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This work is a study of the way in which future Roman Catholic secular priests have come to understand their role in the leadership of their Church, in England and Wales, since the changes brought about in their seminaries, following the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council in 1965. This is a study in sociology, and not in psychology, or in social psychology. Though the words 'role' and 'socialization' enter the title of the study, it is concerned with overall trends and tendencies, rather than with individuals.

The year after Vatican II had closed, but when its impact was still only beginning to make itself felt in the Church at large, I was appointed to the staff of St. John's Seminary, Wonersh, near Guildford in Surrey. My arrival to teach sociology, happened to coincide with a demand for radical changes in the seminary system by the student body. The staff were fully prepared to listen to whatever the students had to say and a dialogue began, which is perhaps still in progress ten years later.

To help myself to play some part in this dialogue, I proposed four questions which needed to be answered:

1) What kind of world are we moving into?
2) What kind of Church will that world require?
3) What kind of leadership will that Church require?
4) What kind of preparation will that leadership require?

My attempts to help to supply the answers have led to this present study. In 1966 I was attending the Regent Street Polytechnic as an evening student of sociology; in 1970 I became a part-time research student at the University of Surrey. Owing to ill-health this thesis has taken six years to write. Ill-health has also played a part in limiting the form of my research. Thus, instead
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SUMMARY

1. This study of the ways in which future Roman Catholic secular priests are prepared for their ministry begins with a review of "the world today", as seen through the literature of alienation and anomie, followed by a review of the sociological literature dealing with priesthood, and an account of recent developments in Catholic thinking regarding preparation for the ministry. Note is made of the distinctions between Marx's "world", as seen in his concept of alienated man, and Durkheim's, as seen in his concept of anomie; and between priesthood and prophet-hood, as described by Weber.

2. The next section reproduces two articles by the author, which describe a series of interviews with recently ordained priests, and the conclusions drawn from them, regarding the attitude of these priests to alienation and anomie both in the mass of people around them, and in themselves. In the second article is set out a hypothetical examination of the seminary system, to attempt to establish within that system some of the origins of these attitudes among priests, based on the distinction between "alienation" and "anomie".

3. There follows an account of a study of 100 recently ordained priests, in which an attempt is made by means of a postal questionnaire to carry out this examination. At each end of the spectrum of attitudes manifested by the respondents, those of some twenty priests are submitted to a comparative study, to inspect the different model of the Church which each group possesses. There are seen to be some grounds for accepting the validity of a polarisation of seminary students, along the lines of the hypothetical dichotomy.

4. Conclusions are drawn and suggestions made for possible future developments in the preparation for the ministry of R.C. priests.
of visiting all the seminaries and conducting a series of interviews, as originally intended, I have been obliged to concentrate my major enquiry into a postal questionnaire.

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Michael Hornsby-Smith, of the University of Surrey, who has acted as my supervisor, and to Dr. Susanne Bano, for their unremitting encouragement and many constructive suggestions. I am also indebted to those priests who allowed me to interview them, or who completed the questionnaires.

My own values may be gleaned from Appendices X and XI.

Christ's College of Education, Liverpool,
August, 1976.
Chapter I

WHAT KIND OF WORLD?

The key-note of the Second Vatican Council, summoned by Pope John XXIII, was aggiornamento - the need for the Church to rethink its mission in terms of the vast changes that have occurred in human society during the present century, and especially since 1945. In 1965 the Bishops of the Council issued a decree on the preparation of priests for the ministry. In the 16th century the Council of Trent had adopted the seminary system, (using a word borrowed via Cardinal Pole from John Fisher, who had employed it in his new constitutions for Christ's College, Cambridge, at the beginning of that century). Using Tridentine language, the Vatican II decree still speaks of the 'formation of priests', as if the seminaries were a mould in which to set the mixture. While Trent sought to remedy the pre-Reformation exposure of future priests in university colleges, by substituting sheltered education from a tender age, Vatican II laid stress on what it calls 'pastoral' formation. "Every programme of instructions", the decree lays down, "whether spiritual, intellectual or disciplinary, should be joined with practical implementation and directed towards the aforementioned goal... The norms of Christian education are to be religiously maintained", but "properly complemented by the latest findings in sound psychology and pedagogy. By wisely planned training there should also be developed in seminarians a due degree of human maturity, attested to chiefly by a certain emotional stability, by an ability to make considered decisions, and by a right manner of passing judgment on events and people".

The year following this decree, when I was appointed to the staff of the seminary at Wonersh, to teach sociology, I saw the subject mainly in terms of trying to explain to the students what kind of world we were in, and what were the main influences at work on the mass of the people among whom their ministry would be undertaken.

* references begin p. 17
I had recently come across the article by Seeman in the American Sociological Review of 1959, in which he gave a list of various ways in which modern man has been seen to be alienated. Seeman's list was: Powerlessness, Meaninglessness, Normlessness, Isolation and Self-estrangement. I found this useful for teaching, and it also made a convenient starting point for a series of questions I put to twenty recently ordained priests, whom I interviewed in 1971. Seeman, basing his approach on that of a psychologist, J.B. Rotter, who had used attitude scales to try to measure expectations, seeks to provide a subjectified version of these different areas of alienation, to facilitate the construction of attitude scales, by which 'alienation' can be measured.

Alienation and false consciousness are terms often associated with Marxism. But Marx did not invent Entfremdung, the German word for alienation. Martin Luther used it, in his translation of Philippians 2, 7. "Christ emptied himself, to assume the condition of a slave", according to the Jerusalem Bible. For Luther, "Christ alienated himself". This word Entfremdung became a key word in Hegel's Philosophy of Spirit. For Hegel, man is essentially Spirit, possessing a quality of universality. But man finds himself cut off from universality, cut off from 'the social substance', as Hegel calls society. Man finds he is an alien to his own true self, for universality has become alien to him. What can man do to put things right? He must surrender his 'particular self', and thus be self-alienated, in a new way.

