on religious leadership in particular:

We want them to be – we *need* them to be – larger than life. We expect them to be all-knowing, capable of telling us what we should do. We

demand that they be all-providing as well, accessible to us at all times and ready to care for our needs. We require that they be perfect – accountable to standards of morality, generosity, and excellence that far exceed those to which we hold ourselves. (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 28)

Such expectations are clearly unreal. While believing that our leaders have all the answers comforts us, we remain in a position of religious immaturity and avoid taking the responsibility which is essential for real partnership to occur.

Authority in the community of faith is not simply what *they* do to the rest of us – whether we judge them to be good-hearted or malicious, enlightened or hopelessly out of touch. The rest of us are more than just beneficiaries or victims, more than simply observers of how religious authority functions. We are all active participants in authority. (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 29)

Such comments are very telling at a time when lay people in the Catholic Church are being invited to accept their legitimate role as partners in faith rather than remain in the background. Such partnership depends on both lay people moving beyond their accustomed subservience and on clerical authorities facilitating new structures of shared decision-making. The present time is clearly one of great transition and hopefully, transformation, with much upheaval of previous ways of thinking and acting. Much of the rest of the Whiteheads' work examines ways in which such transformation may gradually take place.

I look further now to another of the concepts associated with power mentioned earlier. Emphasis on male celibate authority in the Church returns us to the notion of patriarchy. Brown and Bohn (1989) speak with great challenge to the present system of such male power when they question the theology which underlies such a system and maintain that Christianity needs to in fact be liberated from this theology if it is to be liberating itself: 'Christianity is an abusive theology that glorifies suffering. Is it any wonder that there is so much abuse in modern society when the predominant image or theology of the culture is of the "divine child abuse" - God the Father demanding and carrying out the suffering and death of his own son? If Christianity is to be liberating for the oppressed, it must itself be liberated from this theology.' (Brown & Bohn 1989, p. 26) Such comments raise the question as to whether the theology traditionally adopted by the Church has been shaped as

much by the forces of institutional needs as by fidelity to the gospel message. Because theology is always developed by human people in particular social settings, the subtle influences of the setting may exert a strong influence on the way of thinking which results.

In this light, it is interesting to note the comments of Fox (2001) whose study of some prominent theologians, in particular Elizabeth Johnson (1992), causes her to state that a new conception of God is needed in order to move beyond the difficulties brought about by traditional conceptions of God. Fox encourages a movement away from an all-powerful, remote and dominating God, not the God of the Christian scriptures, to 'a Trinitarian God of mutual relations whose very being is communion'. (Fox 2001, p. 153) She goes on to say:

> To speak of a suffering God totally subverts the patriarchal image of perfection and the consequent ideal of unilateral power. It communicates that self-containment and the absence of relationship do not represent an ideal but rather signify imperfection. Omnipotence can thus be redefined as the free, unlimited capacity to make room within the self for the other. (Fox 2001, p. 244)

Parkinson (1997) similarly questions our expressions for God, especially in relation to those who have been sexually abused: 'God the Father, as creator of the universe, is associated with absolute power, and this power can be terrifying for those who do not know its benevolence. Victims of sexual abuse have experienced the most serious kinds of abuse of power. They may well be threatened by the power and authority of a heavenly Father.' (Parkinson 1997, p. 151) Poling also notes that those who have been abused report confusion in their relationship with God, having trouble finding benevolent images of God which would provide a stable reference point for their faith. (Poling 1991, p. 154)

When people feel that institutional church language and theology do not speak to their experience, or are in fact quite alienating, Capps (1992) speaks of the possibility that religious ideas might be as abusive as physical punishment for children. He argues that religion was often used by parents to discipline their children in order to train their will which was not ordered according to God's commandments. In an article rather chillingly entitled 'Religion and Child Abuse: Perfect Together', Capps indicates his belief that resort

to religion or religious ideas has often accompanied the physical abuse and tormenting of children. Capps gives some evidence for this theory:

> There is evidence for this in the fact that adults relate to religious ideas in much the same dissociative manner that adults who were subjected to physical and sexual abuse as children continue to relate to those abusive experiences. As Greven points out, one of the most common consequences of the experience of physical abuse is dissociation, which *is one of the most basic means of survival for many children, who learn early in life to distance themselves, or parts of themselves, from experiences too painful or frightening to bear. Traumas, both physical and emotional, are often coped with by denial and regression of the feelings they generate. The dissociative process is rooted, it appears, in the ability of so many children and adults to ... render unconscious aspects of their feelings and experiences that, for whatever reasons, they find unbearable or unacceptable.* (Capps 1992, p. 8)

Richards (1997) takes the concept of 'dissociation' a step further by highlighting 'systemic dissociation' in church settings which occurs when the belief system of the church and the behaviour which ought accompany such beliefs are split off from each other:

> When religion purports to be exclusively interested in and exclusively concerned about the spiritual welfare and salvation of the individual and when the religious system teaches and promotes programs only around this core belief, there is a resulting dissociation of body and spirit and a further dissociation of belief and behavior. So much value is attached to correct belief that issues of behavior are so secondary that almost any behavior can be conveniently overlooked. When the system as a whole focuses so exclusively on faith and belief and correct dogma, then adherents participate in this dissociation. An offending minister can lead worship, preach sermons, give Bible instruction and play the ministerial role while successfully unhooking his offending behaviors from the content and process of his narrowly religious thought. Systemic survival is enhanced by keeping attention on belief patterns and by being reluctant or perhaps intentionally failing to uphold those behavioral patterns which clearly derive from the belief patterns. Systemic dissociation provides the climate or the

setting for the psychological/emotional dissociation that accounts for so many of the instances of sexual exploitation and abuse now coming to our attention. (Richards 1997, p. 2)

Language plays an important part in the issue of power in relation to Church structures. While the Church tries to develop a sense of community, and in many cases it succeeds very well, some would see that pushing this line too strongly could lead to abuse. At times reference is made to the 'family of the church', to enshrine the community dimension with a closeness which people are expected to feel or are certainly encouraged to develop. In this context, any abuse which occurs in the community is seen as incest and has many of the same dynamics which are present when incest occurs in a family. As Ormerod (1993) notes:

> One of the most accurate predictors of possible incest in a family is the presence of authoritarian and/or patriarchal power relationships. Similarly, in a church community the minister is the most influential person, often to the point of having absolute authority. The minister's role carries the authority of the helping professional, the teacher and mentor, as well as pastor. Often he functions as a counsellor, with all the child-parent transference inherent in such a relationship. The male minister also carries the power society socialises men to hold over women. But the strongest, most potentially healing or potentially dangerous aspect of the minister's power derives from his unique role as 'man of God'. The minister carries a spiritual authority, particularly in the eyes of a trusting parishioner who looks to him for spiritual guidance. (Ormerod, Thea 1993, p. 24)

Fortune (1994) gives reasons why it is wrong for a minister or teacher to be sexual with someone whom he/she serves or supervises. She notes that these reasons in respect to sexual abuse by a minister could equally apply to incest in a family. Because of this, she believes that we should be de-emphasising the image of church as family in favor of images of *community* in which boundary expectations are more clearly defined. (Fortune 1994, p. 20)

Even projecting the church as foremost a community still has the potential for abuse to occur. Those who challenge the community in any way, for example, by proclaiming that

they have been victims of clergy sexual abuse, have often been scapegoated as the cause of the problem and needing to be moved from the community. Poling notes:

> The search for community and betrayal by community are central themes in the testimonies we have heard. Abused children are betrayed by their parents and other adults, by the church and schools, and by the wider ideologies that determine how power and privilege are distributed. Analysis of social institutions and ideologies in recent feminist and African-American theologies uncovers the betrayal by community. Abuse does not occur in a vacuum. The testimony of our witnesses has disclosed how institutions and ideologies explicitly and implicitly sanction abuse of power. (Poling 1991, p. 121)

Unfortunately, such betrayal and scapegoating are in fact ways for the community/institution to avoid facing the deeper issues of abuse of power and control which are in operation.

In this light, Capps (1993) has some interesting observations about pastors who abuse sexually in a church community:

> I suggest that some pastors accommodate the scapegoating process by giving the congregation good cause for getting rid of them. These pastors are akin to those designated scapegoats who, wittingly or unwittingly, play the role assigned to them, and commit wrongs for which they are justifiably punished (ie, either killed or expelled from the community). Having an affair with a married woman in the parish is a wrongdoing which, when discovered, demands such punishment. It also allows the congregation to avoid any serious soul-searching on its own behalf, especially by way of challenging its underlying mimetic structure. Nor is it punished for its sins, as the scapegoating mechanism has successfully diverted attention away from the congregation and has focused the spotlight, instead, on the designated sinner. (Capps 1993, p. 359)

Thus the search for someone to be scapegoated has in fact helped the community to avoid the institutional issues which need to be addressed.

All of this seems to be saying that it is very difficult for a person to challenge the system and the power which is entrenched in the web of relational dynamics at play. Brown and Bohn (1989) go on to note that there are particular religious values which make it difficult for victims of sexual abuse who live in a Christian context to come to healing: the value of suffering, the virtue of forgiveness, the necessity of remaining sexually pure, the fact that they are in need of redemption, and, most important, the value that is placed on obedience to authority figures. (Brown & Bohn 1989, ch. 5) Benyei (1998) indicates that many victims in such situations remain silent rather than challenge the system:

> Victims do not disclose their abuse for one or several of four major reasons:
> loyalty and the fear of the loss of a treasured supportive relationship; felt
> guilt, often as the result of being scapegoated or abused in their families of
> origin; an intuition that they will not be believed, with consequent
> congregational retribution and abandonment; and overwhelming fear and
> denial, often as a response to consciously suppressed childhood
> victimization or severe anxiety over job or vocational security. (Benyei
> 1998, p. 84)

My focus now comes more particularly on those who are ministers or pastors in church settings. There is no doubt that people in this situation do hold significant power. Gill (1995) puts it this way: 'As a result of their identification with a sacred and powerful corporate body, priests have access to power that is at times compensatory and other times condign or conditioned. In other words, they can get what they want in many life situations simply because they are "men of the cloth", which to their constituents implies special entitlement.' (Gill 1995, p. 7) In this context, condign power is the ability to inflict or threaten some sort of adverse consequence on another person, should the other refuse to comply. Cooper-White (1991) expresses a similar idea:

> In some sense the minister carries ultimate spiritual authority, particularly in
> the eyes of a trusting parishioner who looks to him for spiritual guidance and
> support. But the male minister also possesses other forms of power: as a
> man, he carries the power society confers upon men and socializes them to
> hold over women, often in the guise of being their protectors. He is often
> physically stronger and more imposing. He may be an employer. He may
> also assume a teaching or mentoring role which encourages women to listen

to his advice and correction. Often he also functions as a counselor, with all the transference inherent in such a relationship (Cooper-White 1991, p. 197)

Because church ministers have traditionally been expected to be 'all things to all people', they consequently often do not have clear role definitions. Such a generic expectation can lead a minister to experience an intense level of satisfaction in his/her service of others. This is at the heart of the ministry of all who give generously of themselves. At the same time, what is experienced as power by the congregation may not be so clearly experienced by the minister him/herself. As Willerscheidt et al say:

> The *lack of role clarification* produces an elusive derivation of power. Clergy can feel confused about where their power comes from, who legitimates them and gives them their rights. Does their power come from God in the form of their spirituality, from the congregation that pays them, from the bishop who ordained them, or from themselves? The *lack of role clarification* allows seeing oneself as different, special, or unique. (Willerscheidt et al. 1997, p. 5)

This uncertainty and claim to specialness can in fact come across as quite paradoxical. Capps distinguishes between the actual power a minister has and the perceived power which he/she often feels. Perceived power is deceptive as pastors often do not perceive themselves as having power. In fact, ministers may be uncomfortable with the idea of having power because of the messages they have received that they are to be servants. (Capps 1993, p. 353) Hopkins and Laaser (1995) note in this regard: 'Understanding the power dynamics is a challenge, in part because of the paradox that clerics are most prone to abuse their power when they themselves feel powerless. The inappropriate crossing of sexual boundaries is nearly always precipitated by feelings of extreme neediness and entitlement on the part of the clergy.' (Hopkins & Laaser 1995, p. 220) In other words, the denial or lack of recognition of the power a minister actually has seems to be a fundamental precursor to the abuse of that power. Gill says similarly:

> Priests who seduce children into complying with their sexual desires - and the same is true in relation to adult women - are often giving evidence of their own feeling of powerlessness in the face of what they perceive to be overwhelming power exercised by the pope, by bishops, and sometimes by

pastors and even parishioners. In such cases, the abused victim is simply being exploited in an unconscious effort by the clergyman to attain a 'sense of power'. (Gill 1995, p. 7)

Capps defines what he calls the *paradox of pastoral power*: 'The more you succeed in reducing the power differential between you and the parishioner, the greater it becomes.' (Capps 1993, p. 356) He goes on to explain why this is so:

> Because power in ministry is precisely the power of freedom, of access and accessibility, and of knowledge. Thus, as the parishioner shares intimate facts about herself, making her personal life accessible to him, the power differential is actually increased, not decreased, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding. And, if the pastor proceeds to share intimate facts about himself, this does nothing to counteract the increase in the power differential, as, through these self-disclosures, his access and accessibility to the parishioner are greater than ever. The more successful the pastor becomes in appearing to reduce the power differential, the greater the power differential becomes. (Capps 1993, p. 359)

Guggenbuhl-Craig (1971) puts a Jungian perspective on the ambiguity faced by the minister in trying to be genuinely human and facing expectations of congregations. In doing so, his work is reminiscent of some of the Whiteheads' comments earlier:

> The dark side of this noble image of the man of God is the lying hypocrite, the man who preaches not because he believes but in order to gain influence and power. As in the case of the doctor and his patients, so with the clergyman it is frequently the members of his congregation who involuntarily activate his dark brother. They exert considerable pressure on him to play the hypocrite. Doubt is the companion of faith. But no one wants to hear doubt expressed by a clergyman; we all have doubts enough of our own. Thus the priest often has no alternative but to be the hypocrite now and again, to hide his own doubts and to mask a momentary inner emptiness with high-flown words. If his character is weak, this can become a habitual stance. (Guggenbuhl-Craig 1971, p. 23)

It is in light of the complexities of the situations faced by many ministers that the need for a clear understanding of boundaries becomes important. While boundaries have been referred to earlier, it is appropriate to return to them here. Lebacqz and Barton (1991) believe: 'The mere fact that the pastor is a professional already sets some boundaries for many pastors. It means that the pastor must adhere to professional codes and be honorable in his or her dealings with the parishioner, and above all it means that it is the pastor's responsibility to set limits.' (Lebacqz & Barton 1991, p. 108)

Macke (1993) makes a significant point about boundaries as follows:

> Boundaries are limits that delineate time, place, our person (ie. where we leave off and the rest of the universe begins), and units such as family and community, ethnic groups and nations, and various religious denominations. Boundaries also define and limit various professions. ... Boundaries have texture. They can be placed on a continuum that ranges from rigid to structured to flexible to fluid to chaotic. ... When it comes to professional boundaries for those in ministry, boundaries that are too rigid or too fluid can prove equally problematic. (Macke 1993, p. 23)

All of this presupposes that the minister is well-grounded emotionally and psychologically, so that the appropriate flexibility is able to be exercised in pastoral relationships. A person who is naive or lacking in such balance runs the risk of being so tight in relating that no real humanity comes through, or alternatively, of being so loose that unacceptable liberties are taken in relationship.

Markham and Repka (1997) refer to the three major ways in which boundaries are crossed by professional people: through touch, through sexualised behaviour, and through the power of role. Speaking of this last area in the context of a religious person, they say:

> The third way boundaries are crossed has to do with the role of the religious as a minister. It is important to be aware of the power differential between those who minister and those who are served. Boundary violations by religious are often nonsexual. Sometimes, well-meaning religious, recognizing only a sense of personal powerlessness, are naive about how much power they have in relationship with those they serve, simply by virtue of their ministerial role. (Markham & Repka 1997, p. 38)

While all professionals have particular complications at times over what is appropriate and what is stepping over the boundary of ethical behaviour, Pellauer believes that church ministers face this reality to a greater degree still:

> Problems about boundaries are structurally built into the role of ordained ministers. 'Overcommitment' to the job is not just an occasional problem; workaholism is the single most widespread social disease among the ordained. That it is a high-stress profession goes without saying. Teaching clergy to say no, to avoid burn-out, to learn appropriate ways of nurturing themselves, are serious matters in any case. They may also be high priority for preventing sexual exploitation. However unfamiliar the language of 'boundaries' may be, we need to wrestle with questions like this. (Pellauer 1987, p. 49)

It would appear that those clergy who have not learnt good habits of self-care are particularly vulnerable to overstepping boundaries, and the ramifications of crossing the sexual boundary are massive in terms of impact on the person who trusted in the professionalism of the minister not to do any harm.

Gonsiorek compares clergy with other caring professionals as follows:

> Clergy roles are inherently more complex and fraught with boundary strains. The role of a typical clergy member involves liturgical activities, spiritual direction, pastoral and other counseling, fund-raising, group leadership, and social activities, all with the same group of individuals. Health care professionals generally have much more circumscribed roles. In fact, some health care professions, such as psychology, consider such a complex role to be inherently unethical, because of dual relationships. In effect, some health care professions have determined that the extraordinary diversity of roles that clergy routinely play are simply impossible to manage appropriately, because of boundary strains. (Gonsiorek 1995, p. 154)

The question of dual relationships is a key one for ministers and takes us back to White's features of a closed organisational system. When ministers are so involved in ministry to the extent that they have little life outside it, then the people to whom they minister can in

effect become the source of the ministers' emotional and social support. This 'dual' role of the relationship has ambiguous boundaries at best and at worst can become quite abusive as the minister seeks, consciously or not, to have his/her legitimate needs met in ways which are not professionally appropriate. In the second draft of 'Integrity in Ministry' (National Committee for Professional Standards 1999), a document of principles and standards for Catholic clergy and religious in Australia, there is the statement: 'It is healthy for religious and clergy to develop relationships beyond those of their pastoral relationships wherever that is possible, so that pastoral relationships do not bear the burden of providing affirmation and affective support to the minister.' (National Committee for Professional Standards 1999, p. 8) This raises some very significant issues re education of those who would take on such ministerial roles, that they do in fact know how to develop healthy relationships beyond the workplace; it also requires education for the congregation since the effective 'placing on the pedestal' of priests and religious has virtually condemned them to living in perpetual ministry and not being able to move aside from that role. It takes a large degree of clear identity formation on the part of ministers to be able to negotiate in life-giving ways this maze of possible expectations.

For those who do not have the ability to negotiate ways of living within necessary boundaries, the inappropriate stepping over the line can have a variety of harmful consequences, the more so when there is not the accountability built into the organisation. Rossetti (1996) quotes the Canadian Winter Commission which investigated incidents of clergy-child sexual abuse in the Archdiocese of Saint John in Newfoundland, and identified underlying factors that contributed to clergy involvement in child molestation and the poor response of the archdiocese:

> One of these factors was the unchecked authority of the priests over the people. … [The Commission] said that this 'pattern of power has not been good.' It gave the Church and the priest 'too much influence, unchecked by social ... balances. It also precluded a healthy scepticism about some of the men who occupied positions of authority in the Church.' (Rossetti 1996, p. 119)

The need for clearer accountability and ministerial professional supervision structures is highlighted here.

Reid (1997), coming from an Australian context, talks about abusive relationships and makes the telling statement:

> Much of the current thinking about sexual abuse correctly places a strong emphasis on the abuse of power and the violation of trust that is an essential part of the situation of sexual abuse. At the same time, I think that an abuse of power and a violation of trust are intrinsically more potentially wounding when the sexual being of the other is affected. The sense of abuse and the violation of trust is deeper precisely because it is a *sexual* abuse and violation. (Reid 1997, p. 15)

Reid goes on to speak of Australian clergy and male religious and notes that they show all the typical characteristics of the Australian male culture, which does not value revelation of emotional states which do not fit the male image of strength and command of situation. The culture precludes the sharing of experiences which promote true intimacy and thus provide emotional support. He adds: 'Furthermore, living up to the image of the priest of being all things to all people at all times (being Christ when you are clearly not Christ) also results in priests not being able to express their inner feelings to others.' (Reid 1997, p. 14) This has major implications for recruitment and formation of Australian clergy and male religious.

It is pertinent to note here the role of celibacy of ministers in relation to use of power. Burkett (1993, p. 231) would believe that, in relation to child sexual abuse, mandatory celibacy involves a culture which attracts abusers, but more particularly, it facilitates the rise of the rigid Church hierarchy that may be the most formidable obstacle to a solution of the crisis. Sipe (1995), already quoted earlier, posits a theory that the structure underlying the celibate/sexual system has seven interlocking and mutually reinforcing elements that influence its function and form both the contour and the character of its power. The elements are:

- the insistence on generic blame for perceived ills or evils, with Christian theology refining the blame of woman to a high art form and establishing it as the bedrock justification for celibacy, power, and male control;
- the proclamation of one superior group;
- the reserving of power for the designated pure group;

- the restriction or subjugation of the inferior group at the pleasure or for the use of the group in power;
- the belief that the restriction of one group by the other is justified by an appeal to nature or God's will;
- acceptance that behavior condemned and found intolerable in the general population or among the subservient is tolerated or encouraged in a group of the select; and
- the belief that violence is accepted as necessary or inevitable in the establishment or the retention of the system. (Sipe 1995, pp. 163-177)

Sipe concludes by saying that this analysis gives some clues to the relationship between celibacy/sexuality and power. For the Church to have stated that the state of celibacy was more perfect than the state of marriage was only a rationalisation in the service of male power, with no relationship to spiritual reality. Since the Second Vatican Council where there was recognition of the call of all to holiness, his arguments would be appreciated by more people. At the same time, this has been a time of increasing uncertainty for many clergy as to their changing role, a factor which of itself adds to the stress of their situation.

Collins (1986) refers to priests in Australia when he comments that they were trained in models of priesthood which emphasised their authority and central place in the worshipping community:

> They were trained to see their task as providing clear, authoritative and binding leadership for the faithful... Priests were sacred persons, the intermediaries between God and the worshipping community. A whole ethos was built up around this model. Its origins lie primarily in the reform of priestly life in France in the 17th century. The major elements of clericalism developed in their modern form in this period. In the historical perspective of the 17th century the reforms made sense. In the contemporary Australian Church they are a stultifying and dead weight. Clericalism is the tendency to separate the priest from the people through a specific lifestyle, a uniform (cassock and collar) and through an unfruitful celibacy. Most Australian priests are neither stuffy nor status-seeking, but some have difficulty with ambiguity, and are emotionally under-developed and occasionally rigid and authoritarian. A sense of separation from ordinary people was encouraged in the old seminary training. This has led

to the development of an insulated priestly sub-culture. (Collins 1986, p. 192)

Helping priests and religious to deal with the expectations traditionally placed on them is an important part of their continual personal and professional development.

Schneiders ((2001, p. 49) notes that formation for religious prior to the Second Vatican Council was affected by the 'school model of formal education', which she understands to be 'the structured inculcation [through school institutions] of information and behaviors deemed desirable for members of society and church', a process which she believes is a relatively recent Western development. Since 'most Religious congregations in North America were founded during the era when the school model of education was becoming the normative ideal in society, [i]t is hardly surprising, then, that the school version of initiation was incorporated into the formation model of most congregations.' (p. 50) Emphasis was on learning, achievement, testing and comparisons between candidates, with the 'ever present danger of being expelled for poor performance.' (p. 50). 'The patriarchal, agonistic, conflictual character of Western education … so powerfully influenced the model of formation that many Religious considered profession a kind of victory and themselves survivors of an ordeal.' (p. 50) Schneiders notes the significant change in the type of formation since the Vatican Council, with more emphasis on vocational discernment, testing whether the candidate is indeed called to be a Religious, such discernment taking place subtly within a process of incorporation into the congregation. While Schneiders is writing from a North American context, her comments seem equally relevant to Australian Religious involved in school ministry in particular.

Tacey (2000), in his recent analysis of spirituality in an Australian setting, comments that Australians' tendency towards anti-authoritarianism would suggest in present times a greater emphasis on democratic worship and egalitarian faith:

> The old clerical system … would obviously fail in Australia, and has already
> done so, except for isolated pockets here and there. The people simply will
> not tolerate a clerical dictatorship, and to this extent, the episcopal
> hierarchical systems of both the Anglican and Roman churches are contrary
> to the egalitarian ethos of this country. However, there would be much hope
> and purpose in encouraging a democratic Church, in which lay people could

make creative contributions to liturgy, prayer and worship. The Australian emotional climate would favour the displacement of the clerical system, and the empowerment and elevation of the laity, who would respond well to the recognition and development of their latent priestly capacities. (Tacey 2000, p. 71)

Tacey is highlighting here at a deeper level in Australian life similar issues to Collins in the latter's reference (noted earlier) to the present times as being profoundly unsettling for organised Christianity with established patterns of belief and practice being constantly called into question in the search for frameworks of faith which address issues of importance to Australians today.