In 1841 Feuerbach argued, in The Essence of Christianity that man is alien to himself, because he has created God. Onto 'God' man projects all that is good in himself. This thesis Marx accepted, and elaborated, in 1843. Marx, he said, makes religion. Religion is man's self-consciousness, and self-awareness - so long as he has not found himself, or lost himself again. This state, this society, produce religion. "Religious suffering", Marx adds, "is at the same time an expression of real suffering, and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the
sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men is a demand for their real happiness." (7)

In 1844 Marx wrote his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, in order to "unmask alienation in its secular form, now it has been unmasked in its sacred form". Reflecting on the way Hegel had seen, in the Prussian state, the highest peak in human development, Marx asked himself how it is that human beings projected onto outside objects, onto reified abstractions, those powers which are truly their own. But while he rejected Hegel's religion, and politics, Marx retained the language of self-alienation. He rolled together Hegel's two versions of Entfremdung to make it mean 'separation through surrender'. (Entäußerung, a word which Marx sometimes used as a synonym for Entfremdung, he sometimes distinguished from it, as meaning 'surrender'.) What for Marx was alienated from man was not Hegel's social substance, but the material product of man's labour. Instead of a man's labour embodying his own personality in its product, it has turned him, under Capitalism, into a mere instrument of production. The product of his labour becomes a power, independent of the producer, and sets itself up against him, as an alien and hostile force. Man has surrendered himself. Alienated labour makes of man "a spiritually and physically dehumanized human being", an animal, a slave, a machine. Man's whole existence becomes inhuman, for he is essentially social. (8)

Though these manuscripts were not published until 1932, Georg Lukács was able to work out for himself Marx's theory of alienation, from a study of Capital. Lukács published in 1923 his History of Class Consciousness, in which he described 'reification' and that state of mind of the proletariat, which Marx had termed false consciousness. (9) Soon afterwards, Heidegger produced, in 1927, Being and Time, in which he too developed a
theory of alienation, based on the notion of human inauthenticity. Da-sein, Being-there, is the kind of being which belongs to persons, people in full possession of humanity. Man is eigentlich, correct, authentic, when he is self-determined. As an existentialist, Heidegger was not, as was Marx, concerned with man’s essence. A man can develop either way, authentic or inauthentic. There are no implicit value judgements. (10)

Sartre was to give alienation yet another interpretation in Being and Nothingness, that of 'alien-me', an object of revulsion when caught out peeping through the key-hole. Alienation, for Sartre, is part of the human condition, since it focusses on the human body. Each person is separated from the others by an unbridgeable chasm. By 1960, Sartre wrote as a Marxist, for whom man is alienated, reified, mystified, by the division of labour and exploitation. (11)

A neo-Freudian who has described alienation in many ways is Erich Fromm. For him man in general is simply alienated in our modern world. This alienation pervades especially the relationship of man to his work. (12) Karen Horney, another neo-Freudian, had adopted a more psychoanalytic approach. Alienation for her, suggested a stifling of spontaneity. Later she saw alienated man as oblivious to his real self, his vision obscured by his idealised self-image, in a state of 'neurotic-inertia'. (13)

A third neo-Freudian who wrote of alienation was Marcuse. In 1964 he published One-Dimensional Man, in which he notes the psychological stress which still exists in mechanized and automated production, even when the drudgery has gone. The worker may be up-graded by automation, incorporated into the technological community of the administered population. He may even have acquired a new consciousness, new aspirations. Authoritarian leadership may have changed into administration; the language of power replaced by 'flexible and manipulating leadership'; the slaves may be sublimated, but slaves they remain, mere instruments, men reduced to things,
one-dimensional men alien to their real needs. Like D.H. Lawrence, Marcuse noted the connection between industrial life and sexual repression. "By repressive desublimation", he wrote, "the individual becomes satisfied and adjusted to existing social conditions, and no longer develops the desire to emancipate himself." (14)

Lukács was taught by Simmel, and influenced by Weber. Weber himself had no theory of alienation as such, though some of the concern of writers like Frankl and Mannheim with meaninglessness may be associated with his concern for the meaning of social action in the actor. (15) He did, however, make a distinction between 'substantive' and 'formal' rationality; the first kind has a criterion based on ultimate values; the second is independent of outside values, and related only to one main goal: the "central striving within the capitalist system to achieve profit". Another distinction he made was between 'instrumental rationality' and 'value rationality'. The latter may be seen in "the actions of persons who, regardless of possible cost to themselves, act to put into practice their convictions of what seems to them to be required by duty, honour, the pursuit of beauty, a religious call, personal loyalty, or the importance of some 'cause' no matter in what it consists". (16)

Rational calculation, for Weber, was a precondition for the capitalist mode of production; formal rationality was one of capitalism's most important characteristics. Weber derived from this principle of rationality four phenomena: the spirit of capitalism; the technical means with which an enterprise is managed; the system of authority which is a consequence of the capitalist mode of production, namely, bureaucracy; and, the social system. In the words of Joachim Israel "the phenomenon which Weber calls the 'spirit of capitalism', i.e. the values and attitudes of life, being intertwined with the bureaucratic system of power and authority, with the 'mathematizing' of decision-making processes both in private enterprises and in the public administration, and privately owned
means of production, control over the money and trade systems - all this Weber subsumes under the principle of formal rationality. Rationality has made capitalism possible, and capitalism builds upon it. For Marcuse formal rationality is not value-free at all, but is in itself "an ideology, a way of justifying the action of power-elites, dominating groups, a ruling class". Weber himself wrote that "the ultimate and only value is going to become a rational administration and distribution by functionaries, who determine the shaping of human affairs".

Writing of the origins of capitalism within a 'spirit of asceticism', Weber remarks that this spirit has left its shell for good. "As yet nobody knows who is going to live in this shell, and whether at the end of this unprecedented development completely new prophets will emerge, or whether there will be a powerful renaissance of old thoughts and ideas. If none of this happens, then a mechanized fossil might develop determined to take itself seriously in a convulsive way. For the 'last people' in this cultural development the word itself would instead become truth: Specialists without spirit, pleasure-seeking beings without a heart - these no-ones make themselves believe that they have risen to heights never before reached in the development of the human species." Here, even with value-free Weber, is the language of alienation, recalling Marx's Unmensch - the unmanned alienated man. To be a man, for Weber, implies an individualism, based upon rational, conscious action, and able to assume different roles, sometimes within the bureaucratic organisation, sometimes outside it. To quote Joachim Israel again, "to be a human being should mean to preserve one's ability to take the responsibility for one's acts, to be able to act consciously and with regard to the consequences of one's action - all that even if one is forced, as an 'expert' or 'organisational member', to act in a different way. Intellectual honesty, as a precondition for independent choices and for the will to take responsibility for the consequences of one's action, is a central part of
Weber's image of man."

Simmel, Lukács' teacher, saw the deepest problems in the modern world of mass society deriving from the claim of the individual to preserve his autonomy and individuality in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, external culture, and the 'technique of life'. In his Philosophy of Money (1907) he wrote: "The supplier, the creditor, the workers on whom one depends, do not appear as personalities, because their relations to oneself only involve one aspect, namely, to deliver goods, to lend money, to work, while other aspects which could lend a personal touch to the relationship cannot be taken into consideration." (22)

(One is reminded of Schumacher's subtitle for Small is Beautiful - a study of Economics as if people mattered. (23) But Simmel was concerned with what he called the 'objectionalisation' of men, and of the things they produce. For him, "the relation among men has become a relation among objects". He saw the individual's personality as a totality, split up by social developments. He puts the blame not on capitalism, but on the replacement of the exchange of goods by a money economy. (24)

Most of the writers so far considered saw themselves as philosophers, rather than as sociologists. As he grew older, Marx separated himself from the young philosopher of 1844, who could only talk about the world. Sociologists, however, intent on 'reifying' alienation tried to measure it, or at least the subjective feelings that accompany it. Talcott Parsons, for one, saw it as the opposite of conformity, something a sociologist might begin to grapple with, in contrast with Fromm's idea of an 'alienated society' in which the individual is an automaton conformist. (25) Seeman's article of 1959 illustrates an attempt to fit into one overall scheme all the different notions of alienation, including anomie. To measure alienation, Seeman redefined each aspect of it making it rest on the individual's subjective attitudes.

Joachim Israel believes that such psychologism is the
opposite pole of sociologism, as a "reified sociological theory". He quotes Durkheim's basic rule for sociological method: "the explanation of a social phenomenon by another social phenomenon, the explanation of a mass phenomenon by another mass phenomenon, rather than the explanation of a social phenomenon by individual phenomena". He refers us also to Popper's anti-psychologism, calling for sociology to make itself independent of psychology, since it has to explain undesired and acceptable consequences of human action, which can be done only by reference to social conditions. (26)

Seeman's summary, however, does still possess a value, in so far as it gives us a brief history of the various ways so many different writers have reacted to the impact on man of capitalism and industrialism. He begins with 'Powerlessness', which he takes from Marx, to whose name he adds those of Weber, Gouldner, and C. Wright Mills. Seeman defines it as: "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements he seeks." (27) (A popular variant of 'powerlessness' is 'domination', which even entered the vocabulary of the 1971 Synod of Bishops in Rome, who spoke in their statement on justice of "a world-wide network of domination, oppression and abuses which stifle freedom"). (28)

Seeman's second word is "Meaninglessness", which he associates with Adorno, Cantril, Hoffer, and Mannheim, to which list we may add the name of Frankl. Seeman offers this subjective definition, for purposes of attitude measurement: "a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made". (29) Mannheim, like Weber, saw society becoming ever more organised and rationalised. (30) As this happens individuals tend to lose their ability to think for themselves and act on their own initiative, because they cannot understand the events in which they are engaged. Frankl, in Man's Search for Meaning, and other works, has commented on the meaninglessness of existence in the concentration camps, an
experience he had shared. In such places, he believes, the idea of life in an intelligible world seemed very remote. As a psychiatrist Frankl devised the term 'logotherapy' for his attempts to restore mental health to patients; the Greek word logos, which we usually translate as 'Word', also conveys the idea of 'Meaning'. For Frankl, man's hunger for meaning is his strongest drive.

Adorno, and the other authors of The Authoritarian Personality, observed the irrational behaviour of those who experience meaninglessness, because they have identified their personalities with the society or ethnic group to which they belong. If they feel that the whole meaning of their society is threatened, they display irrational reactions in a number of ways, which can be linked together as a syndrome. They want strong leadership, even dictatorship - the Fascist reaction to chaos. They resent foreigners, aliens, who threaten the status quo; they make a scapegoat of them for anything that seems to be wrong with society. They become obsessed with any threat to the established sexual mores of society. In his study Adorno attempted to measure the authoritarianism (or liberalism) of respondents, by use of what he called the A-S- (Anti-Semitism), E- (Ethnocentrism) and F- (Fascist) scales, ranging the results along a continuum, with the extreme 'authoritarian personalities' at one end, and the extreme liberal or anarchist respondents at the other. (The findings show much more of syndrome at the authoritarian end of the continuum.)

Meaning plays a central part in the thought of Alfred Schutz, and of Luckmann and Berger. English translators remark, in their introduction to Structures of the Life World: "as Schutz emphasized many times, everyday life intrinsically involves the suspension of doubts concerning the reality of the world". Once a critical phenomenological attitude is taken up towards this 'reality', "the structures of the life-world become apprehended as the fabric of meaning taken for granted in the natural attitude, the basic content of what is unquestioned - and in this sense what is taken up as self-evident - that undergirds all social life and action". Peter Berger develops these
ideas in The Social Reality of Religion. Men who continue in false consciousness regarding the 'reality' of the 'world' are in a state of 'nomization' – the opposite of anomie. This takes place when men seek to construct, amidst the terrors of a chaotic universe, a 'sacred canopy' to shelter themselves. Religion can also result in 'de-alienation', if it preaches anarchy, or anti-nomianism. Berger describes the process by which the Judaeo-Christian religion moved away from the 'sacred canopy' and the distinction between sacred and profane, so that eventually our collective consciousness has become secularized. (35)

Weber saw the work of the prophet as that of effecting a 'break-through' to a new 'meaning' of reality. (36) A 'meaningless' world, such as Weber foresaw and Frankl witnessed, is one in which reality appears to have lost all intelligibility. There is a collapse of that fundamental 'life-world' which men share when they build a society together. Normlessness, or anomie, on the other hand, presupposes a more stable state of society, in which law and order are still accepted as values, but in which the norms, which men have agreed to follow, no longer seem to make sense in a given situation. Whereas the men who suffer from meaninglessness are compelled to reconstruct their world, those who suffer normlessness will try to adapt themselves to the world around them.