At this stage, in looking at some specifically Australian references, I refer to two particular pieces of literature which deal with Congregations of Religious Brothers. The first, referred to earlier, is Angus' (1986) study of [B.S.C.C.], a specific but fictitiously named school run by a Congregation of Brothers. In looking at the motivation of the Brothers on the staff of the school, Angus says:

> The notion that Brothers in those early days of Catholic victimisation were serving the needy linked [B.S.C.C.] to the most important of all traditions of their Order. The sense of purpose that was afforded by such a mission helped to create stability and harmony amongst the religious who comprised virtually the entire staff of the school. Unified in resistance to social arrangements, the Brothers defined their mission in opposition to Protestant power. (p. 77)

and:

> Such a 'life-world' for an individual Brother almost always had its origins in a devoutly Catholic upbringing, began to be more definitely shaped throughout schooling in a Brothers' school, and was finally cast in the Brothers' training institutions. It was then sustained in communities by rigorous obedience to the Rules and Constitution of the Order, and also … by a shared sense of purpose and community. (p. 77)

Angus is referring here to the period largely before the Second Vatican Council in the 60's, since which there have been considerable changes in understanding of mission, formation and style of community living.

The play 'The Christian Brothers' by Ron Blair (1976) also has some interesting observations about a Congregation of Brothers of the 1950's, when Blair was a student in a Brothers' school in Sydney. In the booklet accompanying the 2000 production of the play, also in Sydney, there are reflections by Thomas Kenneally, well-known Australian author and former student of a school run by Brothers, and Peter Carroll, another former student who played the role of the Brother in this one-person production. Kenneally (1977) is quoted as saying: 'The Brothers … retained even in the 1950s an idea that they shared with the revolutionaries of the world, that to educate was a political act and education was power'; and:

> Later on, it became a trend to look back on such lives as a heinous
> abdication of self and desire to live by proxy, through us. Such an easy
> judgment ignores the texture of the Irish-Australian culture in those days.
> Besides, … old boys … remember a sort of solidity of personality about the
> Brothers that makes a mock of facile judgments.

Carroll (1976) makes the following reflection on his time as a student and on the play itself:

> The education system which is portrayed is no longer with us in such an
> extreme form. But although some aspects of it might be considered brutal
> by today's standards I did not think so when I was being taught. I was
> aware that the Brothers were motivated by a desire to serve God by teaching
> pupils and if that involved physical punishment then it was usually given
> without malice.

<div align="center">*　　　　　*　　　　　*</div>

I would like to conclude this section on issues of power in relation to church structures by looking at what is said about the implications for initial and ongoing training and formation for ministry within churches.

The first issue to comment on is the importance of ministers understanding the dynamics at work in their relationships. Transference and countertransference are two realities which are very significant here. As Hopkins and Laaser put it:

> Helping clergy understand the complex dynamics of transference and
> countertransference and enabling them to recognize and own the symbolic
> power they carry with them in the exercise of ministry can often get at the
> heart of what the responsible exercise of good professional ministry looks
> like. Examination of clergy power and authority, where it comes from, and
> to whom clergy are accountable as they exercise it are issues that are at the
> heart of ordained leadership. (Hopkins & Laaser 1995, p. 123)

Transference refers to the phenomenon where a person relates to another, in this case a minister, in a manner which relives a significant relationship from his/her past. Countertransference is the dynamic in which the minister relates to a person in a way which relives significant relationships or events in the minister's life.

Without a good understanding of these processes and the way in which they occur, ministers are very vulnerable to misreading the actions of others and being out of touch with their own motivations. Markham and Repka indicate that ministers are potentially more vulnerable in this area than other professionals:

> The power of transference is often increased in religious ministry because of
> the esteem in which people hold religious. People generally consider it safe
> to come to a religious when in trouble, expecting not to be hurt or mistreated
> in any way. Sisters, brothers, and priests frequently inspire awe just by
> virtue of their dedicated way of life. If a religious extends tenderness and
> compassion to a parishioner, that parishioner may feel especially touched,
> unconsciously recalling childhood experiences of longing for the nurturance
> of a parent (eg. a parent who had difficulty loving). (Markham & Repka
> 1997, p. 41)

These reflections highlight the need not only for good initial training, but also for ongoing ministry supervision so that the minister is helped to be accountable for his/her conduct and the underlying inner dynamics at work. Understanding countertransference can be particularly useful in preventing boundary violations.

Part of the training necessary for religious professionals must involve a greater understanding of the power which goes with the role and is tremendously enhanced by the authority of the person's position. Someone who has the authority to describe to members

of the congregation their status with God has more than professional power; it is clerical or pastoral power as well. The Whiteheads call this aspect the 'symbolic power' of ministers since they are representing something more than just themselves. (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 78) Hardman-Cromwell (1991) insists that any such situation requires the minister to be able to set appropriate limits, particularly in the sexual area. Without such training, the minister's naivete is potentially dangerous to those helped. Hardman-Cromwell comments that if a pastor cannot set appropriate limits, he/she attempts to be all things to all people, faces burnout, and is unaware of personal needs. These are red-flag danger signs. (Hardman-Cromwell 1991, p. 72)

Good formation will help ministers to own the power that they have and act to use it responsibly:

> To come to terms with their position of leadership, however, clergy must recognize and intentionally use the power they have. They will need to move toward rather than away from that power. They will need to make it a friend. They will need to work specifically with what it means to be a powerful person. If clergy can make a different decision about power, they will act differently in relationship to it. They will realize that owning their power is realizing the impact they have on others. They will realize that owning their power means recognizing how people react to them. (Willerscheidt et al. 1997, p. 6)

Similarly, 'it is … important for religious leaders to befriend their symbolic role, learning to draw on its power in ways that serve and strengthen the community of faith.' (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 80) These comments highlight the great value of ministers understanding such issues as system closure, the power which belongs to religious systems per se, their personal need and ability to set boundaries and limits, the dynamics of minister relationships, and the implications of these matters on the way in which the minister makes personal choices for holistic living. Indeed, it would seem that a well-rounded personal integrity is a prerequisite for any church minister to be able to effectively use power in a way other than abusively.

An interesting dimension to healthy self-understanding for a minister is referred to as coming to increasing acceptance of personal weakness. While the following quotation refers to the Christian leader, it in effect is speaking of anyone in a ministerial role:

> Weakness, and the acceptance of it, is necessary to Christian leadership not only because it delineates our relationship to God, but also because it clarifies our relationship with those to whom we minister. The Christian leader can help the confused teenager, the guilt-ridden parent, or the restless octogenarian not because he has successfully dealt with each condition, but because he struggles with confusion, guilt and restlessness in his own life … Weakness is necessary to Christian leadership because it marks our solidarity with all that is human. (Hoeing, quoted in Collins 1991, p. 36)

Poling sets a broad agenda when he elaborates five Principles for Ministry Practice, which cover vast areas in relation to the way in which both church and society operate. While the statements are extremely broad, it is fair to say that they indicate the massive shift in organisational thinking and operation which is still required to redress some of the present problems society faces. Poling says that church and society must: be reorganized so that victims have adequate resources for prevention and healing from sexual violence; devise more effective accountability to challenge the ways men use and abuse power; revise their institutional policies and procedures to prevent abuse of power and sexual violence; examine assumptions about the family, about the devaluation of women, and about sexuality and violence. In addition, the church must reformulate the images of God that sometimes give latent sanction to abusive patterns in families and interpersonal relationships. (Poling 1991, pp. 183-185)

Out of these considerations comes the need for some clearly spelt-out ethical standards, a requirement perhaps even more important in church situations where those who interpret theology in different ways can justify various stances and actions. Pellauer notes: 'As Marie Fortune put it, conservatives may think that they have dealt with the issue by asserting, "no sex outside marriage". Liberals, on the other hand, may think that by justifying appropriate sexual behavior by the criterion of love, they can ignore the power dimensions of relationships. Neither makes explicit any guidelines.' (Pellauer 1987, p. 50)

Given that the minister as professional person carries an ethical responsibility to safeguard the tenuous boundaries of his/her ministerial relationships, codes of ethics define the limits of a well-ordered professional relationship. Neil Ormerod (1994) cites the statement from the Reformed Churches of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons) as a good Australian recognition of the need for codes of ethics in churches. It reads:

> Sexual misconduct [either child or adult abuse, assault or harassment] by ministers will not be tolerated. Ministers of the Church will be informed that the ministerial relationship presupposes the minister will serve the best interests of the other person and that sexualised behaviour is not appropriate to a ministerial relationship; that the minister is always responsible not to abuse his/her authority and power, even if sexualised behaviour is initiated by the other person; that by definition the other person in the ministerial relationship is vulnerable to abuse and when this is taken advantage of, the minister is in violation of sacred trust; and that in the ministerial relationship there is an imbalance of power and authority with the minister having greater authority and expected trust, thus any possibility of meaningful consent by the other person to sexual behaviour is precluded. (Ormerod, Neil 1994, p. 6)

The Australian Catholic Church's first and now second drafts of 'Integrity in Ministry' come from the church's attempts to learn from its experiences in dealing with the exposure of sexual abuse among clergy and religious. It seems that churches, albeit with varying rates and perhaps with a mixture of motives, are realising the need for clearer articulation of standards of ministerial activity.

Another feature of professional religious training relates to training in celibacy as a way of life. While celibacy is mandatory in Catholic Church discipline for priests and is part of a chosen way of life for religious, Sipe, from his investigations in the United States, believes that only a small proportion of priests and religious really come to holistic personal integration in celibate living. However, he does indicate that, for those who freely choose celibacy as a way of life and who understand the power which historically has been conferred on official celibate church roles, there are ten essential interrelated elements that support celibacy as a way of life. 'The ten elements that support celibate achievement are:

work, prayer, community, service, attention to physical needs, balance, security, order, learning, and beauty.' (Sipe 1990, p. 267) Each of these areas could be developed at length, but it is fair to say that there appears now to be a much greater attentiveness to the multiplicity of factors which need to be addressed in formation for celibate people, and this can only be seen as positive in terms of ministers having a more holistic approach to lifestyle and particularly to their use of power in ministry.

It is interesting to note that Schneiders (2000), whose writing is possibly the most detailed synthesis of current understanding of religious life, maintains that freely chosen celibacy is *the* essential feature, the heart of religious life, necessary if religious life is to continue to offer a prophetic witness to the Church and the world. This is certainly clear, but very challenging material, for those who wish to live the life-style authentically today.

A final word

As a final statement in this literature review, I would like to quote Gonsiorek (1995) whose reflections I find extremely challenging and considerably disturbing. While he speaks from an American context, it appears to me that Australian society is moving in the same directions. He indicates that the emphasis on sexual abuse of children in more recent times, while first promising much hope in helping greater understanding of the dynamics of abuse, particularly power abuse, may be a subtle, even deeply insidious, way for society to really avoid the deeper issues which must be addressed. It may be that studies around the abuse of power will need to go a long way further:

> A final thought: Over the past two years, I have been completing a volume
> on male sexual abuse ... As I reviewed the literature on child abuse, I was
> initially pleased by the increasing professional and lay interest in this area.
> Later, I was deeply disquieted. The same decade of the 1980s that witnessed
> increased 'awareness' of child abuse has also witnessed an economic, social,
> and political neglect of children, such that more children are in poverty than
> in living memory and services for children have severely diminished. In all
> areas, except concern for childhood sexual abuse, the level of concern for

children in the United States seems to have returned to that of the nineteenth century. What is wrong with this picture?

A grim hypothesis occurred to me: Are we really concerned as a society about children, or have we found a new vehicle with which to focus our cultural love/hate extremist relationship with sexuality?

The relationship of these somber musings to sexual exploitation by health care professionals and clergy is this: Will the 'sexual' or the 'exploitation' part of this problem be our touchstone? Will we have the courage to explore abuse of power and exploitation in all its forms: emotional, economic, political, social, as well as sexual? Or will we stay focused on the one area of abuse of power that is culturally 'easy' for us to see: the sexual?

That is our future challenge. (Gonsiorek 1995, p. 396)

CHAPTER 2:   FOCUS GROUP ANALYSIS

Method

I began this study with a Literature Review of relevant material on understandings of power and, in particular, how power issues were related to Church structures and functioning. A considerable array of material presented itself as a result of this Review.

In terms of an interviewing process, I chose to use a number of Focus Groups as this method enabled me to gain a broad understanding of how various collections of people viewed the issue of power and, while directed through particular questions, allowed an open-ended response from participants so that themes of significance would emerge through group interaction.

Specifically, five Focus Groups were held involving people with a number of different associations with the Catholic Church and with the Religious Congregation being studied.

The groups (with numbers in brackets indicating the number of participants) were:
•	current and former staff in schools run by the Congregation (7);
•	current religious Brothers of the Congregation (7);
•	former religious Brothers of the Congregation (7);
•	women who have had various associations with the Congregation (6);
•	former students of the schools run by the Congregation (7).

There was no attempt to run extra Focus Groups until no more themes were emerging from the groups, but the choice of these five groups was made in order to help surface what each saw as being the significant elements in a discussion about use of power in the Catholic Church and in particular as related to the Religious Congregation.

The questions asked of each group were:

1. Do you have a story which characterises the use of power in the Catholic Church in recent years?

2. In your experience of priests, brothers and sisters, how have you seen them exercise power?

3. How would you describe the way in which the [Brothers of St Charles] have exercised power? Perhaps there is a story you can tell which captures something of the use of power by [Brothers of St Charles] for you?

4. What images, ideas, memories, emotions, thoughts, stories relating to [Brothers of St Charles] are evoked in you by the following words?

> sexuality
>
> celibacy
>
> all-male communities
>
> attitudes to each other
>
> attitudes to women
>
> attitudes to other men
>
> attitudes to minority groups

5. What signs are there for you which would indicate any abuse of power by [Brothers of St Charles]?

6. Are you satisfied that we have covered all the relevant aspects?

Different groups chose to focus attention more on some questions rather than others, but each group was offered the chance to see all the questions at the start and then to devote their time to whatever seemed to provide the most interest. At intervals, questions not given attention were shown again, with an opportunity provided in the last ten minutes for any comments thought important which had not yet surfaced. The length of each Focus Group was approximately ninety minutes.

Selection of Focus Group participants was as follows:

• Current and Former Staff: invitations were given to staff in a number of schools run by the Congregation and most of the subsequent participants expressed interest as a response. In two cases, word of mouth resulted in others contacting the researcher to offer their services.

•　　　Current religious Brothers: expressions of interest were invited from the members of the Congregation through a regular Congregation communication and those who responded were accepted.

•　　　Former religious Brothers: from the mailing list for a quarterly Congregation newsletter, a group of former Brothers was invited to be involved. A small number declined because of health or availability issues, but most were pleased to be invited and accepted the invitation.

•　　　Women's Group: the women invited to be part of this group came from a variety of backgrounds and were known by the researcher who invited them personally. Two were religious Sisters, others were current or former staff members, parents of students, married to former Brothers, Board members of schools or welfare institutions in which the Congregation had a governance role, or a combination of these categories.

•　　　Former Students: after efforts to contact some Old Collegians' Associations bore little fruit, the researcher spoke with people in a variety of settings who both expressed interest themselves and recruited others until a workable number was obtained.

In all cases, the number interested was slightly more than the number who actually participated, given that the practicality of gathering everyone together seemed to ensure that someone was always unavailable.

Process of Analysis

Huberman and Miles (1994, p. 428) suggest three linked sub-processes as elements of data analysis in qualitative research: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. For data reduction, I developed initial transcripts of the Focus Group discussions and produced a set of headings of significant themes from each discussion as they related to Church and Congregation. I then linked these themes from each discussion into a display of areas which had emerged. This was the beginning of data display. Further organisation of the material then enabled me to select the key summary elements which form the basis of the analysis which follows below. After relating this analysis of the Focus Groups with the Literature Review, I have drawn some conclusions which appear in the final section of this study. The verification process is challenging in the sense that I

was constantly self-verifying the material from my own living as a member of the Congregation for many years, yet I readily accept the subjectivity of such a stance. The study is presented in this light and will hopefully stimulate others from different backgrounds to take up the issues from a wider perspective. I agree with the perception of Richardson (1994, p. 516) who comments: 'Writing is also a way of "knowing" – a method of discovery and analysis. By writing in different ways, we discover new aspects of our topic and our relationship to it. Form and content are inseparable.' A key aspect of the analysis comes from the process of writing in itself.

Ethical Considerations

Under this heading, Fontana and Frey (1994, p. 372) refer to 'traditional' ethical concerns: informed consent, right to privacy, and protection from harm. As they state further: 'Because the objects of inquiry are human beings, extreme care must be taken to avoid any harm to them.' (p. 372) Punch (1994, p. 89) has a slightly longer list when he says that most concern 'revolves around issues of harm, consent, deception, privacy, and confidentiality of data.'

All participants in the Focus Groups were initially sent an 'Expression of Interest' statement. Those who responded were given a letter of explanation of the study, requirements of Focus Group members, the intention to audio-tape sessions, an indication that they were free to withdraw their consent or discontinue their participation at any time without giving a reason, and information re making any complaint to the University Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants completed 'Statement of Consent' Forms which indicated their assent to the details of the letter, and provided their authorisation to the researcher to use the material from the Focus Groups in a form that did not identify them in any way. Participation was voluntary and participants were thanked by written communication in the week after their Focus Group was held.

The researcher did not anticipate beforehand that the study would cause any harm for the participants. While talking about some issues resulted in some participants feeling a variety of emotions, the discussion was an opportunity for some in fact to express their feelings in a way which one participant described as being personally helpful.

Each Focus Group was audio-taped and the tape copied in case of mechanical failures. Transcripts of the sessions were made. These transcripts have been kept separately from the tapes, and all material has been stored securely. Once the analysis and thesis have been completed, all of this material will be stored on the University premises for the regulation five years and subsequently destroyed through tape-erasing and shredding of written material.

While the researcher has identified the speaker in each case by an identifying code in the transcript for the researcher's convenience, no mention has been made in the analysis of any person except to indicate the sub-group to which he/she belonged (current Brother, former Brother, etc).

Consideration of Other Potential Problems

The specific question which was significant for me before conducting the Focus Groups was my own current position as a member of the Leadership Team of a Congregation of Religious Brothers. Would participants feel restricted in commenting freely on any of the issues raised? Would they feel that their present relationship with me (since most but not all participants were known to me beforehand) would offer subtle encouragement or discouragement to voice their opinions in areas of contention or potential embarrassment? As a result of this awareness, I was specific in asking at the start of each session that the Focus Group would be effective to the extent that each person contributed his/her unique perspective, and that all views were equally valid and would be equally accepted for the purpose of the study. A number of times during the Focus Groups, I can remember feeling that my knowledge of many participants had the effect of encouraging a greater freedom in their expression of opinion.

Context

Since the particular focus of the study is on the Congregation, the context will initially set some discussion of comments emerging about use of power in the Catholic Church more generally, as perceived by the participants in the Focus Groups. It is important to say at the outset that I have not tried to make links between Focus Group comments and what has

been presented in the Literature Review. I have regarded the Focus Groups as separate and having an integrity of their own. In the next section, I will bring both Focus Group and Literature Review material together.

Given that the groups were made up of people with an association with the Catholic Church and almost exclusively from the Archdiocese of Melbourne, the stories and reflections on power were in the context of the local Melbourne scene. Given too that the majority of people's association with the Congregation was in schools, it is not surprising that the examples given tended to come from both parish and school settings. It is also interesting to note as an initial observation that the majority of comments were more critical than supportive of the way in which power has been used in the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Melbourne in recent years. Most participants tended to equate the use of power with that of clergy and bishops rather than a more universal use of power by the 'People of God' as Church.

From a positive perspective, it was noted that the leaders of the Church in the Archdiocese and the wider Church had made significant statements in social justice arenas where the principles of Catholic Social Teaching were considered important in public debate and policy formulation on a variety of issues. Two examples specifically mentioned were the challenges offered by In-vitro Fertilisation technology and its impact on the quality of human life into the future, and the question of capital punishment. While it was noted that the power of the hierarchical Church to challenge unjust structures was very important with the Church being quite active, there was a corresponding feeling that the influence of the Church was declining as a greater diversity of opinions was prevalent in the broader community. It is interesting to note, too, that since the events of 11 September 2001, voices from Church groups seem to have attracted more prominence, hence raising the question about the fluctuating nature of people's expectations and responses to official Church pronouncements. It may be a matter of society's need to hear the voice of the Catholic Church on matters of social justice, and being more ready to listen to such a voice in times of greater human difficulty.

A further comment of a positive nature related to the experience of one participant who commented that his parish seemed to be somewhat of a rarity; it was a community of

people where power came from the community. There was a sense of democracy where the Parish Priest had given groups in the parish the ability and encouragement to make decisions and feel a sense of ownership in what was taking place. His experience was that in most parishes this was not the case:

> I would see most other Parishes that I have been in that the use of power is
> not one that's come from the community but one that's come from other
> places – the Archbishop, Rome; you get a sense that you're being told this is
> how things are. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 68)

Before looking specifically at the Brothers of St Charles, I will refer to two areas which received Focus Group attention. 'School Amalgamations and Closures' is not a dominant theme, but featured at the beginning of discussion in two of the groups. I include it initially as a brief but specific example, close to the hearts of a number of participants, where they had some clear reservations about processes used by the Church. The section on 'Patriarchal Models' is a more general look at the structures and approaches taken by the official Church, and as such, provides a helpful background to the material which follows on the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles.

School Amalgamations and Closures

Most of the reflections of Focus Group participants were more questioning of the use of power in the Catholic Church. One particular area which had caused considerable angst for a number was their experience of school amalgamations or closures. One current female teacher spoke of her experience of a decision made to amalgamate two schools:

> Power used by the Church to close them down was very authoritarian and
> they [teachers, students and parents] were very disenchanted with the
> Church structures and the people that executed those orders as Church
> authorities. To this day some of them are still very bitter about the Church's
> role in that, and I say Church in the broad sense … and with the CEO
> [Catholic Education Office] and the [Brothers of St Charles] in particular
> about the way that was handled. It was a very negative experience for some
> of those teachers and students and parents. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 75)

Another staff member, referring to a school closure, believed that the processes were 'superficially transparent, but predetermined … very disillusioning'. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 83)   One Brother, commenting on his role as Principal in a school where there was consultation about amalgamation, expressed a similar concern that the process was not open, but was manipulative as he believed that the decision had already been taken by the relevant Church authorities. Another Brother, in a different but similar situation, said:

> It was patently obvious that the die was cast by people who didn't seem to
> really have a vested interest in either school. I saw it probably as an abuse
> of power under the circumstances. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 189)

Yet another Brother, in hearing these ideas, expressed the thought: 'That process, I think, quite often disempowered people, and that's using power incorrectly.' (Tape 2, Side A, No. 187)

Patriarchal Models

Perhaps not surprisingly, it was the Women's Group which had most to say about the male, hierarchical, patriarchal structures in the Catholic Church and how they experienced them in practice.   One woman questioned the difference between the Church and society in general:

> We're talking about the Catholic Church and the hierarchical and patriarchal
> side of it, but I don't know that the Catholic Church isn't necessarily just a
> mirror of a lot of other parts of the society generally. Maybe we've been a
> bit harsh to say that you expect us to have a Christian attitude. … Maybe
> we're expecting far more of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church than we do
> of the hierarchy in a large corporation where most of the people in power or
> who have a say are male … they have the token women, but essentially the
> women haven't really got much hope of having too much sway because
> they're in a minority. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 123)

A religious Sister summarised this by saying that there is a male advantage in society, which is exacerbated in the Catholic Church. Women are beginning to realise more that their voices are more welcome in the Church (as per the recent document 'Woman and

Man: One in Christ Jesus' (Macdonald et al. 1999)) and that their previous compliance was based around their not being heard.

On an Archdiocesan level, many saw the personality and the approaches of the incumbent Archbishop as having a significant influence in how people perceived power as used in the Church. At one stage, when a new Archbishop was appointed, a former Brother commented that he heard disquiet among the priests because processes of consultancy changed and structures disappeared, with many people feeling 'that they were being held down by power'. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 35) The Archbishop was regarded as wielding power in a hierarchical way. Another participant, a woman, echoed these comments by stating that the power of the official Church often left others powerless.

Most of the women present in the Focus Group mentioned that they were members of WATAC – Women And The Australian Church – and saw women as wanting to minister in different ways. As one said:

> I'm thinking of collaboration, where that comes now, in the way power is exercised, thinking of different ways where that can come in. … In that idea of working together in collaboration, and getting back to that idea of WATAC, with women working together, that they have a different image of this Sarah's Circle, a circular movement where people come in and out of power of the group, of leadership, and I mean, it wouldn't work in big organisations, but there's a shared leadership and it changes every, well, six months … You allow different people to lead when they feel able to. That's a different idea that some women's groups have. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 170)

The image of Sarah's Circle contrasts with the Jacob's Ladder image of the male, hierarchical system more usually associated with Church structure. This theme of lack of power of women in decision-making in the Church was common across all groups. One male former student commented that it was quite a revelation to him when he got to know a number of well-educated and experienced religious Sisters that:

> The thing that stood out for them was that they had no power in the Church because the decisions in the Catholic Church were basically made by men sitting around a table. You've got the hierarchy of the Catholic Church,

outside your own Order, it's controlled by the priests … and there are far more religious women in the Church than men, so they felt very upset actually, that they weren't given a voice, at least that's how they felt. … which I'd never thought about because I was a man … so you never even thought of it, until they would express how they felt that they were out of the power structure in the Church. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 255)

In speaking about the model of power operative in the clerical Church, other groups had various comments as well. A Brother, referring to decision-making in school situations, spoke about the 'all-priests' enclave' (Tape 2, Side A, No. 74) which excluded any non-clerics from involvement in ultimate decisions, even when others did have justifiable input.