Seeman offers this definition of normlessness: "a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals." (37)

Durkheim, it seems, been made to appear much more of a conservative theorist that was actually the case, (38) introduced the idea of 'anomie', (which he derived from Guyau's L'Irreligion de L'Avenir) in The Division of Labour in Society (1893). In seeking to explain why 'organic solidarity', which accompanied the division of labour in industrial society, still produced conflict, he suggested that the division of labour does not everywhere produce cohesion, because it is in an anomic state. "The division of labour", he wrote, "produces solidarity only if it is spontaneous, and to the
degree that it is spontaneous. But by spontaneity we must understand not simply the absence of express and overt violence, but of anything that might, even indirectly, shackle the free employment of the social force that each person carries in himself."

In Suicide (1897) Durkheim distinguished three motives: Egoistic, when suicide results from man's no longer finding a basis for existence in life; altruistic, when the basis for a man's existence appears to be situated beyond life itself; and anomic when man's activity lacks regulation and he suffers in consequence. Durkheim himself touches on the problem of meaningness, when he writes that while egoistic suicide, as well as anomic, springs from society's insufficient presence in individuals, "the sphere of its absence is not the same in both cases. In egoistic suicide it is deficient in truly collective activity, thus depriving the latter of object and meaning. In anomic suicide, society's influence is lacking in the basically individual passions, thus leaving them without a check-rein". (40) Egoistic suicide, we are told, draws its chief recruits from intellectuals; anomic suicide from the industrial or commercial world. Anomic suicide rates tend to increase during economic slumps. "In periods of social disintegration", (Joachim Israel suggests) "when the individual's ties to his groups and to society in general are weakened, a crisis occurs. This may be the case either in periods of economic depression or when there is prosperity - traditional customs are weakened and the social control mechanisms which tend to keep society in balance are put out of order." As Israel concludes: "Whereas in individual-oriented theories of alienation the societal forces become too strong and thus prevent the individual from realizing himself, in society-oriented theories the strength of societal norms prevents alienation. Its weakening leads to chaos. Durkheim maintains that in such situations there are no rules which define what is possible and what is not possible, right or wrong, which demands are normal and which are excessive; and therefore there are no limits to what a subject can demand." (41)
The idea of anomie was further developed by Merton who notes that those who fall victim to the contradiction in American society between "the cultural emphasis on pecuniary ambition and the social bars to full opportunity" may become alienated from the social structure, and become ready candidates for rebellion. "But others, and this appears to include the great majority, may attribute their difficulties to more mystical and less sociological sources.... In such a society (a society suffering from anomie) people tend to put stress on mysticism: the workings of Fortune, Chance, Luck."(42)

Next on Seeman's list comes Isolation, which he defines as the state of those who, like the intellectual, "assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society". He attributes this idea of alienation to Nettler. Perhaps the best known literary example of this intellectual isolation is to be found in The Outsider by Camus. In a later article Seeman has called this kind of alienation 'cultural isolation', and he devised the term 'social isolation' for the expectation among individuals and groups, such as the elderly, that they will be unable to establish relationships with the society around them.(43) One suggestion which Seeman would not accept was that of a group at Whittier College, to the effect that alienation should be seen as a process, starting with powerlessness, and leading on to isolation. Whether we speak of alienation or of anomie, we are thinking of the weakening of social bonds, and therefore of a growing tendency towards isolation, and to an accompanying feeling of loneliness, as described by Riesman.(44)

Last word on Seeman's list is Self-estrangement, defined by him as "the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards". He refers to The Sane Society by Fromm, where the notion of alienation is associated with the loss of 'intrinsic Meaning' or pride in work.(45) Seeman refers also to C. Wright Mills, and, Riesman.(46)
In *Alienation and Freedom* (1964) Blauner looked at alienation in work. Alienation exists, for him, when workers are unable to control their immediate work processes (Powerlessness), to develop a sense of purpose and function which connects their jobs to the overall organisation of production (Meaninglessness), to belong to integrated work communities (Isolation), and when they fail to become involved in the activity of work as a mode of personal self-expression (Self-estrangement). Blauner places somewhat restricted interpretations on each of Seeman's categories, while adopting a subjective and therefore quantifiable approach. What Marx saw as 'alienated labour' went far beyond any discussion of job satisfaction, or any 'feeling' that one's work is not intrinsically satisfying or self-directed or meaningful, or self-expressive for the worker.

Seeman has had his fair share of critics, notably Schacht, who cannot accept this method of lumping together in one list so many contradictory uses of the one word, alienation. Horton likewise rejects Seeman's list, especially the inclusion of 'Normlessness'. For him Seeman's approach dehumanizes the whole concept of alienation, and anomie, by relegating them simply to social psychological expectations. He prefers to see the two expressions as the metaphors of Marx and Durkheim, respectively, for the human repercussions of the dominant institutions and values of industrial society. Durkheim, according to Horton, concentrated on the barriers to an orderly functioning of society, thrown up when some of the individuals who compose it find it hard to adapt themselves to change. Marx, on the other hand, saw in alienation a barrier to the productive growth of individuals, and, by extension, to the adaptive changes needed in the social system.

Berger, too, sees alienation as a phenomenon "entirely different from anomie". Anomie he describes as a radical separation from the social world, by which the individual loses his 'orientation in experience', and may lose even his sense of reality and identity. By their membership of society, "a meaningful order, or nomos, is imposed upon
the discrete experiences and meaning of individuals. Marriage is one such nomos-building institution, "a social arrangement that creates for the individual the sort of order in which he can experience his life as making sense". Another such institution is religion, a "bulwark against the terrors of anomie", a "powerful agency of nomination". Religion is also, Berger believes, the most powerful agency of alienation, and of false consciousness, in which a man thinks his world is something imposed upon him, "by the gods, or by nature, or by the forces of history", instead of being something he is constructing himself. (50)