It was noted just how strong was the power of the Parish Priest in former times; one Parish Priest was described by a former student as ruling 'the parish with a rod of iron, but at the same time, people saw him as a really benevolent leader. I mean, you know, my mum or grandmother, … they loved him!' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 86)

The force of the individual personality of the Priest was crucial, and the status of Parish Priest in Canon Law gave him a 'God-given right' to be over others. A former Brother, speaking about Parish Priests, noted:

> People say that you've got power because you've got authority; bishops … try to exercise that authority in the diocese and they've got priests who just tell them to get lost. … They've actually got to deal with that reality in trying to exercise what authority they have; the level of maverickism is very high. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 95)

The same participant went on to add, when referring to a Bishop in another diocese:

> [He] listened to all his priests and believed everything every priest told him, and created mayhem in the diocese! Eventually he had to turn around and take a much more directive approach. … The only language some of his older priests understood was directive stuff; it was all power-based; it was his power that was greater than their power. In the [X] diocese, [Bishop] is totally consultative … he has the same problem in dealing with priests; it's

rafferty's rules on many issues, and the people who run Catholic schools and other Catholic institutions of various sorts find that they spend a disproportionate amount of their time trying to deal with the power games played by priests. … Not one of them wants to be involved in Catholic schools; … but do they enjoy playing games with power! It's like a drug to some people. The more disoriented they become in their religious moorings, the more into power they come. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 45)

These comments are directing attention more to questions around formation for clergy, styles of leadership and psychosexual development. Given one woman's comment that she thought that the Church's insistence on celibate religious and priests for ministry was 'the epitome of power' (Tape 4, Side A, No. 325), attitudes to sexuality feature prominently as well. In fact, another woman believed that the Church's closed attitude to discussion of sexuality enabled abuse to occur. These issues will be looked at further in the following section which deals specifically with the religious Congregation of Brothers.

The Religious Congregation of Brothers of St Charles

Over the course of the Five Discussion Groups, there were many ideas expressed in relation to the Brothers of St Charles and how they exercised power. Given that Brothers were men with a significant role in the 'official' Church, it might be expected that many of the broader themes referred to above would surface in discussion about Brothers. I would like to summarise the Focus Group themes which emerged under the following headings:

A   'The Brothers' System'

B   Motivation and Influence

C   Formation

D   Relationships and Sexuality

E   Leadership in Ministry

F   Corporal Punishment

G   Sexual Abuse

How power relates to each of these areas will emerge in the discussion. By way of overview, it is fair to indicate the opinion of one former Brother and current teacher who maintained:

> I would find it impossible to try to characterise the use of power as I saw it while I was in the Brothers or outside. There was the full gamut: from fantastic, enabling, freeing use of power, to quite restrictive and I'd use the word abuse. But to try to characterise one use of power I would find it very, very difficult. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 115)

A   'The Brothers' System'

I have used this heading to capture many elements which came up largely in the current and former Brothers Groups. Under this title is included a variety of issues which relate to the way in which men who are or have been Brothers have seen themselves and their relationship to other Brothers, their sense of being part of a group with some unified purpose, the ways in which that sense of connectedness was developed, sustained and encouraged, and the dynamics at work in the processes of groups of Brothers. The impact which this had on Brothers will also be discussed later.

Those who joined the Brothers were welcomed into an *'all-male club'*, as one Brother called it. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 225) A name used in former times, but little these days, was 'The Monks'. There were roots of this title in the connections of the style of religious life with the old monasteries, even though the Brothers of St Charles' mode of living was quite different. But perhaps the appropriation of the title 'Monks' indicated a sense of camaraderie, or unity, of bonding which for many was a very real part of their experience. Brothers were proud to be part of the group, and for many it was not an isolating bond. It seemed to depend on an individual Brother's history and the communities to which he was sent. The idea of an 'all-male club' was not meant to be disparaging, but while this sense of unity and loyalty was felt, there were aspects which were questioned by some. One Brother observed:

> Not all monks that I've lived in community with I've liked. … Some of them I've bloody well loathed! There's no way known you would get me, listening to an extern back in those days, (we used the word 'extern' in the Rule as somebody who was a non-monk). If a person who was not a monk

criticised another monk, … I'd go in to bat for that bloke, even though I didn't like him! … That's what I'm talking about, the all-male, monk enclave! (Tape 2, Side A, No. 251)

There was a clearly perceived hierarchical structure in any Brothers' community, with the community leader (called the 'Superior') being most senior, those who had taken perpetual vows next in order of length of time professed, and then the Brothers of 'junior' profession, that is, not yet perpetually professed. In former times, up to the 1960's, the Superior was usually referred to as 'Sir' by the other Brothers. A colourful story was related by one Brother about an older man with whom he got on well and whom he called by his religious name. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 89) When he attempted to continue that practice when the man was appointed the community Superior, he was roundly berated by the Superior as not showing the necessary respect! He sensed a degree of artificiality in the relationships which led to such an outcome. The power of Superiors could be quite legendary insofar as they were the ones to give permission to Brothers for purchases, activities outside the community, and such related matters. While some showed a real humanity and care for their Brothers, others were renowned for a strongly idiosyncratic and quite autocratic style, 'bullying', as one Brother termed it. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 120) A consequence of this is that for at least some younger Brothers, there was a certain fear involved. A former Brother made the comment:

> People in authority are authorised to do certain things and to have a certain role in my life and other people's lives, but at the same time, in exercising that process, I'd like them to be consultative, to use dialogue, to be able to listen, to generate certain bonds with me, … not be ruled by rules, not by fear … In the Brothers, [I was] ruled by fear, ruled by the Rule and the fear of not keeping the Rule and what consequences might follow from that. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 82)

The process of 'Scrutiny' had the potential for fear, by which a Brother under temporary vows had to apply for renewal of vows each year for at least six years before he became eligible for perpetual profession. Admission to vows was approved by the Brothers' Provincial Council which relied largely on the observations and comments of the senior Brothers in community with the applicant, a process termed 'Scrutiny'. For applications

for perpetual profession, the Brother applied to the Congregation Council, the most senior authority group in the Congregation. In most circumstances, this was a wise and supportive process, but there were some examples where the candidate was effectively dismissed from the Congregation with his application rejected, largely on the comments of particular individuals, perhaps with limited viewpoints. As one elderly Brother noted:

> If there's anything I'm ashamed of, it's the case of [Brother X]. He came to the end of his six years and he failed scrutiny, on one man's opinion. He appealed and oodles of Brothers wrote to [the Congregation Council] in support of his appeal; and he was told – you can start again! If he's considered worthy to go back and start in the novitiate, why wasn't he accepted for Finals? (Tape 2, Side B, No. 137)

The possibility that such an outcome could occur may have been a source of fear for some younger Brothers who perceived themselves to be not engaging well with older men, who potentially exercised a significant degree of power over the younger men. One woman, a current teacher, observed with respect to Brothers' power over Brothers:

> Younger brothers were on staff and lived in fear and trepidation … that if they stepped out of line then they would be reported to the Provincial Council … and that would get them sent to Tasmania, or somewhere worse! … [At times] in an all-male community, it certainly was a real abuse of power, and yet on the other hand, I can think of Brothers as Superiors who encouraged younger members of the fraternity to take initiatives, and to do courses and to go and mix and do things in the broader community. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 338)

Being a member of the Congregation was often likened in earlier days to 'putting one's hand to the plough'. In the Gospel imagery, having done that, the ultimate sin was 'turning back', or its religious life equivalent, leaving the Congregation. Stories were told of men who left the Congregation in times of early training, and nothing was said. It was as if they had not existed. For some who had been friends with these men, such an occurrence was considerably painful. One Brother gave a poignant example of a man who had left the Brothers, and an effort to reconnect with him:

When I was in Western Australia in 1987, I chased up a former teacher of mine (and he was the best I ever had). He left the monks … I invited [him] out to [Brothers' community] for a meal. He was almost too terrified to come, because he felt that when he left the monks years and years ago, he had let the side down, he'd betrayed everything. … The man just warmed to being accepted once again by the Brothers. … That to me is power, an exercise of power, maybe it's a misunderstanding of power being used against someone. (Tape 2, Side B, No. 73)

There was general agreement among current and former Brothers that the style of authority exercised in the Brothers in the 21st Century by those in leadership was rather different from the standard thirty years ago. It was more of encouragement and exhortation than direct resorting to rules. A former Brother was interested in the possibility of

creat[ing] some understandings of what the process is by which a culture which is highly power-oriented starts to unravel and sort of refound itself and get back in contact with the core values that give what it does substance. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 50)

Certain features were called by one Brother *Instruments of Power*. He referred particularly to the wearing of the Congregation clothing, termed the 'Habit', and corporal punishment:

The Habit, it seems to me, was used in lots of cases as an instrument of power; that you were a brother and that puts you in a more powerful position than a lay teacher in a school. Corporal punishment as an instrument of power over children, and an instrument of fear. That it was a way of expressing your power over the children, and it compensated for your lack of control – a whole area of instruments of power. Being a teacher in a classroom is a position of power, and how do you use that position for the ends and means that it should be used? (Tape 2, Side A, No. 210)

Another feature which would have fitted into this category was title. 'Brother' was a word which gave instant access to recognition in the Catholic community, and what 'Brother' said was usually accepted without argument. The significance of the term as a particular style of relating will be referred to later in the section on Relationships, but a telling

comment came from a current Brother as he attempted to understand the significance of the title 'Brother' nowadays:

> Talking about the use of the word 'Brother': in the past, people would have said they were respectful, they gave you a lot of respect, and they gave us gifts and things like that, tickets to the football because you were 'Brother'. Now I go into places where the word 'Brother' is used and I'm not too sure of the function of that word 'Brother'. I think at times it might have a bit of that former respect in it. At other times I think it's there to alienate you; you don't belong here, you're 'Brother', move on. Sometimes they're telling people when they use it that we don't relate socially well-enough to be included. You know, that's 'Brother', we don't connect with 'Brother', so we'll call him 'Brother' as opposed to Tom or John or Frank. … When I go as a visitor to places now and they call you 'Brother', I often wonder what the function of the word 'Brother' is. In some ways I see it as the opposite of giving you a power and giving you respect; it's putting you down in some ways. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 290)

A former student, and current staff member, indicated some ambivalence over the decline in wearing of the Habit and in the use of the title 'Brother':

> There's something to be said for giving someone a title, especially to a teenage boy, if he has to give someone a title of Sir or Brother or whatever, it gives him an indication that that person is at a point that has been attained by some sort of effort or something worthy of respect, and I'm disappointed that that's not the case any more, that they're not afforded that title, and that they don't wear some sort of more obvious garb, but of course there's also the issue that I'm sure the Brothers don't want to be trussed up in garments all the time, because they were fairly stringent in the earlier days, I know. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 58)

This seems to relate to a clearer sense of understanding of a modern identity for the Congregation, which is somewhat in a state of flux for many, and in a state of definite decline for others. Dealing with change is not easy for both Brothers and those who had rather fixed views of how Brothers lived from earlier days.

There was reference to particular dynamics in which power was exercised in a Brothers' community. While no community necessarily featured all these aspects, and at first glance they seem rather less significant, the fact that it was current Brothers who surfaced them gave a distinct impression that this group understood their significance. For some, the use of humour could become somewhat destructive, with its being used to convey cynicism or criticism in a veiled way. For others, it was the dynamics used in community meetings which showed where the real power lay. A specific example offered was 'the power of silence' in a community, where an individual might say nothing in a community meeting, but his lack of participation was a controlling influence on the community. Another example was of the person who had lived in the one place for a long time, and who effectively maintained control over the way in which things were done in the house. There was some amusement, but general agreement, when one current Brother referred to the 'financial power that bursars had over signing that cheque!' The 'power over the money' was a very real power; in fact, it was agreed that the man with the money had the power! The sum total of these various features was to help create a culture in which many were able to develop positively and holistically, whereas others became caught up in the minutiae of detail and lost the broader picture. Where there was openness and good community involvement, a healthy approach was the outcome; where there was a more restricted approach, decisions tended to be less open and one would have to ask whether systems tended to become closed. As seen in the Literature Review, such closed systems have the potential to become abusive.

What was the impact on Brothers of being part of such a system of Brotherhood? An initial comment, made by one of the former Brothers, was that the bonding is strong when people have shared an intense experience. He believed that living of Brotherhood in community was one such 'intense experience'. It is interesting to note that most of the comments which gauge the impact on Brothers of living this experience have come from the other groups rather than the current Brothers themselves.

One comment of note is that, for some men, their attraction to join a religious community may well have been quite different from their desire to be a member of a teaching congregation. As a former student said:

It must have been very difficult, I think, for people who joined an Order such as the Brothers to be a religious and it almost automatically meant they were to be a teacher, because I think they're two quite different things … I mean, if you haven't got a passion for teaching, it could drive you crazy! And, like any profession, I suppose, you've got to have that sort of passion and want to do it. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 105)

It was clear to the former students that some men were clearly unsuitable to be Brothers. Such comments as the following add to that picture:

And those who were, I mean, you wonder how they ever got into the profession, quite frankly. And this is what's since troubled me at times, thinking of how they were allowed, how they survived for so long as teachers in that environment. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 95)

All those people were at different stages of development and with different personalities, and … some clearly couldn't cope, some of them weren't suited, and some of them were very good. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 185)

There were a whole lot of good men, really proficient, and yet there were still a couple of those people who should never have been there, should never have been teaching Brothers, should never have been teachers, and you do tend to remember through the exercise of power by fear. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 276)

To these former students, some Brothers in this situation seemed ill-equipped to cope with the demands of the classroom, and others just seemed unhappy. Concerns were expressed over some where it seemed that it was as if they were being forced to use a particular mould of discipline which was at odds with their personalities, and they struggled to cope. One of the women, in her observations of Brothers, commented that:

young brothers [were] ground into ill-health because they had to take on all these extra responsibilities, simply because they were Brothers. There were lay teachers there who could have done the role just as well, but they had to be given them; and you saw them dropping under the physical strain of

coping with so many jobs, and half of them still studying part-time as well! That was probably another reason that so many Brothers left, so many religious generally left; they just could not cope physically with the demands that were made on them. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 88)

Another woman, a religious Sister, commented on how some Brothers had learned beyond the socialisation of the system, and she marvelled at the result:

If you think of the way novitiates were, and think of the way you were treated as a young religious … and then this person has the power and position to use and it's really hard. That's why I just marvel at when it doesn't happen! You know, when it's not authoritarian, it's marvellous. You think, where did that come from? Here's a human being who's gone beyond all that socialisation that's happened from maybe when they were 13 when they were in the juniorate, or 12 or something like that, and suddenly, out of, I suppose, some good relation somewhere, they discovered different ways to do it, and that's marvellous. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 96)

I conclude this section on 'The Brothers' System' with reference to the play *The Christian Brothers*, which featured prominently in the Focus Group discussion of former Brothers. While the setting of the play, a one-man production, is set in the mid-1950s and before the changes which occurred in the Church at Vatican II, it features an older man who has been faithful to his vocation for many years, but who has pronounced idiosyncracies and is an amalgam of particular Brothers who taught the playwright. It was interesting to see how the group of men gathered in discussion, most of whom had seen the play, found it as rather accurate in picking up certain features of the life of a religious Brother as they had experienced it. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 317ff) A compendium of their comments would note that there was general good-will from the audience because the play tapped into something deep in a lot of people's experience; people thought it was authentic without being cruel; it highlighted the contradictions in the Brother – a mixture of gentleness and aggression; it projected an element of pathos, with a feeling of being sorry for the man, yet having some affection for him. What came through strongly was the great commitment of the Brother to his vocation of raising up the next generation through education, with some of his ambivalence as he tried to integrate the various aspects of his life. He came across as a

man who was deeply caught up in 'The Brothers' System', with all the ambiguities associated with that. Somehow, the combination of individual foibles, humanity and commitment resulted in people seeing a bigger picture, and a measure of forgiveness applied for what was somewhat disordered.

B   Motivation and Influence

While I use the words 'Motivation and Influence' as the heading for this section, the sense coming from the discussions was quite broad. What motivated people who were Brothers? What vision did they have? Where was the Faith Dimension in their lives? How did they use their power for good? Notwithstanding all the nuances and ambivalences expressed, each Focus Group did have something to say about these issues. Interestingly, it was not the current Brothers who had most to say, but rather the former students and the women. Perhaps those who have lived or are living as Brothers have best hopes of how they influence others, but they are unsure of the impact which they have had in practice. The realities of the last ten years in which Brothers' methods and practices have been often denigrated and their failings exposed may well have left them feeling less adequate in judging the effectiveness of their efforts. As one Brother, in expressing his own and others' hopes, said:

> For what reason has power been exercised by Brothers? As I think back, the power I may have used in the classroom, the power I might have exercised outside the classroom, it was all being tied in with the big picture of theological and philosophical understanding of what life was about and my place in it; and that was that I was on a mission with others to raise up young people and set them on a course of some independence, and also to bring Australia to Christ. … The exercise of power wasn't for personal aggrandisement. … Brothers continued to exercise power because they had this higher motive; popularity never entered my particular mindset in all of that. Power wasn't exercised for personal gain in terms of material wealth or anything like that. … By and large, it was to do good. (Tape 2, Side B, No. 82)

This hope of 'raising up young people' featured prominently in discussions. One religious Sister referred to the Brothers' 'power of focussed energy going towards lifting these kids up from poverty into having some hope in life'. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 280) Another Sister commented on an education study done through Deakin University in the 1980s which looked at one Brothers' school and highlighted that, for the Brothers, the focus was 'to lift their students from being poor up to middle-class'. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 210) This reflects the position of the Catholic community, going back to the 1870s, where education was seen as the only way for Catholics to gain an equal place in society, and religious Congregations were the favoured vehicle for delivering successful educational outcomes for many children.

A former Brother referred to the 'powerful influence' of the Brothers, which he interpreted to mean the desire to make a difference in the lives of young people. That desire changed the whole socio-economic background for generations past and did bring about the sense of equality which had been hoped for. A former student, now staff member, made the comment: 'whatever power is, I think it's power as influence, and influence that lasts over many years.' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 110) One of the women referred to the 'passionate focus' of a group which really believed in what it was doing:

> The power of a group that passionately believes in something is going to do it, do something about these kids who are going to grow up in poverty unless we do it. For all the Orders now, it's really time to take stock of where the passionate focus is. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 139)

The former students group had much to say about this power of the Brothers to influence their charges. One maintained that the Catholic Church 'needed people to join together to have the power to create the schools and to create hospitals … it blew my mind at what these groups … had created.' (Tape 5, Side B, No. 10) The power here seems to come from a shared vision and shared energy which has the ability to achieve great results. A former student commented on the 'charism' of the Brothers of St Charles, the special gift possessed by the Congregation for the benefit of the Church and the world, and believed that the Brothers 'still had a charism of choosing to go to underprivileged places like Africa … to start almost again', and that impressed him. A further former student said: 'it never lost its relevance to me that they were very dedicated, special men that had given

practically their lives to a great cause.' (Tape 5, Side B, No. 60) A former Brother, now a school leader, mentioned: 'Power is one word, but I remember Headley Beare described authority as not that which you have but which others are prepared to ascribe to you.' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 180) In that light and on the basis of the comments of former students, it would appear that Brothers did have authority which was used to influence strongly for good.

A former student and current teacher summed up:

> The fact that the [Brothers of St Charles] were an Irish order, they came from a pretty tough political and economic environment historically. … I think … that's why they made such a huge impact because they changed the whole socio-economic background. … Men of that generation still believe that and still appreciate that. … Kids today don't see that, … a real education, so empowerment … for themselves, their family, and also future generations. (Tape 1, Side B, No. 10)

In the women's group, it was mentioned that the Sisters had similar influence with girls and it helped create for girls a sense of their own autonomy and good role-modelling, which the Brothers were seen to provide for their students.

A crucial aspect of the motivation of the Brothers which stemmed from their vision and gave them their power in the Catholic community was the dimension of faith. As one former student stated:

> I do think the Brothers were able to almost play a unique role in terms of calling forth a response and make a real faith statement. … My recollection would still be that I would have a huge respect, but it was a lot deeper than just a respect for a teacher, it was a real part of the building of faith, and I think they did contribute significantly in that regard. … They were a statement about someone that had given up a part of their life and they really did represent almost a living faith. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 106)

A former Brother, wishing to comment on the nature of religious life as he saw it, made the comment:

You've got to give the Holy Spirit room to move. …. The Brothers have taken a somewhat more open approach. … That whole sense of the prophetic which religious are supposed to bring to the Church, not a sense of the institutional, has come alive again; whether it's come alive when it's too late, I'm not sure, but the notion of being prophetic and bringing some sort of prophetic sense to what's happening is just so badly needed in the Church at the moment. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 139)

On the basis of this comment, one wonders whether the challenges of more recent times have enabled the Brothers to face squarely again the unique vocation to which they are called in the Church, a vocation which may have been obscured at times for many with the concentrated focus on needing to run successful schools. However, in terms of empowerment of students, there was strong general belief across the groups that such did occur. A related comment was the influence exerted by men who had been former Brothers in a whole variety of fields, seen as a positive use of power for the benefit of society.

Brothers may be tempted to believe that with this noble motivation their methods would not be open to question, but that was definitely not the case. It became very clear that the effectiveness of the power exercised by a Brother over his students was strongly dependent on his relationships and ability to engage the students. This will become clearer in later sections looking at Relationships and Corporal Punishment.

I close this section with the reflections of a former Brother who spoke with some pride about the past and offered some inklings for the future:

The education of the Brothers, … taking a group of people who were an underclass and educating them to a position of power within the community, led to a kind of understanding that 'we did this!' I heard people say that Catholic education in Australia rode on the celibate backs of lay religious, male and female, and the educated populace we've got are a product of that, something we should be justifiably proud of. Perhaps there's a tinge of arrogance in that. … We were able to beat the power brokers at their own game and make the next generation powerful through their education. As a young guy joining the [Brothers of St Charles], I basked in that glory. We

were a group of people who were on the march educationally; we opened lots of doors for people like that throughout, and I think the next stage may be not looking at schools for that empowering of these people who are depressed, but empowering them in a different kind of way. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 144)

C   Formation

One of the features of the discussions was speculation concerning the formation which young men received in the early years when they joined the Congregation and its subsequent impact on them and their later functioning. Clearly each man is unique and the effect of formation was seen in a whole variety of responses. Some undoubtedly grew to maturity and conviction and healthy living of their vocation in a way which had a great influence on others, especially students; at the other end of the spectrum, there were those whose acceptance into a teaching profession was still a source of question and some surprise. It was my observation that discussions focussing on the formation received by the Brothers tended to be critical of its quality.

One of the women observed that a Brother's family of origin was very significant: 'If a [Brothers of St Charles] … grew up in a loving family, I mean, they've got some kind of model to go from to show that to other people, whereas, if they haven't, it influences them.' (Tape 4, Side A, No. 154) Given that many joined religious Congregations when they were even as young as 13, and moved into an exclusively male environment at that stage, one wonders how some gained modelling of appropriate relationships with a broad range of people and also a healthy understanding of sexuality. A staff member, himself a former student, commented: 'A lot of [Brothers of St Charles] started at a very young age, so they've never known anything different. In many ways [they've] been indoctrinated and very much institutionalised, and wouldn't know any other way.' (Tape 1, Side A, No. 205) This sense of institutionalisation into 'The Brothers' System' was looked at more fully in an earlier section.

Women had a variety of thoughts in this regard. From stories many had heard, they had no doubts that formation for Brothers in earlier times was quite misogynist! One of them

spoke with feeling of her early experience of Brothers when she first became a teacher in a Brothers' school:

> It was the Brothers who'd gone into the juniorate, who really lived in that very formative time in their adolescent years where they had no interaction, I often felt in daily working with Brothers that they were almost frightened of you; they were just so nervous and really didn't know. … I was one of five women on the entire staff, I was the only one under the age of 50; I was in my late 20s and I had two young children, and I may as well have stepped from Mars in those early days. Why wasn't I at home looking after these children? You could sense a total lack of ease at having to work with women; it was just beyond their ken at this stage. I think the formation in the Brothers in training was to exclude women totally from your world. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 165)

Another woman, commenting from her experience of having relations as both priests and brothers, said:

> Thinking back to people being taken from their homes at the age of 13 or 14 and going into secondary schools and finishing, like in a juniorate situation, there wasn't the training and, I've got a brother a priest and he said that in the seminary they received very little sexual education. … All those things were sort of brushed under the carpet, so I suppose for a lot of people their psychosexual development came later. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 54)

Such a comment could equally have been made in terms of [Brothers of St Charles] formation. A former Brother, in analysing the training which he and others had received said that 'so many people came out of that system with a whole unfocussed aggression that had to work itself out in some ways in subsequent years'. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 265) Such aggression seemed to be related to dissatisfaction with some aspects of the formation, yet, for many, they did not have the personal resources to be able to express that dissatisfaction in an appropriately assertive way. The implication was that the aggression for some was worked out in inappropriate ways, whether by undue harshness or in some other form. A comment from one former Brother, referring to the Brother who had been his Novice

Master in early training: 'Even forty years later, just talking about [Brother X] still gets me mad!' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 97)

Similarly, a former Brother commented that he questioned whether Brothers were well trained in two-way accountability. It seemed to him that the Superior of a Brothers' community was largely unaccountable for his actions most of the time, and the other Brothers were accountable to him. There was never really a 'training to actually lead' and so accountability was never there. Another former Brother felt that 'the saddest abuse of power was not so much by someone in a position of authority … [but situations where someone] wouldn't take responsibility for [their] own actions … a moral immaturity almost.' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 66) He was referring to his belief that it was possible for men to avoid taking responsibility and to use the authority of the Superior of the community as a door behind which they could shelter rather than developing the personal maturity needed for adult functioning. While these comments may not refer to all Brothers, their surfacing in the groups, particularly with former Brothers, indicates that these are issues which have certainly impacted on some men.