This review of the literature of alienation could go on almost indefinitely, especially were one to include the use made of 'alienation' by Tillich and other theologians. As one writer, C.S. Fischer, has remarked recently, "Alienation no doubt ranks as one of the most frequently used terms in sociology. It probably also stands as the most frequently misused, abused, and misconstrued term in sociology". (51) Like Seeman and others (52) he attempts to bring together the contributions of the normative philosophers and the would-be empiricists, with what he calls their "statistical porridge". He suggests as a definition of alienation: "the state in which the actor fails to perceive a positive interdependence between himself and social relationships or other objectifications". (53) Fischer suggests that four implications which may be drawn from this definition, which will assist research procedures are: "(1) Alienation is a cognitive state, and, therefore, investigators should attempt to measure the perceptions and understandings of their subjects (rather than feelings, beliefs, behaviours, etc). (2) In most investigations, the object or referent of alienation should be specified. Alienation is from something. (3) Other relationships between ego and object should be measured separately - e.g., evaluation, objective connection. (4) The specifics of the alienation should also be measured: ego's sense of control, of benefit, of nil relationship, or of negative relationship." (54)
Fischer's insistence on cognition takes us back both to Berger's sociology of knowledge, and to Marx, with his suggestion that all alienation begins with the idea of God which people have in their heads. One need not accept the atheism of Feuerbach or be a Marxist to agree with this observation. Weber wrote that the conflict between empirical reality and the prophet's conception of the world as a meaningful totality, which is based on the religious postulate, produces the strongest tensions in man's inner life, as well as in his external relationship to the world. Marx, in 1844, had written that "Every alienation of man from himself and from Nature appears in the relation which he postulates between other men and himself and Nature. Thus religious alienation is necessarily exemplified in the relation between laity and priests, or, since it is here a question of the spiritual world, between the laity and a mediator". What Marx put his finger on here was the inmost problem facing not just the 'world' of today, but also the Church, and its priesthood, and all the work involved in trying to prepare candidates for a priesthood appropriate to that world. The mediator seeks to bridge a gap, not make a barrier. Yet all too often, as we shall see, he finds that gap, not just between himself and the laity, but even within himself.

Clearly there is a vast amount more to be said about the modern world than we have examined under the heading of alienation. Yet Seeman's article of 1959, for all its faults and its attempt to achieve the impossible, does remain a useful summary, with its five key words, of the reflections of philosophers, sociologists, and psychologists, on the impact on man of the industrial and urban revolution. For the purposes of this study of the socialization of future priests, this list will be retained, bearing in mind all the qualifications which have been suggested, as a series of starting points for an examination of the Church today, and of the leadership of that Church.

As we shall see, one of the articles referred to, that of Horton in the British Journal of Sociology for December
1964 (see Note 49) came, in the course of this study, to play a particularly important part in determining the shape of the enquiries pursued. Alienation, for Horton, is a Utopian concept of the radical left, while Anomie is basically a Utopian concept of the political right. "Whatever the particular meanings, anomie is a social state of normlessness or anarchy; the concept always focuses on the relationships between individuals and the constraining forces of social control....Alienation represents less a problem of the adequacy of social control than the legitimacy of social control; alienation is a problem of power defined as domination, a concept conspicuously absent from the anomie perspective. Anomie concentrates on culture or culture transmitted in social organisation; alienation on the hierarchy of control in the organisation itself. This critical focus of alienation is on whatever social conditions separate the individual from society as an extension of self through self-activity, rather than as an abstract entity independent of individual selves." (op. cit. p. 295.)

One final quotation to conclude this review of literature may be taken from the most recent article to appear on alienation, in which the author discusses the difficulties associated with the term. "Difficulties are not produced by the theory: rather it reveals how they underlie the most simple of descriptions and self-evident of facts." (57)

And Entfremdung, it has been suggested, was, for Marx, an observable fact. (58)
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WHAT KIND OF CHURCH?

The Church, we are told by the Rector of the Gregorian University in Rome, is one of the most complex forms of institutionalisation known to sociologists, embracing elements which deal with the history of origins, with beliefs, with rites, with norms of behaviour, with the world of symbols, integrated into "a dynamic synthesis which for the most part eludes empirical analysis"\(^1\). Since Vatican II there has been a profuse theological literature on the subject, but this is not the place to enter into theology, except to note that the word we use in English for this complex body derives from the late Greek word *Kyriakon*, 'the Lord's house', (which became *Kirche* in German and *Kirk* in Scottish usage). The French word *Église*, on the other hand, like the Hebrew *Qahal* comes from the classical Greek *ekklesia*, meaning "the assembly of the citizens of a city"\(^2\).

The Church today assembles together the citizens of a society such as has been described in the previous chapter. They are citizens, in this country at least, with all the fears and the hopes of industrial society in its present stage of development. The various ways these people may be affected in their consciousness and behaviour by this society, as suggested by Marx or Weber or Durkheim or Freud, or many other writers, will all be assembled in the Church. Not all perhaps are alienated in the way that Marx described in 1844, separated from their true selves by self-surrender to the forces of capitalism. Since Marx wrote his manuscripts, many of the workers have come to agree with him that religion is the opium of the people, and have abandoned the Church. Many have agreed with Marx not only that alienation begins with God, but that the Church itself is the supreme force of domination in the world\(^3\).

The Church today, on the other hand, is increasingly

\* \textit{references} begin p. 26
conscious of the powerlessness of many of its members. It has felt obliged to recall its founder's explicit instructions not to be like "the great men among the pagans, who like to make their authority felt". It sees its task in terms of *DIAKONIA*, servanthood, or ministry, "strengthening the seams of human society". It claims to elevate man, instead of diminishing him. Yet the Church, as many of its members prefer, is still a powerful well-organised institution, controlling ideas and behaviour, exercising a formidable influence at every level of politics. There is no easy prescription for the kind of Church a powerless people need, which can offer them a genuinely spiritual dignity and power, without thereby itself acquiring excessive power, wished on to it by the people themselves. Like the Church in Latin America a Church for our own society today needs to learn what is valuable in the various other agencies of radical reform. Like the Marxists it needs to analyse the situation, in order to re-create a genuinely human consciousness among the masses.

When it comes to meaninglessness, the Church finds itself in a world which may not be as unpredictable as that of the concentration camps, described by Frankl, or more recently by Solzhenitsyn, but which may well have in its bloodstream something of that same insanity, nurtured on racism and the unsettling effects of rapid inflation and heavy unemployment. When a shared world 'meaning' collapses, a prophet is needed. The Church of Vatican II has been recalled to its prophetic role, in which every member of the Church is called to participate. This widespread prophetic vocation may sound at odds with Weber's notion of the prophet, as "an individual bearer of charisma, who, by virtue of his mission, proclaims a religious doctrine or divine commandment". Such revelation involves, both for the prophet and for his followers, a unified view of the world, derived, says Weber, from a "consciously integrated meaningful attitude to life". To the prophet, he continues, "both the life of man and the world, both social and cosmic events must be
oriented, if it is to bring salvation, and after which it must be patterned in an integrally meaningful manner".

For the Church today one problem is the recent collapse of just such an integrated world view, under the impact of secularization and pluralism of culture in society. In her efforts to stop the break-up, the Church still tends at times to earn a reputation for obscurantism rather than prophecy. Pope John, nevertheless, was prophet enough for many even outside his own communion. In his encyclical letter on peace, written not long before his death, this Pope referred to the need of the Church to read the signs of the times, a phrase taken up by Vatican II. In Gaudium et Spes, for instance, the bishops of the Council describe the Church's work as being like Christ's - to serve, and not be served. "To carry out such a task", they tell us, "the Church has always had the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times, and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospels". Later on they comment that this duty of reading the signs helps us to find not only God's will but God himself, "in the happenings, needs and desires in which his People has part, along with other men of our age. For faith throws a new light on everything, manifests God's design for man's total vocation, and thus directs the mind to solutions which are fully human".

The process of "reading the signs of the times in the light of the Gospel" (and of reading the Gospel, too, in the light of the signs of the times) involves the Church in more than analysis and prophetic announcement. As Schillebeeckx has put it, "the Church has for centuries devoted her attention to formulating truths, and meanwhile did almost nothing to better the world. In other words, the Church focussed on orthodoxy and left orthopraxis in the hands of non-members and non-believers". As with powerlessness, meaninglessness demands action from the Church more than words, and action first and foremost in her own behaviour and procedure.
Notwithstanding Durkheim’s assumption that Catholics at the turn of the century tended to be better integrated into their religious community than Protestants, a Catholic Church for today must certainly expect to include in its membership large numbers of people who suffer from ‘anomie’. These will comprise those who still basically accept the Church, and its authority, but who for a variety of reasons are discontented with the present liturgical, doctrinal, and, moralistic norms put forward by the Church and its leaders. In 1961 Conor Ward sought to answer the question as to whether Catholics still preserved a shield against ‘anomie’ and he concluded that this could be said only of a small nucleus of parishioners. Catholics today, after Vatican II, are often in a state of upheaval, dismayed at the constant innovations in their Church, frequently introduced to them in a language code they do not comprehend. Rahner and Spencer have both suggested that the Church is facing heavy numerical losses, if not disintegration.

To assemble those who suffer from ‘anomie’, the Church needs to cater not only for those who display the symptoms of this disease, such as suicide, alcoholism, drug addiction, crime and delinquency, or simply large scale lapsation from the ranks of both laity and clergy. The situation demands what Pope Paul himself has called a "new conscience for our times". In Populorum Progressio he was thinking of a conscience extending out to global dimensions. But the phrase he used can be taken much further, into an examination of conscience itself, and the attendant process of ‘conscientization’ adumbrated by Friere. ‘Awareness-creation’ on the part of the universal Church, not only for her own members, but for all mankind, is possibly a long cry from the present confusion of the Catholic conscience, struggling loose from the authoritarianism Durkheim depicted. It demands of the Church a long re-apprenticeship in the schools of moral and adult education.

When it comes to the problems of self-estrangement, and inauthenticity, the Church may feel more at home. For
centuries it has preached the possibility of holiness to its members, while tending to keep a realistic attitude towards the sinfulness of most of them. Holiness judging from the canonisation of saints, seems to belong more to the religious state than to the secular clergy or the laity. This was certainly true when holiness was identified with otherness, with transcendence rather than immanence. Holiness was out of this world, despite the implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

Holiness, however, may also be written as wholeness. The Greek word pleroma, implying fullness, completeness, or wholeness, is to be found in the prologue to St. John's Gospel, and several times in St. Paul's epistles, where Christ is called the 'fullness' of God, and the Church the 'fullness' of Christ. This Greek concept, adopted by the New Testament writers, suggests today the ideal of human fulfilment, the antithesis of alienation, and especially of self-estrangement. It suggests the fullest development of every human potential. As Moltmann remarks, in the relationship of man, society and nature to the meaning of life, "liberation means a significant life filled with the sense of the whole".

One important aspect of this wholeness, which we might expect a Church to be offering to all mankind, is the development of man's potential for prayer. Mystical or contemplative prayer has long been regarded as the preserve of a select few in the Church, but today we witness the phenomenon of many Christians turning to Eastern religions for their prayer and meditation, in ignorance almost of the riches their own tradition contains. Bonhoeffer believed that the only credible God for today is the God of the mystics, the God known not so much by reason but by direct religious experience. The current upsurge of the so-called charismatic renewal movement is one illustration of the appetite for such experience many Church members feel. Commenting on Berger's belief that 'impressive rediscovery' of the supernatural is unlikely, Voillaume writes that such a prediction may indeed be reasonable, "but reasonable
is precisely what the irruption of the Word of God in human history and the ways of the Kingdom are not." (24)

Isolation, finally, calls to the Church to be once more a koinonia, fellowship, communion, not a collection of individuals meeting in the Kyriakon but a true Qahal; not as in the Middle Ages an assembly of the entire community, but a meeting of members of the overall community concerned for the overall community, and not just for their own sub-cultural survival. In their coming together, to be the Church of Christ, who prayed for human unity, the members of such an assembly might be expected not only to pray for that goal, but to work out together what a Christlike sense of community, based on love and on justice, would entail in practice, given the forces of alienation at work disintegrating existing human links.

One danger facing such a Church is that of becoming a small elitist body of atypical citizens, who choose to go against the trend of 'privatisation'. (25) Berger sees religion in our society becoming increasingly the province of the elderly, the immigrants, the very young, with no impact on the industrial 'heart-land' of the nation. (26) A Church which does the work of Christ the King must be, paradoxically, the Church of Christ the servant, the Church which understands kenosis, and finds itself at home in Durkheim's 'dust of individuals'. Kingdom should suggest an open community, not the imperial closed-shop of Byzantium. (27)
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WHAT KIND OF LEADERSHIP?