One former Brother seemed to speak positively of changes which had occurred in more recent times, and an explanation for what occurred in the past, when he said:

> With hindsight, what would we do again? I think people would have invested a lot more in developing the leadership of the Brothers, but developing the Brothers wasn't what it was about. It was running the system. That's the shift that occurred in the late 80s, early 90s which has really been significant in how the Brothers currently exercise power. It's not something that's peculiar to the Brothers. … The people we've got are a gift we've got and we've got to make the most of the gifts we've got because that's all we've got! It's thinking from that perspective that's really made a significant difference whereas I would have thought that would have been the last thing anybody had in their minds in the 60s and 70s and even well into the 80s. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 198)

A current Brother commented very positively on the importance of a renewal program in Rome, offered to Brothers who wished to avail of it from the early 1970s to early 1990s.

Perhaps this was a further element in the formation of many men which was needed to help them further their own personal development. The comment of this Brother: '[The program] was a transforming element in many people's lives. I certainly felt released and free. … Everyone was included, and to me, that was an exercise of power for the benefit of people.' (Tape 2, Side A, No. 204) Such a statement puts emphasis on the significance of formation as an ongoing process, begun at an early age, but continuously operative in the way in which a person adapts to new circumstances in life, hopefully in a holistic way. It also gives a clear example of the exercise of power for individual empowerment.

D   Relationships and Sexuality

From the Literature Review, relationships and sexuality are two related areas which have clear connection to the use of power. From Foucault's sense of mutuality in power relations, to hegemonic understandings of sexuality, to open and closed systems in which relationships in organisations move into more or less healthy patterns, to take some few examples, it appears that relating styles are relevant to the expression and perception of the use of power. People's understanding of their sexuality is at the heart of their sense of personal identity and is a core element in how they relate to others. A focus on relationships and understandings of sexuality will indicate the degree to which Brothers have a comfortable acceptance of their own personalities and how that manifests itself in the observations of themselves and others in how they wield power. It is clear from what follows that those men who were 'at home' with themselves did have the most positive impact on others.

The area of Relationships featured prominently in the questions posed with the Focus Groups and it is in looking at how Brothers formed relationships with a variety of groups of people that some idea is gained about how their power was demonstrated in actuality. The ability to relate to another, to be appropriately intimate in self-revelation, and to be able to respond with empathy, all have strong connections with a person's understanding of his/her sexuality, and so a commitment to an all-male community will be considered in this section too as a central feature of a Brother's self-understanding.

One female current staff-member asked whether the relating styles of Brothers would be different if the men were not Brothers (Tape 1, B , No. 156); she implied that Brothers'

ways of relating were fairly typical of the styles which she saw in men in general. Whether the all-male nature of the community added a further dimension was not clear, although a former student spoke of a conversation he had with a man leaving the Congregation who intimated that he had difficulty with the reality of all-male communities. Clearly, different individuals would respond in different ways to living solely with men. As one current Brother commented:

> I would have interpreted personally that I'd taken a vow of chastity and that prudence and just general wish to remain faithful to vows; and living in an all-male community was the appropriate way to do that. It was the Rule and it was the obligation of everyone to live in an all-male community. … My experience that it's been a community, and no more and no less than that; at times a very tension-filled community. … [In Sydney in the early 50s] I heard some stories of how life was lived in communities in Melbourne and I knew I was coming to Melbourne – some communities were rather childish. … I couldn't bring myself to want to be part of that childishness, but my experience in community was other than that. By and large, I found communities pretty sensible and pretty mature. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 235)

Much of the experience of an individual Brother seemed to depend on both his own personality development and on his community experiences. While other Brothers could identify with the comment just made, some raised other issues in terms of male-relating. One current Brother mentioned his realisation that men with whom he lived in a particular community and who had difficulty with relational dynamics had been 'terribly hurt'. (Tape 2, Side B, No. 39) He did not say where the hurt had come from, but it was clear that these men had significant struggles in good human interactions. A 'macho culture' provided a veneer which covered over and perhaps disguised some of the problems, indicating that the dominance of hegemonic understandings of masculinity may not always have been personally helpful to men in their living.

In terms of relating with individual Brothers, a current teacher spoke of his friendship with a younger member of the Congregation in very positive terms, perhaps highlighting the development of relational skills in formation in more recent times. He mentioned

the power of friendship that I've had from one [Brother of St Charles] in particular; there have been others, but the sort of level of friendship that I've had with this particular person has been fantastic. If circumstances were different, he would have been best man at my wedding. We're able to share a huge amount of power between us in the sense of being able to relate well to each other … a very powerful relationship. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 100)

Such a comment is a good indication of Fox's (2001) belief that relational power is becoming increasingly important as power seen as domination is being questioned more.

A member of the women's group shared her observation, obtained from conversations with Brothers, that in earlier times, it was possible to be a 'hermit' in a Brothers' community, to live alone and avoid great interaction with fellow Brothers. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 336) She was contrasting this with what she perceived as significant advances in Brothers' relating styles in the last twenty years, brought about by a greater understanding of sexuality and wider relationships outside the community, particularly with women.

As far as relating with women went, the group of former students commented that they had little evidence from their school days that Brothers related to women at all, apart from the women in the canteen or on the Mothers' Auxiliary. Relationships were purely functional. One older, female, former staff-member had some broad observations on Brothers' relationships with women:

Re attitudes to women, I know women who were scared stiff to come and speak to the [Brothers of St Charles]. … Brother [X] … was a very reserved man; and they were petrified of him. … I knew Brothers who were scared stiff of women and could not relate to them whatsoever; they couldn't even talk to them, because they were brought up in those earlier days. … And I also saw a lot of women chasing the Brothers! (Tape 1, Side B, No. 63)

Another current female teacher believed that,

with the Brothers, you really had to prove yourself if you were a woman. … Once I felt that they had accepted me though, and that they felt that I was worthy of their affirmation of my ability, … they will look after you.

You've done your time. … I think that I was lucky that I was the type of personality that didn't get destroyed by having to prove myself; and I'm sure there were a lot of people along the way that got really demoralised by having to overcome all those hurdles. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 326)

Proving oneself as a good teacher was of the essence, in this woman's eyes.

There was general agreement in the women's group that attitudes had changed in the Brothers over the years and that Brothers had been softened through more interaction with women. This 'softening' with its related ability to become more vulnerable, may in itself be an indication that many Brothers were intuitively moving to understandings of power beyond the hegemonic forms to which they had been accustomed. One woman, speaking of a former Brother whom she knew well and describing a renewal program he did in the 80's with a lot of women, said:

His attitudes changed, … he got rid of some of his bad habits and became more flexible and gentle through that interaction with women. … Men and women meeting there and just having more freedom to meet must have changed people's attitudes. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 157)

Such observations lead to greater consideration of the significance of healthy attitudes towards sexuality and approaches to living of celibacy. It is of note that the current Brothers group did not focus much time on these issues, by contrast with the former Brothers group. One inference is that in more recent years greater efforts have been made to help men to be in touch with personal growth areas in their lives and there is generally a healthier attitude to sexuality today.

The feeling of the former Brothers group was that sexuality was largely a 'no-go' area in formation, with a 'huge denial in sexuality' a common feature. One former Brother (Tape 3, Side A, No. 301) believed that there was more sharing at a peer level, which may have been typical of wider society for young men in their teenage years, but the overall sense was that, with little formal training in healthy understandings towards sexuality, relationships with women were looked upon with suspicion and fear, and men were not encouraged to become too close to each other because of the danger of 'particular friendships' which related to a fear of any latent homosexuality. Fear seemed to be caught

up with much of the living. Such fear tended to promote remoteness, with the result that power was exercised more in control and domination than in mutual interactions with associated vulnerability.

In such a situation, many undoubtedly had difficulty in developing healthy approaches and commitment to celibate living. A former Brother, referring again to the play *The Christian Brothers*, mentioned that the approach provided in the play, and with which he could identify from his formation, was: 'just play handball and keep busy!' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 319) It was an approach of almost avoidance and a channelling of sexuality into action. Another former Brother, also speaking about celibacy, quoted the line from the poem *Easter 1916* by Yeats: 'Too long a sacrifice can make a stone of the heart'. (Webb 1991) He added in reflection: 'I think that happened a lot. The way of life was a pretty demanding life; there was a lot of self-sacrifice in it. I think that has the effect of disturbing affections.' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 9)

Perhaps the strong focus on physical activity for the Brothers in their own living of their sexuality then found expression in the highly important role of sport in their schools. As one current staff member noted: 'You can be a damned good teacher, but, by gee, if you were a good football coach, you're the top of the list! … That Sport-God made you one of the teachers!' (Tape 1, Side B, No. 25) He quoted, to the accompaniment of general laughter from the group, one Brother from earlier times who lamented the number of women coming onto the school staff: 'The problem is, with all these women, no-one can take the sporting teams!' (Tape 1, Side B, No. 25)

What came through constantly in the Focus Groups was that, despite some of the issues referred to in this analysis, there was an enormous range of relating styles exhibited by the Brothers. Given this backdrop, it is interesting to hear the comments of some of the former students on how Brothers impacted on them in their schooldays relationships.   One particularly poignant comment was made by a former Brother who was able to refer to the importance for him of his relationship with another man, now a former Brother too, who had taught him as a Brother many years earlier, and who was now a fellow member with him in this same Focus Group of former Brothers:

Power is the impact you have on people years and years ago, and I think Brothers had a lot of power that they exercised individually and, I can go back to my time in Year 9 at [school] when [former Brother] here was teaching me, … and nearly fifty years later I still remember that and I still think it's important. It's another side of the influence you were talking about that power is exercised at a lot of levels and because people took some great things away from the experience, they forgave you all the other things that they could think about. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 175)

The man referred to in this quote himself remembered the advice he has been given as a young Brother by an older Brother: 'At the end of the day, never leave any student feeling that you dislike them!' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 167)

Such comments reflected the experiences of many of the former students group as well. It was individual Brothers who had an impact in terms of encouragement, motivation and love of learning, albeit with some degree of force on occasion in many cases. A typical example of such feeling from the former students group would be:

[Brother X] stood out as an outstanding person, and he had power because he had such tremendous warmth and such prestige. He was so pleasant and accomplished, and, you know, he wasn't a big head, he was a humble sort of person who always had something nice to say. He had tremendous, I don't know if it's power but, respect and admiration. I do agree that there was quite a range of people and they basically acted very differently; I think that's the thing that I remember most, that it was an enormous range of people amongst the Brothers in their methods and their use of authority. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 101)

Words which came out in discussion about the power of such relationships with students were: warmth, prestige, humility, respect, conviction, humour and wisdom. Such men won admiration from students and were good role models as men and as teachers. They knew and practised relational power. These comments fit well with the motivation of the Brothers, as discussed earlier, where the reality for the students matched the outcomes as intended by the Brothers.

Given the tremendous range of approaches from individual Brothers, it comes then as no surprise that there were some who did not relate well to students. In a later section, attention will focus on corporal punishment as part of the system, but some comments here from the former students reflect that not all students would have felt positive about their schooling experiences:

> There would be a lot of kids from [school] who would have come away from the school with a life-long negative attitude. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 150)

> I've always wanted to be a teacher; and you've taught me exactly how I won't teach! And that was just so much anger and frustration. (The speaker is referring here to a conversation with a Brother who taught him in earlier days). (Tape 5, Side A, No. 174)

An interesting comment from one former student related to his comparison between his own and his son's education at Brothers' schools:

> One comment I would make, and I'm sure the world's moved on a bit since the time I went to school. Certainly when I was at [school], you probably came away with a view that you were a useless article, or a bloody, you know, I could give you twenty five catch phrases, stinking worm to a, useless article, to a, you'll never achieve anything. And when my son did Years 11 and 12 at [another Brothers' school], I was absolutely staggered by the messages he got: you can achieve, you can be like this, you can do that; that was an absolutely different message, and I thought what a huge and what a great change! To people like us, having got that message a lot earlier, we probably wouldn't have had some of the inhibitions and the other hurdles that we had to get over in our life. To some extent, it almost seemed the way the world was; you have twenty five hurdles in front of you … I notice it so stark, I think, because of my recollections. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 284)

Another former student reflected on his school experience and had the following to say:

I can say I've seen most aspects of power with the Brothers … and a lot of it really comes down to the individuals, what they are like as people, how much they apply their religious vocation to their everyday life, in teaching, that is, and I think really human weakness can show up in various ways and they have slipped at times and let their tempers go, and …. they're just people as far as I can tell, that have all the frailties of anyone else, but there are a couple of standout examples, and these ones I remember more than the bad side of things. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 154)

It would seem from these last few comments that men who struggled to relate well with others, particularly students, tended to exercise their power more as domination with its often perceived characteristics of criticism, cynicism and physical punishment, as opposed to more positive influencing through more interactive relating styles.

One woman, a religious Sister, commented on her experience of Brothers as school Principals twenty years ago, and, while noting their competence, questioned their relational skills:

Relational was the bit that I hesitated about, that many Brothers to me took on the role of Principal and I didn't know what the person was like. …. I was petrified actually in the Principals' Association of about six of them who were big, physical, articulate, competent, heavy, so knowledgeable. … I knew they were running good schools, but they didn't relate to me as a person. (Tape 4, Side A, No. 304)

To conclude this section on Brothers' relationships and understanding of sexuality, I would like to look at the word 'Brother'. Some reflections on the meaning of this word have been provided earlier, but it is worth noting again that the title in itself is a very relational word. If a man was being true to his calling to be 'Brother' to people, then his relational skills would have been developed to a high degree. The fact that former students can recall men who did relate well to them is testimony that many did develop good relational skills, while others obviously were less gifted. One former Brother made the observation:

My experience was that it wasn't a family, it was a Congregation. The term 'Brother' didn't really mean what it means to people within a family. It

meant something different, and yet that growth in the understanding of that depends upon whom you lived with. I would dearly love to have lived with some people whom I really believed had the vision of 'Brother' and in nearly every case they came from large families; they'd learned it elsewhere, not in the Brothers. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 20)

Such a comment suggests that there are many factors at work in whether a man succeeded in developing good relational styles.

In summary, by interpreting power for Brothers as having a significant positive impact on people, it is very clear from many of these comments that a Brother's style of relating was central to the manner in which others (students, staff, women, fellow Brothers) experienced him as exercising power or not.

The degree of his integration of a healthy sexuality is strongly related here, a factor which for many Brothers appears to have developed more strongly in the last twenty years. It seems fair to say that those men who imposed fear on others through their remoteness, cynicism or use of strong corporal punishment were frequently exhibiting a lack of comfort with themselves, including their sexuality, and they in reality had little power because they were unable to exert a significant positive impact. Conversely, those men who did have strong positive influence on others usually demonstrated a more open relating style which showed a greater sense of personal integration and identity.

E   Leadership in Ministry

Having looked at other factors, it is appropriate to consider how Brothers were seen in leadership roles in ministry situations, particularly in schools. It is of note that the group of current Brothers made few observations in this regard, even though four of the group had been school principals at some stage. Most of the comments come from former Brothers, staff members and the women's group.

It is clear, given the regimen of religious life, that order and discipline were at the heart of the running of schools. One former Brother referred to disorder as being akin to sin! (Tape 3, Side B, No. 169) There were certainly powerful pressures on young Brothers to control

their classes so that fruitful learning could occur. Another former Brother felt that it seemed a given that if a Brother was a good teacher, he would be good at running a school. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 193) Training for leadership was more assumed; if a man had experience as a good teacher, he would be able to move into leadership if required. It seemed that efficiency equated with the ability to provide capable leadership. In this situation, one current staff member noted:

> [The] use of power in our schools has come out of a monastic/convent-type model where the superior or principal of a school made the decisions and you followed those decisions. There may have been very little consultation with those who would be affected by that decision. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 294)

Another current staff member and former Brother observed he had worked with three groups of Brothers who were principals of schools, and how they responded to 'having the mantle of power put upon them':

> One were the out-and-out autocrats, maniacs, absolutely ruled by what they decided and everybody jumped; then there were the middle people who generally thought that participation by staff and involvement was good, and unfortunately a couple of those were actually crucified by other brothers and staff members and being looked upon as being weak. Lack of being autocratic meant that you were weak, … developed reputations within the Brothers' community as being poor principals, because they actually believed in some sort of sense of democracy and community and decision-making. … The other group: one particular [Brother of St Charles] … who was somebody put into power, a position of power and responsibility, didn't want it, was not suited for it, couldn't cope with it, and when there was any pressure, he simply left the school. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 268)

Another issue commented on particularly by current and former staff members was the perception that some Brother principals had difficulty in trusting, that 'they don't really feel comfortable with alternative points of view; they have an adversarial mentality'. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 135) Another staff member thought that Brother principals often ignored issues which were difficult and this was an aspect of their use of power:

How do we deal with things when things are beyond our control, so rather than deal with that, you just simply tightened the reins and you just went to more power and more power and more power, rather than, if this is an issue when people are raising objections or have a different angle on it, how am I going to deal with it, the answer was, let's blot out those responses and not enter into any relationship or dialogue or discussion, and just come up with a very black and white answer. (Tape 1, Side B, No. 55)

Added to these factors, as perceived by staff members, was the belief that Brothers had limited understanding of family matters and the family context of staffing so that, when it came to the good order of the school and an individual's family needs, the former won out most often. A woman staff member, speaking of one principal in particular, felt: 'In a sense we gave up our power to him to say that to us without challenging him. These days we would probably challenge him.' (Tape 1, Side B, No. 5)

One former Brother noted that, when a separation was made in the 1970s of leadership roles of Superior of the Brothers' community and principal of the school, a turning point was reached as far as the exercise of power by the Brothers was concerned. 'Once there was a division there, I think there'd be an improvement'. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 159)

Given all these thoughts, it is important to comment that the individuality exhibited by Brothers in teaching was obviously also shown in styles of leadership by principals. There were some who did have the charisma and the compassion to make major differences in the lives of staff and students, and former students named a number of such men. Equally, it was observed that styles had changed significantly over the last twenty years. One thought was that the experience of the Brothers in dealing with all the abuse issues which they had faced had caused an 'undermining of a certain arrogance in Brothers' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 122), with the result that Brothers had been forced to rethink where they stood and how they positioned themselves.

A challenge was issued to the Brothers by one current staff member that, as Brothers find it hard to replace current Brother principals with other Brothers, they do not try to 'tighten the reins' further rather than become more collaborative. He referred to the 'use of power in

appointments' which is currently with the Brothers in their schools, while processes are being examined for future governance of these schools. (Tape 1, Side B, No. 130) A former Brother referred to 'a whole different paradigm of power' in operation today as compared with earlier years. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 159) The concept of the '[Brothers of St Charles] Family' was also highlighted as a means of those who shared the vision of the Brothers being empowered positively to carry that vision into the future when the Brothers no longer had the personnel resources to do so.

One further issue raised in the women's group was some questioning of the position of the Brother in the Catholic Church as distinct from the Priest. Whereas the Priest is clearly part of the hierarchical Church, the Brother is in a different position, as male but not cleric. One woman religious Sister wondered whether Brothers as a result felt that they didn't have the status that Priests had, despite the fact that many Brothers were more educated than many Priests. (Tape 4, Side B, No. 121) If there were any feelings of lowered status, of having to prove themselves in some way, then the exertion of considerable effort to run good institutions would be an obvious way in which to proceed. A related but different issue, also from the women's group, was that of expectations on Brothers from lay people. Having established what were perceived as good schools, did Brothers become 'hostage to the expectations of the laity', by which they were expected to continue down similar paths rather than make significant changes? If such a thought were true, it would have tended to lock Brothers into a more hierarchical Church structure than was strictly the case.

F   Corporal Punishment

An account of the Focus Group discussions would not be complete without reference to corporal punishment which surfaced in most of the groups at some stage of the discussion. It is clearly true that for many Brothers use of corporal punishment was part of their way of controlling students, and meant to engender a healthy self discipline into their charges. For many students, this policy obviously worked, but for others a legacy of fear and negative feeling has resulted.

One current female staff member remembered her early days as a teacher at a Brothers of St Charles school:

'Get the cuts all the time'. [Boys] are very familiar with that terminology [from their fathers and uncles]. When I first started at [school], … the first thing Brother [X] said to me: 'We don't really like employing women at our school. We've had a few problems; we'll see how it goes. Do you have any experience of handling boys?' … He'd patrol my class to make sure everything was OK! … In their use of power to control the boys, they were very aggressive. I thought that that was the way they had to do it. … I never once sent a boy out to get the strap. … I never had to resort to that, yet the Brothers felt they had to. It's real sad; … you'll have thirteen year old boys saying to you that the one thing their fathers remember about [school] is their strap experience. … That disturbed me at times. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 175)

One former student noted that he was surprised to learn in Teachers' College that corporal punishment was common in other schools as well in the 1950s. While it was true that physical punishment of students was widespread, a former Brother gave something of the rationale for its use:

I heard one person speak about the 'Strap-happy [Brothers of St Charles]' down the road. I think we perhaps did have a reputation for that. I think we were brought up in the school that, you're not going to put it over me, son, right, whatever that meant. You're not going to put it over me. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 165)

Another current teacher referred to a Brother who taught him as 'putting the fear of God into people'. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 200)

There were numerous references to corporal punishment from the former students group, with fear a dominant theme in discussion. It was not just the punishment, often perceived as violent, but also the threat of punishment, with its associated emotional blackmail as a way of exercising power through fear. A former student recalled one Brother and wondered how he managed to remain a teacher for so long: '[we were] ruled by fear; kids scared to do, not to do, scared to ask a question, scared at the reaction.' (Tape 5, Side A,

No. 276) Another former student found that there was much favouritism of students from some Brothers and said:

> I think the hierarchical system was the most inappropriate thing about my education. I really think that almost everyone in every class I was in could point to a hierarchy of who was the most favoured, right through to who was the least favoured. It was that transparent, it was that obvious to everyone, and the top of the tree were the people who had older brothers who'd been successful, … who were Anglo-Saxon rather than Italian or Maltese, whose parents were active in the school Council or parents association, who'd given money, who'd raised money, or whose parents were DLP people rather than anything else. You know, it really was very obvious to me that there was a real hierarchy in people's minds, at least, the Brothers' minds, about who was dispensable and who wasn't. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 230)

Other former students wondered if the engendering of fear in students was 'an act' on the part of the Brother concerned. One mentioned that he had got to know a feared Brother well later on and found that he was quite a different person; he felt that the harshness was an act. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 130) Others were less sure about this, because, as they said, they had little opportunity (or desire in many cases) to get to know the Brothers concerned later because of their school experiences.

A telling comment from another former student about corporal punishment was:

> Other Brothers who dished out the strap didn't have a lot of power, as I say, but I think, fear, well, fear, I think you can equate with power, but it is not a real power over anyone, and it's a control but it's a very ineffective one. It has some of the desired effects, but the learning wasn't the same in those sort of classes as it was under – well, I never was taught by [Brother X], he was headmaster, but there were other Brothers like him, eg. Brother [Y] that I had in Form One who was a very good teacher; he was very young, but he was a very good teacher, very charismatic, very rarely resorted to the strap. So you could see the difference. In hindsight, you could see all these differences; you don't see it at the time. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 208)

The ineffectiveness of reliance on corporal punishment as an effective educational strategy shines through in all of these comments. Linking this section with the earlier one on relationships, I would repeat the comment that the relationship developed between students and Brother was the central most important aspect of the learning and growth of students. If the relationship was perceived as basically good, corporal punishment was seen in perspective and not taken to any extreme. When the Brother in particular had difficulties in relating to his students, then imbalances often occurred. As one former student summed up:

> Your memories for the great part are all good ones, aren't they. That's why the one or two individuals you're a bit fearful of, and who did abuse power, you can remember quite vividly. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 71)

G   Sexual Abuse

I conclude this section of Focus Group analysis with some comments which surfaced at times without being a major theme in discussions.

One former student commented that he knew from his experience of some students who had been sexually abused in one school. While such experience had not been his, he was very critical of the degree of physical punishment in the school he attended, although he made no connection between these two aspects. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 3, and post-group comment to researcher) Another student related that a lay teacher had been summarily dismissed in the 1960s when he had overstepped boundaries and invited a student to spend the weekend away with him. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 1) The others in the former students group did not have any direct knowledge of any sexual abuse of students, and in fact had been quite shocked to hear about such incidents in later years.