Given that the world we are moving into is marked by powerlessness, meaninglessness, anomie, self-estrangement, and isolation, and that such a world requires a Church capable of offering power to the powerless, meaning to the meaningless, conscience to the normless, wholeness to the self-estranged, and community to the isolated, we would expect the leadership appropriate to such a Church to be distinguished by the ability to give a lead in all these tasks. Leaders of a Church in a world of powerlessness should not themselves be dominating figures, but men (or women) capable of offering genuine participation in the life of the Church to all its members, to lead the whole Church towards playing its part effectively as an agency for giving power to all the members of human society. Similarly, leaders of a Church in a world of meaninglessness should not themselves be obscurantists, persisting in repetition of dogmas which no longer hold any meaning for the mass of Church members; these leaders should, on the contrary, be to some degree prophetic figures capable of leading the whole Church towards the fulfilment of its prophetic role, offering a meaningful interpretation of phenomena to the masses of mankind. In our modern world it is more than ever necessary that prophetic words should be given credibility by a prophetic life style.

In the same way the leaders of the Church should offer their members a new conscience for our times, which implies a true knowledge of those times, and of the problems facing the masses of ordinary people. Such leadership needs to be well versed in the arts of counselling and of conscientization. Similarly the leadership of a Church which professes to offer wholeness to the self-estranged needs itself to be well integrated, whole, genuinely fulfilled, contemplative. And lastly, the lead-
ership of the Church needs to give the example of authentic community life, in which vertical and horizontal communications, and feedback from communications, are all working well, if it seeks to lead the Church to communicate with the increasingly isolated and privatized members of industrial society, if they wish to see mankind re-integrated.

Here are the ideal characteristics of the leadership required, and we must obviously be both realistic and patient in waiting for such leadership to emerge, especially when the members of industrial society want something quite different. In one discussion of religious leadership in industrial societies (1) it has been suggested that only the priest is genuinely relevant to such societies — unlike the founder, the reformer, the prophet, the seer, the magician, or the saint. (2) For in a society built on rationality, the leadership considered relevant will itself be the rationalising priesthood, pegging down with institutions the vision of the prophet. According to Weber (3), as religion became more organised under the influence of priestly castes, the power of the priesthood could effectively suppress or destroy the original domestic cult, and with it the priestly function of the head of the family. In Egypt the priesthood was marked, Weber tells us, by an extensive rationalism. The cult of the sun was a magical coercion of the god, "to be compared with the work of a Catholic priest exercising the power of the keys". Weber saw such coercion as the original, though not exclusive origin of the "orgiastic and mimetic components of the religious cult, especially of song, dance, drama, and the typical fixed formulae of prayer". (4)

With the development of sacrifice, the term 'priest' came to be applied to a "regularly organised and permanent enterprise concerned with influencing the gods", in contrast with the individual and occasional efforts of magicians. This gradual transition was characterised by the presence of certain fixed cultic centres. The emergence of a rational metaphysic and a religious ethic
generally presupposed the operation of one or both of two forces outside the priesthood - prophets, the bearers of metaphysical or religious-ethical revelation; and the laity, the non-priestly devotees of the cult. Both priest and prophet claimed a personal call, or vocation. The priest laid claim to his authority by virtue of his service in a sacred tradition; the prophet based his claim on personal service and charisma. It was no accident, for Weber, that so few prophets had emerged from the priestly class. The typical prophet, he wrote, propagates ideas for their own sake, not for fees.

In striving to maintain its power the priesthood, Weber believes, "must frequently meet the needs of the laity, and come to grips with three forces operating within the laity". One of these is prophecy; another traditionalism; the third lay intellectualism. If a prophet does succeed in introducing a new doctrine, the priesthood has to codify it, or else codify the old doctrine, (if it still maintains itself despite the prophet's attack). The priesthood determines what is sacred, what is profane; it has to infuse its own views into the religion of the laity, if it is to secure its own position. "The more a priesthood aimed to regulate the behavioral patterns of the laity, in accordance with the will of the god, and especially to aggrandize its status and income by so doing, the more it had to com­promise with the traditional views of the laity in formu­lating patterns of doctrine and behaviour. This was particularly the case where no great prophetic preaching had developed, which might have wrenched the faith of the masses from its bondage to traditions based upon magic".

As a man gets drawn more and more into the vortex of industrial society, he finds his religious ideas approximating to those of a pygmy, according to Mary Douglas. Pygmies believe in spontaneity, friendship, freedom, and goodness of heart. They reject formality, magic, doctrinal logic-chopping and condemnation of fellow human beings for their wrong doings.
using Bernstein's terminology, sees ritual as a form of 'restricted code'. This she contrasts with a purely ethical religion. The modern Church, she believes, is advocating such a religion despite her "vast unlettered flocks scattered over the globe", who may still prefer an easily located deity to more intangible ethics.\(^{(9)}\)

In the quest for aggiornamento, one might say, the Church is catching up with the industrial revolution, moving out of magic into a priestly codification of the laity's preferences. The priest succeeds the magician, when what may be needed is a prophet.\(^{(10)}\)

In a review of the literature of the role of the clergy today, Budd notes the decline in prestige of the churches, and the way this affects the prestige of ministers.\(^{(11)}\) Many surveys, she remarks, report a dislike of the clergy, and of organized religion. The clergy make efforts to break away from associations with hypocrisy, with an easy job, with the ruling classes, despite the resistance they encounter from church hierarchies and their congregations. In the United States many clergy are turning to counselling and psychiatry. Those who see the Christian message as a challenge to existing society have failed to notice the pressure on clergy both from church officials, and from parishioners, "to build large, united and financially viable congregations, which entails that survival goals triumph over the original doctrinal ones". This author comments that one of the organisational strengths of Catholicism lies in its 'institutional sub-specialization' when it comes to dealing with radical clergy and religious.

Schillebeeckx writes of conflict-situation for the priest today, so severe that "for some it amounts to panic".\(^{(12)}\) The 'identity crisis' felt by priests is due, in his opinion, "not to their own pride or laxity but to something objective, the structure in which they have to work", in a society no longer feudal, but urbanised and secularised, in which the priest encounters widespread anti-institutional feelings, and a reaction against every ideology which "seeks to rationalise its
position of power". Schillebeeckx suggests that it is possible to re-structure the Church to overcome this crisis of the clergy, provided two extremes are avoided: clericalisation, which identifies the Church with Church authorities; and secularisation, which denies that officials are in any way set aside from the community. The Church authorities, he believes, must pay more attention to the behavioral sciences, and in particular to the sociology of the Christian community, with special reference to vertical communications.