The impact of the sexual abuse revelations on the Brothers themselves was speculated upon by the former students. Two statements which followed on from each other in the group were:

> I was at [school's] ninetieth anniversary in ninety something and the Brothers were under terrible pressure at the time – there was sort of revelation after revelation in their treatment of boys in orphanages and what have you – that had nothing to do with [school], but I remember the Brothers

coming in to the room, the ballroom en masse, and they got a fantastic ovation, and it was a genuine, heartfelt one … that there is a lot of respect for a group of men who taught a hell of a range of kids, you know, across the spectrum really, and did it reasonably well. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 12)

And a lot of suffering. I think, I know I've spoken to some, when the revelations happened and the announcement to the staff, you know, what had happened that particular day or the day before or something, and I know just talking to our former principal, he like many others was suffering because of the actions and the sins of people in their Congregation. … I was on the [school] leadership team at [Brothers' Centre], … [Brother X] as the [Leader of the Region] flew across from Tasmania to speak to us, and we were some leaders in Catholic schools from Tasmania and Victoria, and living in for a couple of days and [Brother X] was disarmingly frank, one of his really excellent features, and he spoke to us about this and he posed the question not as a legal thing, and obviously a person who was reflecting and suffering, but he posed the question: what do we, Congregation, do with these people? … and it was, what would Jesus have done? … It obviously indicated a lot of reflection, a lot of pain, a thing you couldn't put under the carpet, and I suppose with their declining numbers, and all these things that have happened in the last fifteen years, all these stories, I'm more impressed than I was. (Tape 5, Side B, No. 20)

A current staff member, in reflecting on the same issues, felt that the Brothers had moved away from the exercise of using their moral authority because of their struggle in dealing with sexual abuse issues and fear of reverting to former styles of aggressive discipline:

There's a failure to understand the distinction between being authoritative and having moral authority … a terrible traumatising affect of the abuse things whereby the Brothers stepped away from exercising power at the highest levels, … a shying away from exercising a real moral power the Brothers could exercise, for fear of stepping back into that old mould. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 150)

Another current staff member and former student spoke about the importance of good psychosexual development for those who wanted to be teachers:

> Reflecting as a teacher, because as I said, I've always wanted to be a teacher and work with young people, it's really important to be comfortable with yourself, and if you're going to teach, you've got to know the boundaries of intimacy with people. Now some people naturally will reach out more than others, and there are do's and don't's. There's a whole lot of fear now about the reaching out, even patting kids on the back is a bit taboo, encouragement, but that's just the litigious society we're going through. But what I'm saying is, in my reflections as a teacher, I just wonder whether some of the people who displayed that sort of violence – I know it was a different culture and different era – hadn't developed that comfortableness with themselves, whether it was a psychosexual development which hadn't flowered, or had been stunted due to something, may have been going into the Brothers far too early for some of them; because I think through the whole distribution, the whole range of people, and some progressed and some didn't, and I just wonder, I mean, you sort of wonder, how happy must they have been? (Tape 5, Side A, No. 295)

A religious Sister in the women's group commented on the leadership which the Brothers had shown in the Church over their response to sexual abuse matters:

> Thinking of the Brothers, the remarkable thing is that sometimes people make a quantum leap. I think of the leadership of the Brothers in the event of all the allegations of sexual abuse and facts of sexual abuse, and from what I know from the side of it, thinking about the same things with our own institutions, the leadership of the Brothers in this Province and other Provinces I know of has been quite extraordinarily humble and creative and life-giving and using power in a most liberating, like, the best way you could think of using power. To me, that's quite amazing. … It's not the same way as the institutional hierarchy of the dioceses have done. I think particularly the [Brothers of St Charles], I don't know how that quantum leap happened, so I suppose extraordinary individuals, I'd say that this is a moment of grace, a moment of opportunity, we can do this or we can do that; we'll do

that. And I really find that very heartening and quite amazing. (Tape 4, Side

A, No. 200)

It is in the nature of quantum leaps that they are unpredictable and cannot be planned. It may be possible in the future to see, as this Sister indicates, that what has been the way of using power in the past, and which with all its excesses and ambiguities served many well, has moved into a new era and mode of operation which offers a challenge to the institutional Church in terms of inclusiveness and empowerment.

One postscript to the Focus Groups was for me to hear personally from one participant, a former student, that participation in the group was a helpful and healing experience in itself, and had enabled him to move on from some traumatic features of earlier years. This acknowledgement was a positive, and quite unplanned, outcome of conducting the Focus Groups.

CHAPTER 3:   EMERGING ISSUES

In this section, I will link the documentation of the Literature Review with my analysis of what emerged in the Focus Groups. While there is a variety of ways in which this might be done, I will use the headings of the Literature Review and look for connecting points between what has been presented in the Literature Review with material from the Focus Groups. Undoubtedly I bring my own personal history as a member of a Congregation of Religious Brothers to this task.   In terms of ethnomethodology, this is referred to as *indexicality* (Keel 1999), the fact that all human interpretive work is bound to the context in which it occurs.   In that light, I claim responsibility for my interpretation while acknowledging that it will be unique; of necessity, other persons will interpret facets of the study in different ways, and hence, while my contribution adds to the studies in the field of power in the Church and a specific Religious Congregation, it enables further considerations from other perspectives. Equally, I will not try to interpret everything mentioned in the Literature Review, but only those issues which seem to have specific relevance to what was said in the Focus Groups.

I note at the outset that the Focus Groups, while giving initial attention to how power is used in the broader Catholic Church, spent most of their time looking at the Brothers of St Charles, so that my comments will tend to be more about the Brothers as well, with reference to the wider Church as possible.

A   What is power?

i   Definitions of Power

What comes out of the Literature Review is that there are multiple definitions of power and the 'anything goes' interpretation of Davis (1988, p. 70) seems quite appropriate!

Foucault's (1980) attention to how power is exercised, his focus on power relations and discourses, his looking for productive networks and webs which demonstrate how power is being employed, his insistence on the necessary freedom of individuals in any power relations, are all worthy of consideration in the Focus Group context. It would seem that the motivation, as perceived by participants, of the Brothers of St Charles was to provide a Catholic education and to lift students from poverty to having some hope in life. In that context, the relevant discourse of exercise of power in a Brothers of St Charles institution appears to have been that parents entrusted their children to the Brothers and fellow-teachers in the belief that any methods used would be effective and acceptable in helping to reach the anticipated goals. Hence, by virtue of their position and status, the Brothers were allowed freedom to exercise influence on students. However, it was only in the interplay of relationship that power was seen. The mutuality of student cooperation and involvement was essential in creating the productive network which a Brothers of St Charles school wished to be. For many students, this seems to have happened, but for some, their sense of being constrained in action and thought precluded a clear sense of mutuality. Foucault's contention of the need for at least a certain form of liberty was present but perhaps with a modified freedom on the part of students, with strong encouragement to act in particular ways. There are a number of examples from the Focus Groups of Brothers who did have the skills and personality to engage in creative relationship development with students. Perhaps a person's later memories of school life may be determined largely by the relative numbers of teachers able to develop good relations with their students. In such interactions, productive networks enable a new generation to own the ethos and understanding of the dominant Catholic discourse.

A functionalist understanding of power (Angus & Rizvi 1986) sees power and authority as mutually exclusive. Whereas authority is the legitimate use of influence in an organisation, power is the illegitimate or unauthorised use of influence. However authority and power are seen, I note the comments of at least one former student that those Brothers who had most influence did not rely on the use of corporal punishment, and those who did use corporal punishment often generated fear but not a sense of having genuine power. Somehow, once again, it was in the ability to develop relationships with the students that real influence was seen, and the distinction between power and authority was seen by the grass-roots.

Bourdieu's (1991) emphasis on 'symbolic power' holds some significance here as well. Bourdieu would claim that power is seldom exercised as overt physical force (although in the case of the Brothers' schools this was a relevant feature often), but transmuted into a symbolic form whereby it was endowed with a kind of legitimacy it would otherwise not have. Comments from parents such as, 'The Brothers will straighten you out', to a potential student would undoubtedly have given such symbolic power to the Brothers. By virtue of who he was, irrespective of any action, a Brother had power.

Fay's (1987) emphasis on the 'power of the powerless' is interesting here as well. For those who may have seen interactions between Brothers and students as more those between the powerful and the powerless, Fay's theory holds some hope. He is interested particularly in how the 'power of the oppressed' may be used in the process of social transformation. I wonder in this context if the changes of recent years, largely brought about by the phenomenon of child sexual abuse and commented on during the Focus Groups, may have enabled those who then felt powerless to now find a voice, thus enabling a necessary and healthy social transformation to occur.

Gergen's (in Reed & Hughes 1992) postmodern understanding of power emphasises mutuality and cooperation in achieving the goals of an organisation. This understanding was strongly challenged in the Women's Group where almost all of the participants were members of WATAC (Women And The Australian Church). The women commented on the rhetoric of mutuality which was strong in official Church documentation but did not square with their day-to-day experience of being disenfranchised in terms of affecting decision-making in the Church, and of developing different models of interaction from the official hierarchical model. Interestingly, the Women's Group believed that Brothers had changed to a considerable degree in their style of relating to women, and had faced the need for change in this, as in other areas, to a significantly greater degree than the clerical members of the Church.

ii   Some Related Concepts and Aspects

Gender

Some of the issues referred to in this section will be reinforced in the following sections on Hegemony and Patriarchy. With regard to Gender, Archer and Lloyd (1982) highlight evidence of a power imbalance between women and men in society as seen in the behaviour of each. The Women's Focus Group would agree strongly with this perspective in terms of the way in which the official Church with its hierarchical structure operates. With regard to the Brothers of St Charles, women in particular noted the changes which had occurred in Brothers over the years as they learned to relate better to women. In earlier times, Brothers seemed to be less comfortable with women, not only from the way in which their formation had made them somewhat wary of women, but also in finding that women were less inclined or able to take on roles which Brothers as men expected them to take. Such roles as strong classroom disciplinarian and sports coach appeared to be seen by Brothers as more the domain of men, and if women were members of staff, they were tolerated or accepted to the extent that they could manage their classes well and were able to engage in sporting activities. In other words, women were valued to the degree that they could demonstrate masculine traits, rather than bringing different feminine modes of operation to the tasks of teaching and schooling.

In this same vein, one wonders whether the mindset of many Brothers was so caught up, albeit from strong and noble motives, with the development of effective schools as they perceived them to be that anything which they may have seen as militating against this focus was looked upon with suspicion or dismissal. The comments of a female staff member that the good order of the school came before the family needs of an individual teacher (in particular, it seemed, those of female teachers), suggest a lack of understanding of family matters and the family context of staffing on the part of a significant number of Brothers.

Fineman (1993) refers to the concept of 'mobilisation of bias' as a way in which males keep certain issues such as gender, sexuality and emotions off the organisational agenda. Such comments would be supported by the female staff member who believed that the staff gave certain Brother principals power to limit issues for discussion by not using their own

power as staff members and challenging them. The attention to good order, well organised and run schools, the appearance of effective establishments may have tended to push off the agenda those aspects which could have been interpreted as being side issues for those in leadership but which were central to the lives of staff with families. Women in particular seem to have been sensitive to these matters. This appears related to Willerscheidt's (1997) observation that, given the dominant hegemony where men have more legitimate power at their disposal than women, men may lack awareness of how their position and actions disadvantage women. Being so used to doing things, in schools formerly staffed totally by Brothers, in particular and well-established ways, Brothers often have not seen the potential discriminatory impact which their assumptions bring about for women.

Hegemony

For Catholic parents of students in former years, their acceptance of the hierarchical authority of the Church and the clearly-stated expectation that they send their children to Catholic schools reflected the established hegemony of the time. As regards schooling, it was the Sisters for girls and Brothers for boys who were the instruments to enable a new generation of Catholics to embrace the accepted values of the Catholic community. Angus (1986) refers to the curriculum content and evaluation procedures at one Brothers of St Charles school as being key elements in instilling the culture, which was accepted by students who saw their personal achievements in this system as their best way of moving ahead in life. While Angus is questioning what he perceives as the narrow selectiveness of elements within the system, he is also highlighting its effectiveness in improving the relative social position of students. Such thoughts are echoed well in the Focus Groups where the effectiveness of the Brothers' efforts in raising the status of their students is noted constantly, with the clear parental expectation that 'whatever is said or done by Brother' is accepted without question as most appropriate in terms of the outcomes desired and the culture inculcated.

A former student's comments, quoted in greater detail in the Focus Group Analysis, about his experience of a hierarchical system of favouritism at school reflects something of this hegemonic understanding of Catholic life and suggests a narrowness of approach on the part of at least some Brothers:

I think the hierarchical system was the most inappropriate thing about my education. I really think that almost everyone in every class I was in could point to a hierarchy of who was the most favoured, right through to who was the least favoured. It was that transparent, it was that obvious to everyone. (Tape 5, Side A, No. 230)

This quote is reminiscent of Connell (1995) who speaks of hegemonic masculinity. Favoured candidates are successful, are part of families which embody that success, are supportive of the school in practical ways and are 'politically correct' in the terms of the day for accepted 'Catholic' understanding. From the Focus Groups, it would appear that one key element in the implementation of such a masculinity is ability to engage successfully in sport. Not only is this seen as a character building exercise for the students, helping to turn boys into men, but it is strongly expected that teachers will be committed to the values of such a sporting program. If a teacher was anointed by the 'Sport God', then he (and sometimes, she) was held in high esteem in the established pattern of status.

There are contrasting views expressed by Sawicki (1991) and Tulley (1997) concerning the role played by force or violence in maintaining a dominant hegemony. The former feels that use of force is often an indication of a shallow and unstable power base, evidence of a lack of power; the latter notes that violence often accompanies the living out of hegemonic masculinity, to the cost of both victims and perpetrators of that violence. The multiple comments about the use of corporal punishment in Brothers of St Charles schools would tend to support both these views. Past students expressed the ideas both that excessive use of corporal punishment was often evidence of poor relationship and lack of authority of a teacher with students and hence manipulation rather than ready acceptance of the dominant hegemony, and also that the Brother involved often did not appear happy in his role, hence raising questions about the impact of such behaviour on himself as well as students.

Connell (1995) suggests that hegemonic masculinity is a historically mobile relation, and this seems to 'square' with the comments made by various parties in the Focus Groups that over the years Brothers' attitudes have changed. Closer association with women, growth in interpersonal skills, a broadening of the understanding of 'Catholic' brought about by the Second Vatican Council, and a less restrictive formation system have brought about

changes in the understandings of Brothers about themselves as men, teachers and religious. Hence, the models of masculinity which are portrayed by Brothers are more varied now than in former times. Over the years, it would seem that the dominant hegemonic masculinity – largely white, heterosexual, Connell would suggest – inculcated in Brothers' schools has changed, or at least been nuanced. Undoubtedly some of these changes reflect the wider challenging of all men by feminist and gay movements, but my impression would support Connell's assertion that hegemony continues to be 'on the move'.

Patriarchy

While the Literature Review expresses patriarchy in various ways, the common thread is that men set the standards and parameters around which life is valued and determined. Patriarchy is seen as a complex of ideologies and structures which sustain and perpetuate male control over females (Brown & Bohn 1989), a lens which keeps certain things out of focus, a defining of men as the standard for humanity and women as something slightly less than that (Horst 1996), an ordering of life in terms of hierarchical dualities in which the male pole claims greater merit and esteem (Kenway 1995), and a system of domination by men over women and other men whose expression of masculinity is other than the hegemonic form (Pryce 1998).

It was, once again, particularly the Women's Focus Group, but not exclusively, which had much to say about the Catholic Church around such matters. While one woman expressed her belief that the Catholic Church was more a mirror of society in general as far as how women were treated goes, there was strong agreement that the hierarchical nature of Church structures ensured a perpetuation of patriarchy. Reference to Sarah's Circle, as opposed to Jacob's Ladder, emphasised that women would prefer different ways of structuring how the Church operated to enable greater collaboration. The hierarchical structures seemed to these women to be ensuring that women were effectively disenfranchised with regard to genuine involvement in decision-making. Such feelings were also expressed by some Brothers and former Brothers, particularly in relation to school amalgamations and closures. Processes followed did not involve those who were seen to have a stake in the outcomes, but decisions were taken by clerical authorities acting more independently.

Discussion around the area of patriarchy and the entrenched structures of the Church generated much feeling, as seen in the Focus Groups. The rhetoric of invitation to women to contribute their expertise to the Church's life was not matched, in their experience, with any change in underlying understanding by men, particularly clerics. The feminist movement has meant that the boundary lines are no longer marked out as in earlier days, yet there is no clear message that the hierarchical Church has taken this reality to heart. The recent Australian Church document 'Woman and Man: One in Christ Jesus' (Macdonald et al. 1999) has resulted in the setting up of a committee to look at implementation of the recommendations of the document.   This committee offered some hope to women that their voices may be heard in new ways into the future, but there was a strong feeling that the personality of the incumbent Bishop in any diocese was going to play an important part in how any implementation would occur.

While I detected an underlying sense that women, and some of the men too, held no great hopes for change to occur quickly, there were clearly signs in the Focus Groups that, as Connell (1995) suggests, all is not well for patriarchy in the present world. The increasing awareness of men, brought about by the women's movement and also their own experience, has opened the eyes of some at least. As one former student, a married man, commented, in talking about his awareness of meeting religious women in particular: 'They felt very upset … that they weren't given a voice, … which I'd never thought about because I was a man.' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 260) The image which seems to be emerging more broadly for the Church is akin to King Canute trying to hold back the tide. It would appear to be a matter of time before the increasing pressure becomes a flood, but the King is working hard to find ways to keep plugging the gaps as best he can at present.

Authority

As with power, the concept of authority has various understandings. Angus and Rizvi (1986) cite the functionalist view that authority is the legitimate use of influence in a rationally defined formal organisation, with power seen as the illegitimate or unauthorised use of influence. In this sense, authority is geared more towards maintaining the *status quo*, whereas attempts to change the functional equilibrium would be regarded as an exercise of power. Understood this way, the Focus Groups had particular comments to make on authority as used by Brothers of St Charles. The emphasis on order and discipline

was strong, so much so that disorder was akin to sin! An ability to maintain the order and ensure a stability in functioning was seen as using authority to effect. Yet Angus (1986), in his study of a specific Brothers of St Charles College, questions whether this is more superficial and not a real use of authority, but rather more into arbitrary power. It is in the area of developing personal relationships between school administrators and staff that authority becomes *authoritative* rather than *authoritarian*. It was in this context that one staff member referred to various types of school principals: those who were authoritarian and made decisions unilaterally; those who were consultative and invited staff participation; those who were unsuited to the position or who did not want the authority given to them. The particular staff-member believed that certain Brother principals in the second category – those inviting participation through consultation processes – were 'crucified by other Brothers and staff members and … looked upon as being weak' (Tape 1, Side A, No. 270), the inference being that order and discipline were seen as more important than processes of involvement. In other words, any style of use of authority was acceptable as long as the result was efficiency and well-ordered structures. Such an understanding would have been readily accepted in former times by the Catholic community which entrusted its children to Sisters and Brothers.

There is an inherent tension here. The traditional understanding of Brothers of St Charles' use of authority was that parents accepted, and expected, that schools would be well run, that the Brothers were men of status, experience and learning, and that whatever happened in a school was seen as part of the overall process by which their sons would achieve the success which parents desired, particularly so that they would have opportunities which earlier generations had been denied. As such, the authority of the Brothers was strongly legitimised by parents, to the extent of children being further punished by parents if they had been punished by Brother at school! An effective hegemony was established.

In time, however, such an understanding came under question. As lay staff took on greater roles in schools, they expected that their involvement in direction-setting and decision-making would correspondingly increase. It seemed to depend strongly on the personality of the school principal as to whether this took place, with the particular Brother leaving himself open to great criticism if he was not able to maintain the strong discipline and order as understood to be central to effective running of schooling. So, those Brother principals

who were potentially the agents of change were also most likely to be 'crucified' by their own brethren if things were seen to get out of hand in traditional understandings. This left these men in a difficult position.

Based on Jones' (1993) concept of 'compassionate authority', it would seem that those Brother principals who stretched the traditional boundaries, at possible cost to themselves, were trying to bring more compassion into the structures so that the voices of a larger number were heard. Such processes seem to be at the heart of the gospel message of valuing all, particularly those who may be disenfranchised. At the same time, it is likely that those who were strong proponents of earlier systems would maintain that compassion was not lacking. As one former student said of his Parish Priest: he ruled 'the parish with a rod of iron, but at the same time, people saw him as a really benevolent leader!' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 90) This interplay between various interpretations of how authority is and was used reminds us that understandings will change in time as established hegemonies are brought into question and new models emerge.

Leadership

Krausz (1986) refers to leadership as the process by which power is implemented by someone who influences the actions of others. As such, leadership is a way of relating to others. She puts forward four basic styles of leadership: coercive, controlling, coaching and participative, and rates the participative as most effective in terms of both empowering of people and also using less energy to obtain high results. These comments are echoed repeatedly in the Focus Groups, particularly by former students, where there is constant reference to the ability, or otherwise, of Brothers to relate to students. Those Brothers who could relate well were seen to be able to generate enthusiasm and were highly respected and appreciated, perhaps even more so years later. It was the quality of relating which allowed the Brothers to be seen as leaders by their students. A Brother's inability to relate well resulted in students having limited respect. The former Brother who referred to the 'powerful influence' of the Brothers on the lives of young people was getting at this reality. So too was the former student who said: 'Whatever power is, I think it's power as influence, and influence which lasts over many years.' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 110) The woman who mentioned the 'passionate focus' of the Brothers in their influencing of young

people was equally on the same theme. If that sort of influence did occur as suggested, then Krausz would interpret the results as being an effective use of leadership.

In a similar fashion, Janda (1960) believes that the ability to motivate is at the heart of leadership, while Fay (1987) would focus more on the mutuality and consensual nature of leadership and followership. Both would be clear that the relationship developed between leader and follower is at the heart of the quality of leadership displayed. When followers have a willingness to follow as opposed to feeling coerced, then leadership is genuine. The word of advice from an older Brother to a younger one – 'at the end of the day, never leave any student feeling that you dislike them' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 167) – intuitively picks up the importance of relating styles in influencing students positively. While Focus Groups continually reinforced that there was an enormous range of styles of relating exhibited by the Brothers, it was those Brothers who had an impact in terms of encouragement, motivation and love of learning who had most influence. When Brothers were highly committed, skilled as teachers, and able to relate positively with students, the Brothers' own motivation to raise the standards of students bore fruit in their ability to similarly motivate students in learning and character development. When these qualities were lacking, the experience for students was more negative.

Blackmore (1998) comes from a feminist perspective but would say similar things. She would see a feminist reconstruction of leadership focusing on relational skills. Such comments suggest that, where good leadership was exercised by Brothers, the men involved may well have been intuitively more integrated in their personalities, rather than being more oriented to an overly dominating perspective.

Empowerment

'I was on a mission with others to raise up young people and set them on a course of some independence, and also to bring Australia to Christ.' (Tape 2, Side B, No. 82) Such an expression of his understanding of his role by a current Brother was mentioned by many of those in the Focus Groups. Whether it was referred to as 'empowerment for themselves, their family, and also future generations' (Tape 1, Side B, No. 10), 'lifting … kids up from poverty into having some hope in life' (Tape 4, Side A, No. 280), playing 'a unique role in terms of calling forth a response and mak[ing] a real faith statement' (Tape 5, Side B, No.

106), or 'taking a group of people who were an underclass and educating them to a position of power within the community' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 144), it was very clearly understood that an empowering of students both in the academic and faith elements of life was at the heart of the mission of the Brothers.

Fay (1987) refers to this empowerment of oppressed groups from the perspective of social transformation. While members of Focus Groups had no doubt that the Brothers had been very effective in helping to bring about a social transformation in Australian society with Catholics having a greater involvement and influence in the life of the community, it is interesting to note that not a small number of former students felt that they were part of the underclass themselves in relation to the Brothers who taught them. There was some ambiguity between their schooling experience and the ultimate empowerment which came in life beyond school. This was highlighted by the former student who compared his own sense of being regularly put down by the comments of his teachers, with the experience of his son years later where the approach was very different and strongly encouraging of students. Rather than being made into an 'underclass' as the older man had found, present-day students were treated more on an equal footing.

While the previous paragraphs refer more to empowerment of students, empowerment of the Brothers themselves was seen as significant. Sims et al (1993) relate empowerment to 'an extension of democratization in management, and the fading of the authoritarian leader' (p. 246). In the light of changes in approach by the Brothers over the years as mentioned regularly by Focus Group participants, it would seem that the authoritarian approach, much more a part of earlier styles, may be being replaced by a more participative style, thus enhancing the empowerment-potential of people in leadership.

Another aspect of empowerment which came to light in the current and former staff members Focus Group was related to men who had once been Brothers of St Charles and who had moved into positions of leadership in the Catholic education field after finishing as Brothers. One comment was made to the effect that the Brothers tended to choose such men for leadership roles in their schools before they considered others who had not been Brothers. (Tape 1, Side A, No. 92) While this interpretation is open to question, it does highlight the fact that men who have been through formation as Brothers are often seen to

have particularly desirable characteristics for leadership by the broader Catholic community, qualities enhanced through their earlier experience as religious. Such qualities would include some theological formation, an understanding of the Catholic community and its networks, a breadth of experience in teaching and taking on responsibility in different school situations, and a demonstrated altruism and good character.

Wilson's (2000) attention to the power associated with being part of a corporation highlights the significance of a man's being part of the Brotherhood of St Charles. He was empowered beyond his own individual skills as a result of being a member of a group which had status in the Catholic community. As a current Brother mentioned, putting on the Habit [religious attire] of the Brothers was an instrument of power in that the wearer was automatically empowered beyond his personal giftedness. Wilson's paying tribute to the sense of history, tradition and corporate values draws attention to the importance of the culture into which a Brother came and to which he contributed. The use of the word 'Brother' to a man by a member of the Catholic community conveyed much of this sense of corporate respectability, even though some current Brothers were questioning whether a change had occurred in this regard in more recent years, perhaps as a result of abuse matters which had come to light.

Networks

Fineman and Gabriel (1996) specify informal relationships in organisations as a potent force in resource allocation, and how people gain influence and power. The ways in which people form connections, support groups, mutual friendship bonds and shared interest liaisons help to establish these informal relationships which often have a significance for the participants beyond many of the more formal structures established. Such networks developed indicate the significance of the grass-roots in determining where power resides in organisations. Foucault's sense of power used in multiple ways is clearly relevant in this context.

In Focus Groups, some signs of such networks among Brothers came through in a number of comments. A current Brother spoke about supporting a fellow Brother against a non-member of the Congregation, even if he disliked the man in question, thus indicating his own sense that the Congregational bonds were to be treated seriously. There was reference

to 'the power of silence' where lack of communication on the part of some, particularly at a more formal meeting of community members, was used as a control mechanism. Such silence, whatever it may be saying about the relating styles of the individuals involved, may be seen as the networking of some men against the Brother designated as Superior, an attempt to restrict his power and maintain some broader influence on the functioning of the community. A further sense of networking included the efforts of Brothers to cultivate relationship with the bursar, the man who had the 'power over the money', perhaps for similar reasons as the last example, in that ability to use money, however limited, provided some independence for Brothers and not strict reliance on the Superior alone.

A practical indication that networks did exist came from the conduct of the Focus Groups themselves. Those who gathered for the Focus Groups invariably experienced a sense of camaraderie as they shared reflections. The extent of laughter at stories which rang true, the appreciation and depthing of comments, and even the disagreements all gave a strong impression that the people gathered shared some mutual bonding because of their life experiences. Such was certainly true of the current and former Brothers and the past students.

B   Abuse of Power

A first area of consideration in looking at how abuse of power may be related to Church and Brothers of St Charles systems is White's (in Gonsiorek 1995) analysis of 'open' and 'closed' systems, in which he applies family systems theory to organisational health. In applying his criteria for movement towards closure in a system, I will refer to comments made in the Focus Groups and my interpretations based on them.

The following, in italics, are a number of White's criteria for a system moving progressively towards closure over a number of years:

•   *Emergence of organizational dogma – a rigid and unchallengeable belief system:*
A significant number of Focus Group participants indicated a belief that the Catholic belief system was rigid and unchallengeable, especially in the structures which were resistant to change. While there is questioning of many aspects of that system today, there is no doubt

that in earlier times there was a clearly articulated body of dogma which had to be accepted by one professing the Catholic faith. The same could be said of the Brothers of St Charles where the Brothers' Rule spelt out in detail how Brothers were expected to live.

- *Centralisation of power and preference for charismatic styles of leadership:*

The hierarchical structuring of the Catholic Church and the power offered to those in higher positions – Pope, Bishops, Parish Priests – gave each a degree of autonomy in his own domain and, it appears, a limited degree of accountability for their actions. For the Brothers of St Charles, men who were Superiors (leaders of communities of Brothers) also had relative autonomy and, while some were very pastoral and forward-looking, others were renowned as idiosyncratic and unbending.

- *Progressive isolation of the organisation and its members from the outside professional and social world:*

For the Brothers, there were men who made outstanding contributions to their professional fields, but many were involved in communities and schools where, apart from the students, their fellow Brothers were almost their sole companions in life. There were prohibitions against associating with 'externs' (non-Brothers), particularly women. As time necessitated the employment of lay staff in schools, some of this isolation began to break down, to the extent that today it is much less a systemic issue.

- *Homogenisation of the workforce by age, race, sex, religion, or values via a tendency to isolate and expel that which is different:*

While there are clear references to the male clerical Catholic Church in this criterion, the Brothers of St Charles equally could be said to have adopted this homogenisation, as did all religious congregations. Clothing, title and expected ways of acting all contributed in this direction. The practice of 'Scrutiny' referred to by a current Brother in the Focus Groups was an institutional structure for ensuring that those who did not measure up to what was expected would be asked to leave. In a similar fashion, the tendency of former times to treat those who had left the congregation by virtually excising their memory and contribution might be seen in this light too.

- *Excessive demands for time and emotional energy of workers:*

One of the women's group commented on how young Brothers were 'ground into ill-health' (Tape 4, Side B, No. 86) because of the extra responsibilities they were forced to take on, as well as part-time studies. 'You saw them dropping under the physical strain of

coping with so many jobs.' A Brother's whole day was centred around his community and professional tasks.

• *Development of a work-dominated social network by organisational members:*
A Brother's social network was largely his fellow Brothers in community and, as opportunity presented, gatherings with other Brothers in his area. While it may be argued whether this was 'work-dominated', the fact that most socialisation occurred with people of the same sex who were engaged in the same occupation and vocation questions whether such interaction was a broadening aspect of the system.

• *Intense focusing on the personal and interpersonal problems of staff:*
While this feature was not commented on specifically in the Focus Groups, it is logical to say that, in the absence of wider social outlets, the personal and interpersonal issues of the members of the Brothers' community would have taken on a greater weighting in the emotional lives of Brothers than would have been their due in a less exclusive setting.

• *Disruption of team functioning from problems arising in worker-worker social and sexual relationships:*
It is reasonable to assume that where there were interpersonal problems between members of a community, these would have impacted on the effectiveness of the school staff. The usual solution was that one Brother was moved if there was an ongoing difficulty. The issue of sexual relationships among fellow Brothers was not a topic which surfaced in any of the Focus Groups, despite wide scope being offered re comment on the impact of sexuality in all-male communities.

Many of the comments above in relation to Brothers of St Charles could equally have been applied to priests, regarding their training and the expectations placed upon them by their Superiors and the general Catholic community. The indications are clearly present to draw the conclusion that there was a significant closure in the Brothers' system. If an individual Brother was caught up in many of the above aspects of the system and had limited personal resources to determine where his own needs might dictate some bending of the rules at times, there was the potential for him to feel a degree of exploitation. As one former Brother commented: 'So many people came out of that system with a whole unfocussed aggression that had to work itself out in some ways in subsequent years.' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 265) This comment picks up on Jenkins' (1996) 'Group-Think' where he believes that, as people in a group are pressurised to conform to group attitudes and take on the

characteristics associated with strong group identification, they initially do not recognise the impact on themselves, but over time, feelings of anger or frustration intuitively tell them about the lack of health of the organisation.

In more recent years, the encouragement of Brothers to seek friendships outside the community and with women as well as men has had a marked impact on both the psychological health of Brothers and also the organisational opening up of what had been a much more closed system. It is clearly to the credit of individual Brothers that they were able to negotiate some 'opening up' of that closed system and, while accepting the values which were foundational, were able to find ways of seeking personal health and integration. Such men became mentors to the younger members of the Congregation, so that there was often a practical level of scepticism among the grass-roots which enabled a degree of positive growth for Brothers who had the ability to take advantage of their circumstances. Equally, the activities of enlightened Superiors enabled a more open experience for the Brothers in their communities.

White (in Gonsiorek 1995) observes that there is a higher incidence of sexual harassment and sexual exploitation in closed systems than in open systems. Whether this relates to the fact that a certain number of Brothers have been charged with sexual offences against students in their care is open to further investigation. On the surface, it would appear fair to say that, with few outlets for social life and relaxation outside the community, some Brothers who struggled to cope with their circumstances and personal development may have looked to inappropriate ways of meeting their needs. Given that sexual abusers come from a wide variety of backgrounds, further study would need to be done in this area before clearer conclusions could be drawn. It suffices to say that White's theory and the comments of Focus Group participants do point to some closure in Catholic Church culture and the Brothers of St Charles system more particularly.

Poling (1991) indicates that the awareness of abuse by men is often lacking because their frame of reference does not encompass that possibility. In this regard, patriarchy and hegemony are generalised aspects of such a lack of awareness, where the established pattern of action is so ingrained for men as for them to be blind to the fact that their actions may be abusive in some way. Poling believes that those who are vulnerable must be given

authority to testify about their perceptions of abuse of power. It is interesting in this light to hear the comments of the former students, some of whom were taking the opportunity of the Focus Group forum to articulate the degree of vulnerability which they felt as students, along with what they perceived as positive aspects of their schooling. Fear was a dominant theme in the discussions. Given the publicity surrounding child sexual abuse in the last decade, more of those who have suffered abuse have progressively taken the chance to speak about their experiences. The Focus Group was itself an effective forum for giving the vulnerable a voice, and reinforces for me the importance of creating possibilities for former students to be empowered even now to speak in a way which may be helpful to themselves.

Gonsiorek (1995, p. 87) makes the comment: 'when the cloak of power is worn unconsciously, it is dangerous for the client.' This is another way of expressing the same idea as Poling above. But it does highlight the need for learning and conscious understanding of behaviour and how it impinges on others. It was observed in various Focus Groups that styles had changed significantly over the last twenty years, and that the experience of the Brothers in dealing with the abuse issues which they have faced had caused an 'undermining of a certain arrogance in Brothers.' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 122) This might be interpreted as saying that the Brothers have been opened up to be more understanding of these matters now, are more realistic in analysing behaviour, encouraging of healthy ongoing formation for their members, and more accepting of professional codes of ethics and standards than was the case previously. Such a movement would be in line with Rutter's (1989) insistence on the need for professional ethical codes which can be monitored by people outside the relevant profession. The emphasis on empowerment of Brothers through further training and personal development would also address some of Hopkins' (1994) concerns that abuse often occurs when offenders do not feel powerful, and it is an attempt to regain some sense of personal power that causes an offender to act out. Such thoughts are borne out in the comments of former students who observed that Brothers who over-exercised corporal punishment often seemed to be unhappy or were struggling personally in some way. The same understanding could well apply to cases of sexual abuse.

I conclude this section with the comment that, while there is much material in relation to sexual abuse as abuse of power in the literature, there was much less discussion of this issue in the Focus Groups. Despite the issue being raised with each group, the matter of corporal punishment featured much more prominently. Part of the explanation may be that the personal knowledge of most of those involved was limited with regard to sexual abuse in schools; it may also mean that people are still sorting out for themselves how they incorporate an understanding of sexual abuse into their schooling experience with Brothers, and are reluctant to make too many pronouncements at this stage.

C   Issues of Power in Relation to Church Structures

This section of the Literature Review has many different aspects for consideration. I will highlight those aspects of the Literature Review which have been referred to in the Focus Groups and use sub-headings to separate different issues.

The Pace of Change

Rossetti (1996), Beal (1995) and Collins (1986) all comment on the fact that the Second Vatican Council moved the Catholic Church strongly in the position of greater involvement of lay people in decision-making. Yet they noted that the pace of change from a much more clerical-dominated system has been very slow. Reasons adduced for this slowness include the human tendency to resist change and further investigation of some of the theological issues underpinning the nature of sacred power in the Church. At the same time, disenchantment with the institutional Church as a result of sexual abuse, and the practical reality of declining numbers of priests are increasing the push for change. Such dynamics are seen in the Focus Groups as well, with various comments reflecting the traditional hierarchical structures being challenged by lay people who see that they are entitled to and capable of greater involvement in Church life. The ideas of a current teacher, talking about his parish in which he noted the democratic structures encouraged by the Parish Priest and his parish's uniqueness in this regard, seem to highlight these tensions. On the specific issue of school closures and amalgamations, staff members referred negatively to processes whereby decisions appeared to be made in isolation by clerics or religious congregations. It would seem to me that the pace of change will increase only

when the fact of declining numbers of clerics means that change cannot be avoided any further, along with the increasing call for greater accountability from those in positions of authority than has previously been required. (Rossetti 1996, p. 119)

Women

What was said above about pace of change relates particularly to what women may be seeking in the Church. While noting the impact of loss of leadership through men who have left the clerical priesthood, Collins (1986) also observes that there are many women at least as well, if not better, educated than many designated male clerical leaders in the Church. With increasing numbers of younger women in particular taking equality with men in all fields as a given, there will be increasing pressure as noted above for the status quo to be overturned. As a religious Sister commented in the Women's Focus Group, there is a male advantage in society which is exacerbated in the Catholic Church. The desires of women in the Focus Groups would be for more inclusive structures and collaboration in all aspects of Church life, including making decisions, and not just seeing women's role as consultative and providing much of the practical work-force, often voluntarily. The recent 'Woman and Man – One in Christ Jesus: Report on the Participation of Women in the Catholic Church in Australia' (Macdonald et al. 1999) noted that the chief barrier as experienced by women concerned patriarchal attitudes and traditions deeply ingrained in the system. Rather than being broken down as a result of Vatican II, the clerical Church seems to have moved to reinforce these aspects. Most of the women's group were WATAC (Women And The Australian Church) members who experienced such attitudes on the part of some clergy, particularly Parish Priests, as oppressive. It seems that the tensions will have to play themselves out further until change is inevitable.

Formation

Sipe (1994) is critical of the personal and religious formation received in earlier times (and perhaps being reinforced today by way of reaction to the pressures of groups calling for change) by clergy. He is stinging in his comments that those favoured by such formation developed qualities which in effect kept them in an adolescent psychological state. These characteristics helped develop a 'closed system' as outlined previously by White, an 'insulated priestly sub-culture' as expressed by Collins. (1986, p. 192) While noting that many Brothers did develop personally and had good relationships with students and staff

members, the Focus Group members did mention a number of matters relating to the Brothers of St Charles in this area of closed systems which have been commented on in a previous section. As many Brothers began their formation at a young age and were in all-male environments, the adolescent stage of growth at which they entered was in danger of being locked in place by the institutionalisation of their living. Given limited education in sexuality and integration for celibate living as well, their home experience of family life was seen as crucial to being able to negotiate adolescent developmental tasks. Growth into mature adulthood was something which many achieved at a later stage of life than their age counterparts, and for some, as Sipe noted, the process may never have occurred. The former Brother who referred to those who could not take responsibility for their own actions but needed to rely on the authority of the community Superior would suggest that there was a degree of adolescence ingrained in some Brothers as a result of their formation and earlier life experiences. Another former Brother attempted to place these ideas into context when he believed that the prime focus was on maintaining an expanding system of schools in earlier years, and it was not till later that a much greater emphasis has been placed on the ongoing personal development of the Brothers themselves. Such a comment fits well with Schneiders' (2001) belief that formation was linked strongly to the school model of formal education, with the style of formation coming out of the school system and intending to produce teachers capable of perpetuating that system. She notes the changes which have occurred in formation since the Second Vatican Council, as reflected in the comment of the former Brother above.

Religious Authority

While much of what has been said may appear to be critical of the use of power in the Church, it is important not to lose balance and a wider perspective. Willerscheidt et al (1997) indicate the importance of ministers recognising and intentionally using the power which they have, moving towards rather than away from that power. Only by owning their power will ministers realise the impact they have on others. Such statements appear crucial to me for both clergy and religious to be effective leaders into the future in the Church. The Whiteheads (1991) refer to this as befriending leaders' symbolic role and learning to draw on its power in ways that serve and strengthen the community of faith. Religious authority, they say, succeeds by nurturing spiritual growth. That many Brothers did embrace their power for the benefit of their students and society is attested to by former

students: 'my recollection would still be that I would have a huge respect, but it was a lot deeper than just a respect for a teacher, it was a real part of the building of faith.' (Tape 5, Side B, No. 110) Such a comment would echo the motivation of the Brothers and their desire to make a difference. Endowed with the charism [unique gift given to their founder by God], Brothers worked to empower students and develop their Catholic faith. As one current Brother exclaimed: 'The exercise of power wasn't for personal aggrandisement. … Brothers continued to exercise power because they had this higher motive; popularity never entered my particular mindset in all of that.' (Tape 2, Side B, No. 82)

Developments in recent years in terms of the authority taken by the Brothers of St Charles are seen differently by some of the Focus Group participants. One current female teacher observed that, in the aftermath of the sexual abuse revelations involving some of their members, the Brothers have 'shy[ed] away from exercising a real moral power the Brothers could exercise, for fear of stepping back into that old mould' (Tape 1, Side A, No. 150), by which she meant an overly authoritarian approach rather than taking their moral authority. It is reasonable to accept that Brothers have often felt more hesitant than before due to a variety of perceived influences on them to which they had previously given less weight. At the same time, a former Brother noted that the Brothers had chosen to follow a more open, what he called 'prophetic' approach, than he saw in the wider hierarchical Church:

> The Brothers have taken a somewhat more open approach. … That whole sense of the prophetic which religious are supposed to bring to the Church, not a sense of the institutional, has come alive again; whether it's come alive when it's too late, I'm not sure, but the notion of being prophetic and bringing some sort of prophetic sense to what's happening is just so badly needed in the Church at the moment. (Tape 3, Side B, No. 140)

There would appear here to be a good example of an organisation trying to adapt to a variety of influences: among others, its historical mission expressed in a contemporary mode, the signs of the times in terms of emerging social and Church realities, its response to the revelations of its failures, and its desire to express what religious life is meant to be in the world of the twenty first century.

Celibacy

The impression is given in the Literature Review that mandatory celibacy needs to be seen in terms of the system which it has helped to create in the Church. Celibacy is seen by Sipe (1995), Burkett and Bruni (1993) and Collins (1991) in this light. The concern is that celibacy in itself is less the issue than the perpetuation of a male, clerical, hierarchical structure which is resistant to change and to allowing other models of leadership to be incorporated into Catholic Church life. It is a structure which is seen to be privileging those within to the exclusion of those not ordained. One current Brother referred to examples of operation of such a system as the 'all-priests' enclave' (Tape 2, Side A, No. 74) which reserved power and decision-making to itself. Sipe (1990) recognises that celibacy is a sign of commitment to God but questions from his studies whether more than a small percentage of priests and religious really come to holistic personal integration in celibate living and loving.

There is a need to distinguish here the mandatory celibacy required of those who are ordained as priests from the freely chosen celibacy of those who become religious. In the former case, one wonders whether those who feel called to priesthood take on the obligation of celibacy and see it as an essential element of their priesthood. Sipe's research would suggest otherwise. There would appear to be quite a range of styles of living celibacy from holistic commitment through to effective disregard of celibacy in practice. While there are opinions that clerical celibacy is not central to priesthood, at present it is an essential element of the discipline of the priestly vocation.

In the case of religious, there is a different reality involved. Schneiders (2000) insists that a life-long commitment to consecrated celibacy is not an extra element but at the very heart of living religious life. This is not the same as priesthood. One who commits him/herself to religious life knows that living the vow of celibacy is the deepest expression of their life as consecrated to God. There is an inherent difference here, so that, while one might contemplate a future with married clergy, it would be impossible to imagine married religious without changing the essence of religious life.

This is not to say that in practice there will be a great deal of difference in both the formation required for celibate living and the living of a celibate lifestyle. Religious do

have the support of a community, a support which is usually lacking for priests. As one Brother commented, his experience of community, while at times including tensions, was largely a relating to 'pretty sensible and pretty mature' men. (Tape 2, Side A, No. 246) The expression *The Monks*, as used by another Brother, was a common phrase to indicate a sense of bonding, which for many men was something that was highly valued, even for those who had left the Brothers. Such a feeling was clearly evident in the discussions of the Focus Group of former Brothers. As one observed, the bonding was strong when people had shared an intense experience. Another Brother's experience of men in community as often being 'terribly hurt' makes one wonder about these men's ability to integrate their living of celibacy into a holistic and happy lifestyle. The wariness many Brothers had in relating to women seems to have been replaced more now with a greater openness to them. Women themselves readily noticed the difference which has occurred in many men.

For men whose formation in sexuality and celibacy was limited, the former Brother who quoted Keats *Easter 1916* poem – 'Too long a sacrifice can make a stone of the heart' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 9) – touched into the area of dealing with emotions. With such a strong emphasis on physical activity – 'just play handball and keep busy!' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 319) – it was possible that Brothers could devote themselves fully to their teaching and community life with all its many facets. However, in time, without some personal integration of these different elements into a healthy and happy personality, eventually a Brother had to face the question as to whether he was living his true vocation. Many did leave at that stage, yet others clearly did take the steps necessary for integration in their lives.

There is no specific evidence in the literature, and it was not referred to particularly in the Focus Groups, to suggest that celibacy in itself was a reason to explain sexual abuse of children by priests and religious. That would be a simplistic and probably inaccurate understanding of the dynamics in play when abuse occurred.

The Burden of Religious Leadership

It is important to recognise, as the Whiteheads (1991) do when referring to religious authority, that many people project expectations and even their own vulnerabilities onto those in religious leadership, and are reticent about taking responsibility for themselves in

faith matters. 'We want them [religious leaders] to be – we *need* them to be – larger than life.' (Whitehead & Whitehead 1991, p. 28) These attitudes place a heavy burden on those charged with such leadership. When considering the Brothers of St Charles or any Church leadership in fact, it would take a clear degree of maturity not to take responsibility for every issue which emerged. Given the strong expectations of the Catholic community in terms of schooling by religious congregations and the high standing in which religious were held, this situation was a very real one for attention, not just by those in leadership but by religious in general. Priests and religious were definitely placed on a pedestal in terms of status in the Catholic community. The encouragement, in the words of St Paul, to be 'all things to all people' was a stronger than subtle message reinforcing a potentially dangerous situation. Given the commitment and passion of most Brothers for their mission, it is understandable that this tension would be felt by Brothers. The woman staff-member who commented on the pressures felt by young Brothers to be effective in school and to take on multiple roles, at times to their physical detriment, was touching into this issue. The delicate balance between accepting the status of the Catholic community and using one's power to good effect, and taking on more than could reasonably be carried was a continual dilemma for many religious. On one hand, it showed a nobility of character and generosity in service; on the other, there was the clear danger of burnout.

Pellauer (1987) relates burnout in ministry to the inability to set appropriate boundaries, with workaholism as the 'single most widespread social disease among the ordained.' (Pellauer 1987, p. 49) Such a concept again brings into focus the difficulties which religious face – the need to work hard to achieve their mission, the ability to live the highest of moral standards, the challenge to set realistic limits for personal health and well-being. In this situation, some Brothers became very well-adjusted human beings while others struggled greatly to cope, with most somewhere in the middle of this continuum. One former Brother, noting these realities, commented: 'With hindsight, what would we do again? I think people would have invested a lot more in developing the leadership of the Brothers, but developing the Brothers wasn't what it was about. It was running the system. That's the shift that occurred … which has really been significant in how the Brothers currently exercise power.' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 200)

Coming mainly as a response to the sexual abuse scandals of recent years, the document *Integrity in Ministry* (National Committee for Professional Standards 1999) sets out the rationale and practical guidelines for religious and priests to live their ministry in a healthy way. It helps them to address the issues raised above and to set the boundaries which need to be in place for effective ministry and religious living. One of the religious Sisters commented on the leadership of the Brothers of St Charles in responding to sexual abuse matters, and compared this response favourably in comparison with what she had seen from the clerical Church and its hierarchy. The traumas associated with facing the demons of this issue have helped the Brothers to look more widely at ways in which their members can be assisted to be well educated in areas of personal development and relationships. The guidelines promulgated in 'Integrity in Ministry' also go some distance to ensuring greater accountability of priests and religious into the future, one of the elements which various Focus Group members felt was clearly missing in former times in their experience of Church life.

The Brothers' System / Instruments of Power

I finish this amalgamation of Literature Review and Focus Group material with some attention to the section in the Focus Group analysis which I have called 'The Brothers' System'. While a number of issues in this section have already been referred to, I hope that some further comments will help to give broader perspective to what has gone before.

There was no doubt in the minds of the Focus Group members in the different discussions that there was a strong socialisation of men into a group highly committed to taking further the mission of the Brothers of St Charles as articulated initially by their founder and in later interpretations by the Brothers' Congregational Forums. Reference to the 'all-male, monk enclave' and 'The Monks' gave the impression of a bonded group, not all of whom necessarily got on equally well with all others but who were linked with a 'passionate focus' to the type of life they professed and the ministry of education. These comments link closely with the interpretation of the contribution provided by the Brothers in one of their schools as provided by Angus (1986). Community life was structured with a Superior having considerable power and status as the ultimate authority in decision-making for the members. There appeared to be quite a variety of interpretations of the role of Superior; whereas some followed thinking 'strictly by the book' in a narrow approach, others were

more liberal in their implementation of the statutes of the Brothers' Rule. Whatever the interpretation, the Rule itself was seen as dominant. 'In the Brothers, [I was] ruled by fear, ruled by the Rule and the fear of not keeping the Rule and what consequences might follow from that,' said one former Brother. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 82)

Alongside the Superior were those Brothers of the community who had taken their Final [perpetual] Vows, committing themselves for life to this way of living. The process of 'Scrutiny' was referred to in the current Brothers' Focus Group as a way of determining the suitability of younger Brothers to be admitted to another year of life as a Brother, and subsequently to life-long commitment. The power of older men over younger ones in this regard, while meant to be pastoral and supportive which it undoubtedly was in most cases, drew forth one example which was seen as distinctly unjust. A certain fear could be engendered in younger men which might have reinforced tendencies for them to be seen as hard-working and exemplary in their efforts. One of the women staff-members observed this fear in her assessment that younger men were concerned that any reporting of themselves for some inadequacy could result in their being posted to communities in far-flung areas! The tensions associated with such living have already been commented on above. Added to this was the sense that those who left the Congregation had somehow let the side down, they moved away quietly and their contributions tended not to be spoken about. A poignant example of reconciliation with one such former Brother was recounted in the current Brothers Group.

Again these Focus Group comments are reminiscent of Angus' reflections on how men were socialised into the Brothers of St Charles. After devout Catholic upbringing in the home, shaping in a Brothers' school and casting in the Brothers' training institutions, a Brother's 'life-world' was 'then sustained in communities by rigorous obedience to the Rules and Constitution of the Order, and also … by a shared sense of purpose and community.' (Angus 1986, p. 77) Angus also observed: 'The sense of purpose that was afforded by such a mission helped to create stability and harmony amongst the religious.' (p. 77)

Mention has been made previously of the Habit of the Brothers as a visible sign of their status in the Catholic community and hence automatic gaining of deference and respect.

Such status is highlighted in the Literature Review as potentially locking Brothers into the male hierarchical structure of the Church, putting them on a pedestal which effectively placed them in a different realm from ordinary people. One sign of change has been the discarding of the Habit so that Brothers are attired more like the general population, and a sense that there has been a change in the use of the title 'Brother'. One former student expressed some misgivings about the changes, but acknowledged that they were necessary for these times. A current Brother reflected on the change as he observed it in how the word 'Brother' was used nowadays. Whereas previously it has been a sign of respect, he wondered whether people were more inclined to use the word 'Brother' as title when they wanted to marginalise a Brother, in effect telling him that he was different, or that they had difficulty in relating to him. At the same time, it was recognised that the word 'Brother' in itself captures the best of what any member of the Congregation would want to say about his way of relating to others.

Given the many Focus Group comments on corporal punishment, it is important to return to it at this stage. The dominant sense of fear on the part of many students came through in the comments of former students and staff members. '[We were] ruled by fear; kids scared to do, not to do, scared to ask a question, scared at the reaction,' (Tape 5, Side A, No. 280) was a comment from one former student about a Brother who never seemed to be at home in a teaching role. Clearly it depended on how well a Brother related to his students as to whether corporal punishment was seen as abusive or not. Carroll (1976) commented: 'I was aware that the Brothers were motivated by a desire to serve God by teaching pupils and if that involved physical punishment then it was usually given without malice.' The use of corporal punishment, not restricted to Brothers' schools, appears part of the established hegemony of practice in education of earlier times. Even the 'emotional blackmail' associated with the possibility of corporal punishment was fear-inducing. It was not until the 1970s and 1980s that changes began to be seen in this regard. Along with the corporal punishment was the view expressed by a former student that a constant theme in his schooling was that he was told that he (and others) would not amount to anything much in life. He speculated as to whether this was meant to be a motivating factor, but noted with appreciation the change in approach which he saw in the education of his son at a Brothers' school some thirty years later, when, instead of barriers, he saw great encouragement to achieve lofty ambitions. At the end of these reflections, I recognize that a number of

Brothers and former Brothers, while noting that they were acting according to accepted standards for the Brothers at the time, regret the extent to which corporal punishment was used: 'I heard one person speak about the strap-happy [Brothers of St Charles] down the road. I think we perhaps did have a reputation for that.' (Tape 3, Side B, No. 165) Opportunities for those who still feel hurt by their experience to speak about it are important in this regard if such a practice would be helpful for former students.

A former Brother noted the changes which have occurred and mused about 'creat[ing] some understandings of what the process is by which a culture which is highly power-oriented starts to unravel and sort of refound itself and get back in contact with the core values that give what it does substance.' (Tape 3, Side A, No. 55) A former student, in talking about the impact of child abuse on the Brothers commented: 'It obviously indicated a lot of reflection, a lot of pain, a thing you couldn't put under the carpet, and I suppose with their declining numbers, and all these things that have happened in the last fifteen years, all these stories, I'm more impressed than I was.' (Tape 5, Side B, No. 25) Finally, a religious Sister, in commenting on how many were able to go beyond an institutional socialisation, said: 'I don't know how that quantum leap happened, so I suppose extraordinary individuals, I'd say that this is a moment of grace, a moment of opportunity, we can do this or we can do that; we'll do that. And I really find that very heartening and quite amazing.' (Tape 4, Side A, No. 202)

CHAPTER 4:   LEARNINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having carried out the Literature Review, run the Focus Groups, analysed the content of the Focus Groups and related the issues to the Literature Review, and thought about the ramifications of all of these matters, I realise again that my background as a member of the Brothers of St Charles does bring a particular subjectivity to the process. At the same time, the advantage is that I have lived through the last thirty-five years of the life of the Congregation and can weigh up the different viewpoints with my own understandings. While that does not guarantee objectivity to any degree, it does provide some authenticity as being an 'on-the-ground' exercise. As I stated at the beginning of the last Chapter, the opportunity is there for others from different backgrounds to interpret the issues from their standpoints. Further research would complement and take further the reflections coming from this study.

In this final Chapter, I do not wish to present once again all the material which has been the subject of earlier Chapters. My aim is simply to express my own convictions coming from the study and to highlight the key issues which seem to me to be emerging. Undoubtedly my listing will not be exhaustive, but will nevertheless provide sufficient focus to what I see coming from the study and enable other discussion and exploration to occur into the future. I will also make some recommendations which I see as appropriate in the light of this study.

Relationships

At the centre of what has come through is the ability to engage in relationships. With all the qualifying adjectives which can be added to the word 'relationship' – enriching, enabling, equal, empowering, skewed, abusive, dysfunctional, overbearing, loving, broken, committed are just a smattering of the multitude of such adjectives – the range of types of relationships is almost infinite. Nobody would doubt that seeking richness in relationship

is a dominant life search for us all. That does not mean that all our relationships are smooth, satisfying and easy-going. Working at developing relationships seems to require both the will and particular skills. These skills are learned initially in the interactions of family and are honed through the experiences of life. Our personalities give us certain attributes which dispose us to relate well with others as well as providing various areas which could, without attention and allowance for personal growth, militate against our maturing in relationships with others.

Given the breadth of relationships we develop, it is impossible to simplify theories of how people in relationship impact on each other. Whether it is as friends, as teacher and student, as buyer and seller, as life partners, as fellow club-members, as church community or religious congregation members, as casual acquaintances, as chance interactors in the multitude of daily activities, the way people influence each other varies enormously from virtually nothing to major impact on life. To the extent that there is influence, there is power being exercised. Sometimes both parties are aware of the power dynamics, at other times it is a much more subtle affair with one or both parties unaware of how they are affecting each other; and, in between, there is a continuum of possibilities of both influence and awareness.

I would be more in agreement with Foucault's assessment of power in that it is free-flowing, interactive in relationships, dynamic rather than static, never defined once-and-for-all. Theories such as the functionalist theory which distinguish between authority and power seem to me to be making artificial distinctions in an area where the complexities of life and personal interaction do not favour such simplification. To suggest that there is a difference between authority and power on the basis of what is or is not 'legitimate' influence does not sit easily with the ebb-and-flow of relationship, irrespective of the nature of the relationship. What might be interpreted as 'legitimate' one moment may be thought otherwise the next. Foucault's theory also allows for a positive understanding of power, an important aspect to which I will return later in this Chapter, and highlights the significant role of all players in relationships.

Since this study focuses on the nature of power relationships in the Catholic Church and particularly in the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles, it is important to be aware that

the strong sense of the study is that it is men in 'official' positions in the Church who have the power and they are often reluctant to seek new models of interaction with other members of the Church community. In many cases, the officials are priests, clerics who are part of the hierarchical structure of the Church which invests authority and decision-making in those who have received ordination in its various fullnesses. As a result, the Pope would have ultimate authority, with Bishops having a large degree of autonomy in their Dioceses and Parish Priests occupying similar positions in their parishes. In this hierarchical model of Church, power would be seen as clerical members having authority to influence the rest of the faith community to believe and act in ways which the clerical authority has decided are correctly Catholic. There are theological underpinnings for this model of Church, particularly with Christ's handing the 'keys of the kingdom' to Peter being interpreted as divine appointment of the successor of Peter as the central authority figure of the Church.

Members of Religious Congregations such as the Brothers of St Charles are not ordained and so are not part of the hierarchical Church framework, but by virtue of their life-commitment to the following of Christ and the official approval of their Constitutions by the canonical structures of the Church, they have often been seen to be on a different level of status from lay people. As a result, religious have been treated with great respect by lay people, not only because of their perceived special consecration, but also because of their effectiveness in providing ministry on behalf of the Church in education, health and welfare fields.

Since the Second Vatican Council, emphasis has been placed on a different model of Church, that of Church as 'People of God' highlighting the community aspect of Church. At the Council, there was a realisation that this model of Church had been undervalued and overshadowed by the hierarchical model. However, there has been perceived slowness, after initial efforts, to move to implementation of the communial model. It is almost as if the awareness of what its implications would mean in practice has caused a backlash to reinforce the hierarchical model. Change is occurring at a slower rate than many would like, but while at the official level, reactionary forces may be seen to be dominating, at the grass-roots there is the belief, certainly among many people in Australia and first-world countries, that the horse has bolted. Many people are not prepared to be, in effect, dictated to by the clerical Church if the processes used in such interaction are seen to be one-sided

and not participative. While the pace of change is slow, there is a swelling momentum in that direction. What might be perceived by the hierarchy as reluctance to accept the time-honoured wisdom, doctrine and practice of the Church is interpreted by an increasingly well-educated faith community as an awareness of baptismal right and responsibility to play its equal part in Church functioning.

So, Foucault's understanding of the importance of all players in power relationships, and his belief that power is seen in action rather than possession, seem to me to be a more accurate description of what is actually happening than rather one-dimensional understandings. There is nothing static about what is happening in the Church as far as interactions between members of hierarchy, clerics, religious and lay people are concerned. The situation is dynamic and there is equally a great variety of approaches by the people in any one of those groups which adds to the complexity. The swirling and web-like interactions described by Foucault certainly seem to have some credibility as I see things.

Brothers of St Charles and Use of Power

Given this broad overview, how is power used by members of the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles? A given in this is that the area of attention is the Archdiocese of Melbourne and those who were Focus Group members were speaking from that context.

While not being part of the clerical structure of the Church, Brothers undoubtedly have been seen as having status in the Church and accorded respect in that regard. It seems to me that Brothers have exercised power in any number of ways and the relevant task is to try to explain the great variation. I accept what was said by one former Brother:

> I would find it impossible to try to characterise the use of power as I saw it while I was in the Brothers or outside. There was the full gamut: from fantastic, enabling, freeing use of power, to quite restrictive and I'd use the word abuse. But to try to characterise one use of power, I would find it very, very difficult. (Tape 3, Side A, No. 115)

It seems to me that this summary is an accurate description of the reality of use of power by different Brothers, and, given Foucault's theory, it is very much what one would predict would be the likely outcome of applying that theory.

Therefore, I would propose an interplay of two continua. One continuum would be that of personal factors and the other continuum would involve Church and Congregational factors. Each Brother is unique with regard to both his own personal circumstances, and also in his way of responding to the situations which he has faced as a member of Church and Congregation. Therefore my approach here will be to imagine the variations which can occur among the Brothers. Before considering the interplay between the two, I will look at each continuum separately.

Personal Factors

In looking at the continuum of personal factors which have to be considered, a Brother's family background is clearly important. It was commented by a former Brother that his experience was that those he really believed had the vision of 'Brother' 'in nearly every case … came from large families.' His insight was that they had learned something of the essence of Brotherhood in their family life rather than the Congregation of Brothers of St Charles. Whether this insight is correct or not, a Brother's family circumstances would have been vital in socialising him into life in a group, and the many factors at work here all add to the uniqueness of each man's life: parental age, health and expectations; siblings and place in family; economic circumstances; family shifts; accommodation; job security; education; approach to religion; the list could go on. All of these factors have a bearing on the outlook and maturity of someone who puts himself forward as a candidate for a religious vocation to a Brothers' Congregation. The greatest contribution to a young man's acceptance of the established hegemony in Church and society would have been provided in the family context.

Added to family is the unique personality of each individual. Among the many different personality type indicator instruments, the aim is to find out something of a person's underlying approach to life and basic stances to coping with life circumstances. Apart from finding whether a person is pathologically unfit to be considered for religious life, any

testing in this regard helps to discover what areas of particular development will be needed for greater maturity. The uniqueness of each person is obvious.

Another factor to be added here would be age at entry to the Congregation. Various Focus Group participants referred to many Brothers joining the Congregation at an early age, some as young as thirteen for entry into the Brothers' Juniorate in Sydney. One clearly has to question the degree of maturity that has been gained by such a young man, despite many noble qualities and motivations. His life experience would have been relatively limited, his development of relationships of any depth beyond family and school mates was likely to have been narrow, and his framework for expansion of these important aspects was restricted to the more confining surrounds and personnel of the all-male Brothers' formation institutions. Given these realities, a young man's natural gifts leading him towards a healthy maturity would have had to be working overtime. This is not to deny in any way the great camaraderie and strength of bonding which occurred and which played an important role in developing good male relationships for many, but the ability to transcend the enclosed environment was a quality which young men possessed to different degrees.

In particular, a Brother's relationships with women are an important aspect in considering personal factors. Given that Brothers had limited contact with women in their early formation opportunities, their relating styles were determined by such things as their experiences with mothers and sisters, and, later, getting to know other women in school, Church or related contexts – mothers of students, women on staff, female parish members, fellow university students. Some of the women in the Focus Groups commented on how significant such relationships became in terms of humanising Brothers, and the friendships which were formed provided help to men in coming to greater understanding of themselves, their sexuality and their commitment. The ability to form such relationships again varied from man to man.

While these are not the only factors in considering why one person is different from another, enough has been said to indicate that the continuum to which I referred at the start is real enough. One might imagine a hypothetical 'personal factor' scale where some suitably qualified professional has factored in all these and any other relevant areas into a

scale with each person able to be quantified on the scale, according to his degree of balance and adjustment to his personal circumstances. While such an idea is far-fetched in trying to simplify the complexity of personal factors to a number on a scale, it is helpful to the extent that one can imagine some continuum of the effects of these factors. It is also important to say that, for any individual, his place on the continuum would be constantly changing. Altering circumstances, mental states, life situations, crises, opportunities, etc, all would trigger different aspects of his background in different ways at different times, with the result being a constant movement up and down the continuum scale.

Church and Congregation Factors

Another continuum of factors relates to Church and Congregation. First of all, a young man was part of the Church in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. He grew up, for most men over fifty at least, in a Church where the hierarchical nature of the Church was taken for granted, and people knew their roles in perpetuating and extending the influence of the Church in society. He would most likely have been educated in a Catholic school run by a religious Congregation. The Church leadership of Dr Mannix was strong and enduring. With the death of Dr Mannix in 1963 and the virtually simultaneous impact of the Second Vatican Council, changes were afoot. Since 1963, the variety of Archbishops' personalities and styles of leadership has been a significant element in the broader Church approach to these changes. Clearly some have been able to polarise the Catholic community to a degree thought impossible thirty years earlier. How these changes impacted on the environment in which the young man/Brother lived, and how he adjusted to the changes, is one element in the continuum of variables involving Church and Congregation.

From a Brothers of St Charles perspective, the type of initial formation provided for young men has been commented on above to some extent. While providing socialisation into the Congregation and religious training in line with the charism of the Congregation's founder, the enclosed nature of the formation ran the danger of locking men into an experience of a closed system in which they became inward-looking rather than being enriched through wider associations. The variety of formation experiences depended to a considerable extent on the person of the Novice Director, and, while in later years a number of men with an understanding of Vatican II took on this role, for many in earlier times, the regime was experienced as strict and relatively inflexible, with a strong emphasis on producing men

who would be effective teachers in the Brothers' school system. How an individual novice reacted to this environment obviously varied with his personality and background, and his way of moving into new situations. Hence, religious formation at a beginning stage is one variable to be considered. Likewise, ongoing opportunities for personal and religious development came more to be accepted as the norm from the 1970s onwards. How Brothers took advantage of these invitations again varied from person to person, but the fact that such special times were offered was a positive in the spectrum of variables relating to Congregational life.

A factor which did seem to vary from man to man was a Brother's experience of living in community. After his teacher training, he was assigned to living in a particular community, and as well to teaching in a specified school. The location of the community and school could be in any State in Australia up to the 1950s, with gradual separating of different States into geographic regions called Provinces occurring during the 1950s and 1960s. Brothers by and large were moved every couple of years to a different community in their early years to help gain greater experience prior to their taking on a life-time vowed commitment. The composition of the community was an important factor in helping a young man begin to feel at home in his new ministry and life environment, or feel somewhat alienated. Brothers often had a variety of experiences in the different communities in which they lived. The comments of Brothers and former Brothers in Focus Groups support this sense of diversity of community experience rather than its being the same in all places. The personalities of the Superior and those finally professed Brothers who would have some influence through the 'Scrutiny' process were clearly very significant. Likewise, the presence of other young, but slightly older, men to act as mentors was a boon for a young Brother. It was in this environment that a Brother's approach to the use of corporal punishment would have been developed, with the example of others an important factor in that regard. The sum total of these elements was that communities could be places of great encouragement, security and development of professional confidence for a young Brother, or they could be places where he felt a pressure to conform, to be seen as capable, and where he feared the consequences of any perceived mistakes he might make. Again, perhaps the experience of most may well have been somewhere between these two extremes.

In recent years, the Brothers of St Charles have had to face the fact that some Brothers have been convicted and gaoled for sexual abuse of students. Apart from the trauma of facing a critical media and society, the personal vulnerability and questioning of one's identity as Brother have been part of the experience of all Brothers. Investigations into modes of Congregational operation which could have contributed to men acting in this way, encouragement to look at personal issues which needed addressing, and a willingness to listen to those who had been hurt, not only through sexual abuse but also through the regimen of corporal punishment, were all realities to be faced. It would have been unimaginable for Brothers at the time of their entry into the Congregation to consider that they would ever find themselves in this situation. A finding of this research was that the topic of sexual abuse did not surface as much as I had expected in the Focus Groups, but the attention to corporal punishment was equally stronger than I had anticipated. The fact that this situation has had to be faced is a Congregational variable of note at this time. How individual Brothers have responded has varied considerably as well, ranging from those who have tried to maintain their earlier stance as Brothers as if nothing had happened, to those who have recognised the need for different approaches, both in their personal living of religious life and in articulating and evaluating an understanding of Congregational culture.

The last variable I would add here is the present reality for the Brothers in the Archdiocese of Melbourne of an ageing group of men, declining numbers due to death and, while not to the extent of twenty years ago, men leaving religious life, and a lack of younger men joining the Congregation. While this situation is not different from virtually all Religious Congregations in first-world countries, once again it is a situation which men would never have expected to face. It is a Congregation factor to be considered along with the other issues above. Some men have virtually given up in the belief that religious life as they have lived it in days past is dead. This is a time of much sadness for these men, whose faithfulness to what they have believed in and worked hard for has often been outstanding. Again, there is another way of looking at the situation. Historical studies of religious life would suggest that the numbers of religious in the earlier decades of the last century were fairly atypical of those who have lived as religious over the centuries. As a result, another group of Brothers, myself included, would believe that religious life is being called to move creatively into the future in new ways. This movement will involve finding new

expressions of living a consecration to Christ through a celibate life-style and in community, and engaging in ministry that responds to unmet human needs, particularly among poor and disadvantaged groups of the world. So a Brother's response to facing the present circumstances of the Congregation is a variable to be considered, and any Brother will most likely have a range of attitudes and responses at different times, rather than being fixed in outlook.

As with the continuum of personal factors, is it fanciful to imagine that these Congregational factors, issues which have to be faced by each Brother, could be melded together into some form of Congregational index, some attempt to quantify the relative impacts of the different elements? An individual Brother's Congregational experiences and attitudes in all of these areas would interact together to situate him on the scale in a position of lesser to greater personal well-being and adaptability to living as a Brother of St Charles today. While this notion is again clearly simplistic and any Brother's score on such a nebulous scale would surely vary even from day to day, the reality is that, however expressed, Brothers exhibit a range of both understandings of religious life today and, more particularly, of abilities to live that life holistically and with commitment relevant for the future.

A Matrix of Variables

Given what has been said above about personal and Congregational variables, it would be possible to extend the concept of the two continua into a form of matrix. On one scale would be the personal variables, and on the other the Congregational variables. While acknowledging that this is a simplification and that each continuum is quite multi-dimensional in its own right, I believe that the idea of a two dimensional graph or matrix allows for a clearer understanding of the interplay between the personal and Congregational variables, and gives some insight into how a particular Brother used power in his living.

One example would be that of the Brother who was deeply in touch with his own personal issues, was living healthily in his relationships and had come to grips in an integrating way with the Congregational elements impacting on him. His scores on the two scales would be high, and his use of power would in all likelihood influence others positively. Such a Brother would be deeply in touch with the way in which he affected other people and his

awareness would ensure that his interactions were genuinely human, professional and Christian in the best sense. At the other end of the spectrum would be the man who had never dealt with significant deficits in his personal life and history, whose self-knowledge was limited and whose Congregational experience had left scars which had not healed. This Brother would show up at the lower ends of each of the personal and Congregational scales and the interplay between the two would indicate a strong degree of vulnerability in his living. The danger would be that this man was not consciously aware of his own needs and hence his ways of relating to others had greater potential to be abusive. Lack of awareness of how one is meeting personal needs invariably leaves the possibility of manipulation of others for one's benefit. The Literature Review comments that those in positions of power, such as this Brother given the status he has been accorded by the Catholic community, often do not feel powerful. My sense is that this would be eminently true for those who are least in touch with the impact on their lives of the variables in their personal and Congregational lives, and the interplay between them.

The two examples in the preceding paragraph are provided not to type-cast people into one or other case. In reality, Brothers, and people in all walks of life in fact, are not static in their interactions with life. Over their lives, they have their ups-and-downs, which I have approximated to moving up and down the scale of well-being related to personal and Congregational variables. The importance of self-knowledge cannot be overstated here. It is the person who has moved positively to address issues in his life who is continually moving more to the higher end of the scale in each continuum. Such a person will, by human nature, have his periods of vulnerability, but by and large, his life will be tending towards greater integration. His influence on others, his use of the power ascribed to him in his role as Brother, will be geared to the well-being of those he relates to. Equally, he will be aware of his vulnerabilities and will take steps at such times to be more conscious of how he is relating as not to be taking advantage of others for his own needs.

The above views are expressed to indicate my belief that each Brother has to take responsibility for dealing with the factors which have impacted on his life, and the Congregation must provide every encouragement and assistance to each man to enable him to accept that responsibility. Only then will the Congregation be confident that its members

are relating to others in ways which use their power positively and in accord with the principles and values espoused by the Congregation.

Recommendations

- *Learning about power as part of formation for those in Church ministry*

This recommendation is that all who are going to be engaged in Church ministry, particularly men in clerical or religious settings but not restricted to them, be engaged in their formation in programs which highlight the nature of power, how it is exercised, and how it will be an integral part of their own ministry. Particular attention ought be paid to the hidden aspects of use of power (especially by men) with its hegemonic elements, and the impact which they as official Church representatives are invited to have on others.

- *Encouraging personal growth in clerics and members of Religious Congregations*

This recommendation, in some sense immediately obvious, is essential if men, in particular, are to move to personal stances in life where they come to use their power from healthy and integrated living. A specific focus will be on celibacy to enable men to have clearer understandings of their personal call to a celibate vocation (or not, if such is the case) and on their strategies for a happy living of that life-style. Relationships with women will be a significant aspect of this personal growth.

- *Taking up power positively*

At a time when the pendulum swing of use of power for the Brothers of St Charles may have moved from vigorous imposition of strong expectations on students to more of a hesitancy to take action in case of misinterpretation of motivation, this recommendation invites those in Church ministry to take their authority and to use their power in ways which show initiative and daring. A prerequisite for this recommendation is that the above recommendations have been implemented already. Encouragement ought also be provided to the minister to engage in professional supervision to facilitate his learning from his experiences as minister.

- *Importance of healing processes*

This recommendation encourages any forum which enables and supports those who have been hurt in any way through processes sponsored or under the auspice of the Catholic Church to be heard. A person's experience of hurt or abuse needs to be listened to not only for his/her own future well-being, but also for the learning of those who will occupy positions of influence and power into the future. The implications for systemic structures become clearer as well when the opportunity is available for people to tell their stories. Such forums are not only formal, planned occasions, but happen in unexpected and informal ways such as happened in some of the Focus Group discussions in this study.

- *Challenge of existing Church structures*

This recommendation is directed particularly to Brothers in that, as men who have traditionally had status in the Catholic Church, they have the possibility of using their influence and power to challenge any Church processes which are unjust through lack of inclusivity, especially in relation to women and lay people. This recommendation is that they continue to take up that challenge.

Concluding Personal Reflections

I want to include in this section some words of appreciation which are quite subjective. After reading the Literature and hearing the comments of the Focus Groups, I acknowledge the wide range of personalities of men who have been or continue to be Brothers of St Charles. Given the degree of socialisation which they have undergone in entering the Congregation, with its great bonding strengths and also its questionable 'closed' nature, I have come to a deeper appreciation of the efforts of my fellow Brothers. Their motivation in general has been to be of genuine service to the Church through education and related ministries, and the influence which they have exerted on many thousands for good has been noted. The positive impact of their power, the leadership which they have exerted in the Catholic community, has been for the benefit of the many who have passed through their institutions. The negative impact of their power has been felt in the experience of many of the overuse of corporal punishment in particular, and in a smaller number of cases, the sexual abuse of students.

While some of the more recent changes have undoubtedly been brought about by having to face the learnings coming from the experience of child sexual abuse, there has been a commitment on the part of the Brothers to both address the hurts of the past to the extent that that is possible, and to seek ways of ongoing development and holistic growth for the Brothers themselves. Brothers of St Charles by and large do have the highest ideals in trying to live the gospel message in the spirit of their founder, and commit themselves to addressing the needs of new generations of people today. Despite an ageing group, there are positive signs that the lessons of the past are being learnt.

The way into the future for the Brothers of St Charles in terms of their use of power, irrespective of what happens to them as an ageing group, can only be by way of healthy and positive relationships. That way has been the way of the past as well, when Brothers had most impact on students when they were clearly happy in themselves, believed in their vocation and used their power and influence for the benefit of many. The Catholic Church needs Brothers to be 'Brothers' in the very best relational sense if the structures of the clerical, hierarchical institution are to be strengthened by a more inclusive model of involvement of all in the faith community. Equally the world needs men who can use power and present relating styles beyond the hegemonic, patriarchical models which have dominated to the present. The challenge is there to be continually taken up.

Appendices

AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

Office of Research

University Human Research Ethics Committee
Ethics Clearance for a Research Project - Approval Form

Principal Investigator/s (if staff):   **1)** Dr Bob Bessant   **Campus:** Patrick
Co Investigator   **2)**
Researcher(s) (if student/s)   **1)** Br Peter Dowling   **Campus:** Patrick

---

Ethics clearance has been provisionally approved for the following project: How is power used within the Catholic Church? A case study of a group of male religious in the Archdiocese of Melbourne

for the period: 1.12.2000 to 31.12.2002 (subject to annual renewal).

University Human Research Ethics Committee Register Number: V2000/01-24

---

subject to the following conditions as stipulated in the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Statement on Human Experimentation and Supplementary Notes 1992:

    (i)   that principal investigators provide reports <u>annually</u> on the form supplied by the Institutional Ethics Committee, on matters including:
- security of records;
- compliance with approved consent procedures and documentation;
- compliance with special conditions, and

    (ii)   as a condition of approval of the research protocol, require that investigators report immediately anything which might affect ethical acceptance of the protocol, including:
- adverse effects on participants;
- proposed changes in the protocol, and/or
- unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

and subject to clarification of the following to the University Human Research Ethics Committee:

1.   Research Procedures/Consent Form
- Please clarify why further contact is needed with participants once the focus groups have met. Does this mean individual responses are to be followed up?

1.   Consent Form
- Please amend typographical error, "Participant" to "Participants are asked to provide the information below..."

2.   Confidentiality and anonymity
- Section 6.1. participants are not anonymous, as the researcher is present at the interview.
- Section 6.2. please provide a more detailed explanation on how participant responses will remain confidential.

3.   Security
- It is a requirement that data is stored on University premises.

154

A Final Report Form will need to be completed and submitted to the URPEC within one month of completion of the project.
OR
An Annual Progress Report Form will need to be completed and submitted to the URPEC within one month of the anniversary date of approval.

Please sign, date and return this form (with any additional information, or supporting documents to show completion of any amendments requested) to the Administrative Officer (Research) to whom you submitted your application. This is essential before final approval by the University Human Research Ethics Committee is confirmed.

Signed: ...*J. Mushin*..   Date: *28 . 11 . 2000*
               Administrative Officer (Research)

(To be completed by the Principal Investigator, or Student and Supervisor, as appropriate.)

The date when I/we expect to commence contact with human participants or access their records is: ...*March 15*...

I/We hereby declare that I/We am/are aware of the conditions governing research involving human participants as set out in the University Human Research Ethics Committee's *Guidelines and Instructions for Researchers/Students* and agree to the conditions stated above.

Signed: ...*Mercer*..   Date: ...*19 . 1 . 2001*...
          (Principal Investigator (if staff) or Supervisor, as appropriate)

Signed: ...*P. U. Sanlip*..   Date: ...*22. 2. 01*...
         (Researcher (if student))

OR/E30/974

126 The Avenue
PARKVILLE VIC 3052

Ms Jo Mushin
Administrative Officer (Research)
Australian Catholic University
Office of Research
115 Victoria Parade
FITZROY VIC 3065

22 February 2001

Dear Jo

Re: U.H.R.E.C. Register Number: V2000/01-24

I write to clarify a number of matters which are mentioned on the Approval Form which I recently received from the University. For convenience, I have put your questions in italics.

First area: Research Procedures/Consent Form: *Please clarify why further contact is needed with participants once the focus groups have met. Does this mean individual responses are to be followed up?* My response is that I have asked for this information purely as a help to myself. I do not know the level of response which I am likely to receive by way of expressions of interest and, if I need to make a selection from those who have indicated interest, I would want to have information available to be able to contact people quickly. This is before Focus Groups have met. There is no intention to contact people after the meetings.

Second area: *typographical error in Consent Form:* noted and changed.

Third area: *Section 6.1, participants are not anonymous, as the researcher is present at the interview.* Point taken; I mistakenly interpreted this to mean that participants would not in any way be identified in any reporting.
Section 6.2, please provide a more detailed explanation on how participant responses will remain confidential. Data will be available on audio-tape. In any transcribing, names of speakers will not be used, but some other distinguishing feature such as A, B, C, etc. will be used. There will be no record made of which participants made which comments.

Fourth area: Security: *It is a requirement that data is stored on University premises.* I am happy to abide by this regulation once the analysis of the material has been completed. I assume that, in the interim, it is acceptable that I have access to the material for my

purposes and so I propose to keep it in the locked filing cabinet at Treacy Centre, 156 The Avenue Parkville 3052, as indicated in my application.

I trust that these answers provide clarification of your questions.

Thank you for your assistance in obtaining Approval for my research. Please find enclosed a signed copy of the Approval Form.

Yours sincerely

Peter Dowling

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Participant

Re: Australian Catholic University Research Project

I thank you for your expression of interest in being part of a discussion relating to a Research Project conducted under the auspices of the Australian Catholic University. This letter is to provide you with more information and, if you are then willing to participate, to request that you complete the Consent Form attached.

Title of Project: How is power used within the Catholic Church? A Case Study of a Group of Male Religious in the Archdiocese of Melbourne.

Name of Researcher: Brother Peter Dowling

The purpose of the study is to enable a greater understanding of how power is used within the Church, with a particular focus on the Archdiocese of Melbourne. As a Case Study, one particular group of male Religious will be considered. The group to be looked at is the Congregation of [Brothers of St Charles]. The intention is to conduct a number of discussion groups of people who have personal experience of association with [Brothers of St Charles] in order to explore the issues involved. Such people would include current [Brothers of St Charles], former [Brothers of St Charles], current or former teachers in [Brothers of St Charles] schools, former students of [Brothers of St Charles] schools, and others who would have significant knowledge of [Brothers of St Charles]. After analysis of the ideas from the discussion groups, the researcher will then present his findings to the University as part of his Master of Social Science study.

It is not anticipated that participation in a discussion group will involve any risk to participants. Discussions will be audio-taped, but any use of the audio-tape will not identify those who make specific comments. Any reporting of the proceedings in the research will not identify any participant by name, so that anonymity can be assured.

Participants in the discussions will be asked to gather at Treacy Centre, 156 The Avenue, Parkville, at the agreed time and to be present for approximately two hours for the session. This will enable all to gather and the session will last for about ninety minutes. If potential participants have any constraints (for example, travel, care of small children, etc), then it would be helpful to contact me about your circumstances.

Out of the study, it is hoped that there will come a greater understanding for Religious Congregations, the Catholic Church and society in general of the nature of power in a

158

St Patrick's Campus 115 Victoria Parade, Fitzroy VIC • Locked Bag 4115, Fitzroy MDC, VIC 3065, Australia
Telephone: (61 3) 9953 3000 Facsimile: (61 3) 9953 3005

BALLARAT • BRISBANE • CANBERRA • MELBOURNE • SYDNEY
www.acu.edu.au

Australian Catholic University Limited ACN 050 192 660

Church context and some indication as to issues which will need to be taken into consideration when power is exercised by people in the Church into the future.

Participants need to be aware that they are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the study at any time without giving a reason.

If you have any questions concerning the procedures of the study, you are most welcome to contact me on telephone number 03 9347 4211.

The study has been approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.

In the event that you have any complaint about the way you have been treated during the study, or a query that I have not been able to satisfy, you may write care of the nearest branch of the Office of Research:

    e.g.   Chair, University Human Research Ethics Committee
            C/o Office of Research
            Australian Catholic University
            115 Victoria Parade
            Fitzroy   VIC   3065
            Telephone: 03 9953 3157
            Fax: 03 9953 3315

Any complaint made will be treated in confidence, investigated fully and the participant informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this project, you should sign both copies of the Statement of Consent form, retain one copy for your records and return the other copy to me in the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed with this letter.

Thank you for considering the issues involved in your participation in this project. Your potential participation is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Brother Peter Dowling

AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

Statement of Consent Form

TITLE OF RESEARCH PROJECT
HOW IS POWER USED WITHIN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH? A CASE STUDY OF A GROUP
OF MALE RELIGIOUS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MELBOURNE.

NAME OF RESEARCHER
BROTHER PETER DOWLING

I .... (the participant) have read and understood the
information provided in the Letter to Participants and any questions I have asked have been
answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realising that I can withdraw at
any time.
I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or provided to other researchers
in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT (block letters):   ....

SIGNATURE: ....

DATE: ....

NAME OF RESEARCHER (block letters):   BROTHER PETER DOWLING

SIGNATURE: ....

DATE: ....

*Please retain one copy of the Statement of Consent Form for your records, and return the other
to Br Peter Dowling in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.*

Participants are asked to provide the information below, as applicable, to assist in further contact:

POSTAL ADDRESS:
            ....
TELEPHONE:(work): ....
            (home): ....
FAX: ....
E-mail: ....

160

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Audio -Tapes:

The following are the micro-cassettes used in the audio-taping of Focus Group Discussions. Where a section of the Focus Group conversation has been used in the Thesis, the indicators provided in the text show the tape number, side of the tape, and approximate numerical position on that side of the tape at which the comment is found.

Tape 1:   Current and Former Staff Members Group (held on 9 August 2001)

Tape 2:   Current Brothers Group (held on 20 August 2001)

Tape 3:   Former Brothers Group (held on 23 August 2001)

Tape 4:   Women's Group (held on 30 August 2001)

Tape 5:   Former Students Group (held on 22 October 2001)

Other Bibliographic Resources:

Angus, L. 1986, *Class, Culture and Curriculum: A Study of Continuity and Change in a Catholic School*, Deakin University, Victoria.

Angus, L. & Rizvi, F. 1986, 'Power and Ideology in Victorian Education' in *Australian Association for Research in Education - Annual Conference*, Melbourne.

Arac, J. (ed.). 1988, *After Foucault: Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Arbuckle, G. A. 2000, 'Cultures of Bullying', *Human Development*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 25 - 33.

Archer, J. & Lloyd, B. 1982, *Sex and Gender*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Au, W. & Cannon, N. 1992, 'The Plague of Perfectionism', *Human Development*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 5 - 12.

Beal, J. P. 1995, 'The Exercise of the Power of Governance by Lay People: State of the Question', *The Jurist*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1 - 92.

Becker, J. F. & Donovan, D. I. 1995, 'Sexual Dynamics in Ministry Relationships', *Human Development*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 23 - 27.

Benyei, C. R. 1998, *Understanding Clergy Misconduct in Religious Systems*, The Haworth Pastoral Press, New York.

Berry, J. 1992, *Lead Us Not into Temptation*, Doubleday, New York.

Blackmore, J. 1998, '"Breaking the Silence": Feminist Contributions to Educational Administration and Policy' pp. 997 - 1042 in Lockwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P. & Hart, A. (eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration - Part Two*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Blair, R. 1976, *The Christian Brothers*, Currency Press, Sydney.

Boje, D. M. 1991, 'Organizations as Storytelling Networks', *Administration Science Quarterly*, vol. 36, pp. 106 - 126.

Bourdieu, P. 1991, *Language and Symbolic Power*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Brown, J. C. & Bohn, C. R. (eds.) 1989, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse - A Feminist Critique*, The Pilgrim Press, Cleveland.

Burbules, N. C. 1986, 'A Theory of Power in Education', *Educational Theory*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 95 - 114.

Burkett, E. & Bruni, F. 1993, *A Gospel of Shame - Children, Sexual Abuse and the Catholic Church*, Viking, New York.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979, *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*, Gower Publishing Co. Ltd., Aldershot, UK.

Capps, D. 1992, 'Religion and Child Abuse: Perfect Together', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1 - 14.

— 1993, 'Sex in the Parish: Social-Scientific Explanations for Why It Occurs', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 350 - 360.

Caputo, J. & Yount, M. (eds.) 1993, *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*, Pennsylvania State University Pres, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Carroll, P. 1976, 'Emotional Memory' in Blair, R. (ed.), *The Christian Brothers*, Currency Press, Sydney.

Casey, P. R. 1996, 'Sex and Power in the Church', *Doctrine and Life*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 66 - 74.

Cashmore, J., Dolby, R. & Brennan, D. 1994, 'Systems Abuse: Problems and Solutions', The New South Wales Child Protection Council, Sydney.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. 1991, 'Narrative and Story in Practice and Research' pp. 258 - 281 in Schon, D. A. (ed.), *The Reflective Turn - Case Studies In and On Educational Practice*, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York.

Collins, P. 1986, *Mixed Blessings*, Penguin Books Australia, Ringwood, Victoria.

— 1991, *No Set Agenda - Australia's Catholic Church Faces an Uncertain Future*, David Lovell Publishing, Melbourne.

Colton, M. & Vanstone, M. 1996, *Betrayal of Trust*, Free Association Books, London.

Connell, R. W. 1987, *Gender and Power - Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

— 1993, 'The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History', *Theory and Society*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 597 - 624.

— 1995, *Masculinities*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Consalvo, M. 1998, 'Hegemony, Domestic Violence, and "Cops": a Critique of Concordance', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 62 ff.

Cooper-White, P. 1991, 'Soul Stealing: Power Relations in Pastoral Sexual Abuse', *The Christian Century*, February 20, pp. 196 - 199.

Cousins, M. & Hussain, A. 1984, *Michel Foucault*, MacMillan, London.

Cozzens, D. B. 2000, *The Changing Face of the Priesthood - A Reflection on the Priest's Crisis of Soul*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

Dallavalle, N. 1996, 'Power and Gender and Religion', *The ISTI (Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute) Sun*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 3.

Davis, K. 1988, *Power under the Microscope*, Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) 1994, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Dilenschneider, R. L. 1994, *On Power*, Harper Business, New York.

Dominian, J. 1996, 'Sexual Difficulties and Immaturity', *Doctrine and Life*, vol. 46, January, pp. 31 - 36.

Donaldson, M. 1993, 'What is Hegemonic Masculinity?', *Theory and Society*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 643 - 658.

Fairclough, N. 1989, *Language and Power*, Longman, London.

Fay, B. 1987, *Critical Social Science - Liberation and Its Limits*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

Ferguson, H. & Arthurs, H. 1996, 'Men and Sexual Politics', *Doctrine and Life*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 4 - 11.

Fineman, S. (ed.). 1993, *Emotion in Organizations*, Sage Publications, London.

Fineman, S. & Gabriel, Y. 1996, *Experiencing Organizations*, Sage Publications, London.

Flatt, B. 1994, 'The Misuse of Power and Sex in Helping Relationships', *Restoration Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 101 - 110.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. 1994, 'Interviewing: The Art of Science' pp. 361 - 376 in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Fortune, M. M. 1994, 'Is Nothing Sacred?', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, vol. 10, no. 1.

Foucault, M. 1980, *Power/Knowledge - Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, The Harvester Press Limited, Brighton, Sussex.

— 1984, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2 - The Use of Pleasure (translated from the French by Robert Hurley)*, Penguin Books, London.

Fox, P. 2001, *God as Communion: John Zizioulas, Elizabeth Johnson, and the Retrieval of the Symbol of Triune God*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

Frazier, T. W. 1992, 'Dysfunctions in Ministry', *Human Development*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 8 - 14.

Garfinkel, H. 1967, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Gill, J. J. 1995, 'Priests, Power, and Sexual Abuse', *Human Development*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 5 - 9.

Gonsiorek, J. C. (ed.). 1995, *Breach of Trust - Sexual Exploitation by Health Care Professionals and Clergy*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Grant, R. 1994-1995, *Healing the Soul of the Church*, self-published by the author, USA.

Guggenbuhl-Craig, A. 1971, *Power in the Helping Professions*, Spring Publications Inc, Dallas.

Hardman-Cromwell, Y. C. 1991, 'Power and Sexual Abuse in Ministry', *Journal of Religious Thought*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 65 - 72.

Hartsock, N. 1974, 'Political Change: Two Perspectives on Power', *Quest*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 10 - 25.

Hillman, J. 1995, *Kinds of Power*, Doubleday, New York.

Hindess, B. 1996, *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. 1994, 'Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology, and Interpretive Practice' pp. 262 - 272 in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Hopkins, N. M. 1994, 'Power Abuse and Theologies of Sexuality in the Church', *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 357 - 361.

Hopkins, N. M. & Laaser, M. (eds.) 1995, *Restoring the Soul of a Church*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

Horst, E. A. 1996, 'Patriarchy: An Experiential Definition', *The ISTI (Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute) Sun*, vol. 2, no. 3.

Hoy, D. C. (ed.). 1986, *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. 1994, 'Data Management and Analysis Methods' pp. 428 - 444 in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Janda, K. F. 1960, 'Towards the Explication of the Concept of Leadership in Terms of the Concept of Power', *Human Relations*, vol. 13, November, pp. 345 - 363.

Jenkins, P. 1996, *Pedophiles and Priests - Anatomy of a Contemporary Crisis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Jenkins, S. 1997, 'Sexual Abuse - A Process, Not an Event: A View from Practice', *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 65 - 71.

Johnson, E. A. 1992, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse*, Crossroad, New York.

Jones, J. 1994, 'Towards an Understanding of Power Relationships in Institutional Abuse', *Early Childhood Development and Care*, vol. 100, pp. 69 - 76.

Jones, K. B. 1993, *Compassionate Authority - Democracy and the Representation of Women*, Routledge, New York.

Jordan, E. 2000, *Reconciling Women*, St Paul's Publications, Strathfield, NSW.

Keel, R. 1999, 'Ethnomethodology and Deviance', http://www.umsl.edu/~rkeel/200/ethdev.html

Keneally, T., 1977, 'Memoirs of a Catholic Boyhood' *The National Times*.

Kenway, J. 1995, 'Masculinities in Schools: Under Siege, on the Defensive and under Reconstruction?', *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 59 - 79.

Knights, D. & Roberts, J. 1982, 'The Power of Organization or the Organization of Power', *Organizational Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 47 - 63.

Krausz, R. R. 1986, 'Power and Leadership in Organizations', *Transactional Analysis Journal*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 85 - 94.

Kritzman, L. D. (ed.). 1988, *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture - Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984*, Routledge, New York.

Kusch, M. 1991, *Foucault's Strata and Fields*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Lebacqz, K. & Barton, R. G. 1991, *Sex in the Parish*, Westminster/John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky.

Lukes, S. 1974, *Power - A Radical View*, The MacMillan Press Ltd, London.

Macdonald, M., Carpenter, C., Cornish, S., Costigan, M., Dixon, R., Malone, M., Manning, K. & Wagner, S. 1999, 'Woman and Man - One in Christ Jesus: Report on the Participation of Women in the Catholic Church in Australia', Australian Episcopal Conference of the Catholic Church, Sydney.

Macke, P. B. 1993, 'Boundaries in Ministerial Relationships', *Human Development*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 23 - 25.

Markham, D. J. & Repka, F. A. 1997, 'Personal Development and Boundaries Shape Ministry', *Human Development*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 33 - 45.

Morris, M. & Patton, P. (eds.) 1979, *Michel Foucault - Power, Truth, Strategy*, Feral Publications, Sydney.

Morzone, E. 2000, Contemporary Heralds of God's New Reign - Franciscan Religious Celebrating the Victory of Nonviolent Love, Masters Thesis in Applied Theology, Middlesex University

National Committee for Professional Standards 1996, 'Towards Healing', Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Australian Conference of Leaders of Religious Institutes.

— 1997, 'Integrity in Ministry - First Draft', Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Australian Conference of Leaders of Religious Institutes.

— 1999, 'Integrity in Ministry - Second Draft', Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Australian Conference of Leaders of Religious Institutes.

O'Donnell, K. 1998, Two Churches, MA Thesis - Social Policy, Royal Melbourne Institute
     of Technology

Ormerod, N. 1994, 'When Power Corrupts', *National Outlook*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 4 - 7.

Ormerod, N. & Ormerod, T. 1995, *When Ministers Sin - Sexual Abuse in the Churches*,
     Millennium Books, Sydney.

Ormerod, T. 1993, 'Not in Our Family!', *National Outlook*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 24 - 28.

Parkinson, P. 1997, *Child Sexual Abuse and the Churches*, Hodder & Stoughton, London.

Pateman, C. 1990, 'Sex and Power', *Ethics*, vol. 100, pp. 398 - 407.

Pellauer, M. 1987, 'Sex, Power, and the Family of God', *Christianity and Crisis*, February
     16, pp. 47 - 50.

Pinderhughes, E. 1989, *Understanding Race, Ethnicity, & Power*, The Free Press,
     MacMillan, Inc., New York.

Poling, J. N. 1991, *The Abuse of Power: A Theological Problem*, Abingdon Press,
     Nashville.

Pryce, M. 1998, 'On Modelling Relationships: Jesus, Men and Friendship', *The Way*, vol.
     38, no. 4.

Punch, M. 1994, 'Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research' pp. 83 - 97 in Denzin, N. K.
     & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications,
     Thousand Oaks.

Ranson, D. 1997, 'A Personal Response to the Issue of Factors within the Catholic Church
     which Contribute to a Climate out of which Sexual Abuse might Occur' in
     Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission Research Project.

Reed, M. & Hughes, M. (eds.) 1992, *Rethinking Organization - New Directions in
     Organization Theory and Analysis*, Sage Publications, London.

Reid, R. 1996, 'Pain, Hope, Healing', Centacare Catholic Family Services, Parramatta.

— 1997, 'Some Thoughts on Sexual Abuse by Clergy and Religious', Australian Catholic
     Bishops' Conference.

— 1999, 'Adult Victim Consent in Situations of Sexual Exploitation in Pastoral
     Relationships', *The Australasian Catholic Record*, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 74 - 85.

Richards, D. 1997, 'Discernment and Development of Religious Professionals', *The ISTI
     (Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute) Sun*, vol. 3, no. 1.

Richardson, L. 1994, 'Writing: A Method of Inquiry' pp. 516 - 529 in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Robinson, G. 1996, 'Abuse and Trust', *Eureka Street*, September.

— 1998, 'Spiritual Harm and Spiritual Healing in Cases of Sexual Abuse' in *Professional Standards Conference*, Boston, USA.

Roehlkepartain, E. C. 1991, 'Sex, Power & Ministry', *Christian Ministry*, May-June, p. 7.

Rossetti, S. J. 1991, *Slayer of the Soul*, Twenty-Third Publications, Mystic, Connecticut.

— 1996, *A Tragic Grace: The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

Rutter, P. 1989, *Sex in the Forbidden Zone: When Men in Power Abuse Women's Trust*, Unwin Paperbacks, London.

— 1996, *Sex, Power, and Boundaries*, Bantam Books, New York.

Sawicki, J. 1991, *Disciplining Foucault*, Routledge, New York.

Schneiders, S. M. 2000, *Finding The Treasure - Locating Catholic Religious Life in a New Ecclesial and Cultural Context*, Paulist Press, New York/Mahwah, NJ.

— 2001, *Selling All – Commitment, Consecrated Celibacy, and Community in Catholic Religious Life*, Paulist Press, New York.

Sims, D., Fineman, S. & Gabriel, Y. 1993, *Organizing and Organizations*, Sage Publications, London.

Sipe, A. W. R. 1990, *A Secret World - Sexuality and the Search for Celibacy*, Brunner/Mazel, Publishers, New York.

— 1994, 'The Problem of Sexual Trauma and Addiction in the Catholic Church', *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 130 - 137.

— 1995, *Sex, Priests and Power: Anatomy of a Crisis*, Brunner/Mazel, New York.

Tacey, D. 1990, 'Reconstructing Masculinity', *Meanjin*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 781 - 794.

— 2000, *Re-Enchantment - The New Australian Spirituality*, Harper Collins Publishers, Sydney.

Tulley, A. 1997, 'Masculinities and Violence', *Changing Education*, vol. 4, no. 2 & 3, pp. 1 - 6.

Webb, T. (ed.). 1991, *W B Yeats – Selected Poems*, Penguin, London.

Weber, M. 1968, *Economy and Society*, Bedminster Press, New York.

White, W. L. 1986, *Incest in the Organizational Family*, Lighthouse Training Institute, Bloomington, Illinois.

Whitehead, E. E. & Whitehead, J. D. 1982, *Community of Faith - Models and Strategies for Developing Christian Communities*, The Seabury Press, New York.

Whitehead, J. D. & Whitehead, E. E. 1991, *The Promise of Partnership - Leadership and Ministry in an Adult Church*, Harper, San Francisco.

Willerscheidt, P., Kelly, T., Lundin, J. & Peterson, M. 1997, 'Gender and Power', *The ISTI (Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute) Sun*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 3 - 6.

Williams, R. 1977, *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford University Press, London.

Wilson, G. B. 2000, 'A Fresh Look at Corporate Power', *Human Development*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5 - 9.

Wood, T. H. J. J. 1997, 'Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service (The Wood Royal Commission), Vols. IV, V, VI - The Paedophile Inquiry', New South Wales State Government, Sydney.

Wyre, R. 1997, *Professional Education and Training Handouts*, Lucy Faithfull Foundation, London.