The reference to clericalisation has been echoed by Illich in 1967. The present pastoral structures have, for him, been determined largely by ten centuries of clerical and celibate priesthood. In future the cleric will be replaced by an 'ordained layman', an official who will be principally the minister of the sacrament and the word, not "the jack-of-all-trades; superficially responding to a bewildering variety of social and psychological roles".

Studies of priests 'in crisis' have been made, notably in Canada, the United States, and Spain. The Spanish study of 2,000 priests, found 66% were "critical of the hierarchy's approach to leadership". Of the priests under 30, 84.7% were critical. In Spain the pattern of recruitment to the priesthood had been changing, with more coming from the towns, and less from the rural areas, where a greater religious conservatism might have been expected. In America one study by Koval and Bell examined the motives of priests who left the ministry, which proved to be: (i) lack of leadership by the hierarchy; (ii) the Church's attitude to social and moral questions; and, (iii) the slowness of renewal after Vatican II. In another study of tensions among Catholic and Protestant clergy, Koval found that only 10% of Catholic priests leaving the ministry did so in order to get married; only 1% of the Protestant clergy gave up because of marital problems.

The study of the Catholic priesthood commissioned
Opinion Research Centre, under Greely, worked on a sample of one-third of the clerical population, (5,200 priests, 800 former priests, and 250 bishops). (17) This study concluded that the major source of clerical dissatisfaction was the way the clergy were dealt with by authority. Departures from the ministry, however, tended to be unconnected with this dissatisfaction. What this study revealed was a link between resignations and an "inability on the part of those resigning priests to make relationships with other people". This inability showed a connection with special circumstances in the priest's family of origin. A substantially higher proportion of priests resigning than of priests remaining turned out, for instance, to be first children in their families. (44% of resigned diocesan priests.) Resigning clergy tended to come from a higher socio-economic background, and a higher educational background. Another factor was ethnic origin. While 39% of active diocesan priests and 49% of Bishops were Irish in origin (as compared with 34% of American Catholic males) only 17% of resigning priests were Irish in origin. While 7% of active priests were Anglo-Saxon, 11% of those resigning were Anglo-Saxon. The Anglo-Saxon were more likely than the Irish to have been born of mixed marriages. Resigned priests reported other sources of strain at home, such as divorce or death of parents, the emotional strain of religious differences, alcoholism, or mother going out to work. While 29% of resigning diocesan priests reported strain between their parents, only 17% of 'actives' did so. (Resigning priests - and non-resigning Bishops - were both more likely than others to have come from large cities.)

What this American study could not establish was any connection between the age at which a student entered the seminary, and his subsequent attitudes or behaviour. A test of personality orientation found 'actives' falling between 'normal' and 'self-actualized'. Resigned priests came slightly higher in their scores for 'self-actualization'. As a whole the clergy were found to be 'low' (compared with 'normal') in sensitivity of response to their own needs and feelings. This suggests they found it hard to react without
rigid adherence to principles; hard to accept their own natural aggressiveness; and hard to develop intimate relationships with other people.

While priests who did resign often reported a 'binge of health', (to use a phrase of Karen Horney's) after the difficult and painful decision to free themselves from a situation in which they had not been happy, one in five of active priests were found to be 'under-self-actualized' - very passive and unlikely to assert themselves in a way that would be "conducive to a healthy reaction to reality". The clergy are not neurotic misfits, the report suggests, but they do not seem to be the kind of men who would make charismatic leaders.

90% of resignations were of priests under 45, and most of them came in the 36-45 age-group. 'Loneliness' and 'youthfulness', separately or together, came first in the explanations given by priests for wanting to get married; other reasons were 'values, 'personality', and 'lack of work satisfaction'. The main reason priests gave for deciding to stay put was a 'sense of vocation', and 'happiness experienced in their work'. Three per cent. announced that they intended to leave in the future; 22% of priests under 35 were uncertain. On the other hand 55% of diocesan clergy, and 62% of religious were 'definitely staying'. The study adds that whatever the hidden causes of the ability of priests to cope with celibacy, without being lonely, they were not related to the personality variables as measured by the Personality Orientation scale.

One needs to state these United States figures against the world figures for resignations from the priesthood supplied by the Roman Congregation responsible for priests. While the world-wide Catholic population has grown in recent years, the overall number of priests remained remarkably steady. In 1963, 167 priests asked to be laicised. Between 1965 and 1970 requests for laicisation went up by 25% each year, reaching 3,800 in 1970. It has been estimated that about half this number of priests left the ministry unofficially. (18)
Out of the NORC 6,000, 719 priests were selected for a psychological study, directed by Kennedy. (19) Of these 240 were unwilling to take part, 111 did not respond, 97 were eliminated for various reasons, and in the end 271 completed the interview. The conclusion reached was that while the priests of the U.S. were 'ordinary' men, many of their conflicts and challenges arose because they were ordinary men "who may have to live as though they were not ordinary at all". A large proportion of the sample had not "developed to full maturity". "The selection and training process may have tended to mask rather than reveal the lack of development in many of the candidates for the priesthood." (The NORC study, while finding no significant correlation between seminary experience and subsequent behaviour, did admit some possible confirmation "of the argument that seminary training does inhibit development of capacity to respond to one's emotions", and "may limit development of the capacity for intimate contact with others." ) The training process, according to Kennedy, rewarded conformity, passivity to the regulations and authority, as well as willingness to stay away from any normal developmental experiences, such as dating and a 'normal social life'.

What Kennedy terms 'maldeveloped' priests tended to come from 'poor early family backgrounds'; in every case there had been a major disruption of accepted family patterns. (Many of the priests had strong over-protective mothers, with whom they had over-identified.) A breakdown in later life, the report suggests, could be an ultimate effort to communicate to the world around. The 'underdeveloped' made up the largest segment of priests in the study. These "have not achieved the kind of growth which current psychological theory would expect from a group of men of their chronological age and vocational ability". They were unable to form a "significant relationship without fear of loss of the self". For many there had never been a conscious vocational choice, based on their own interests and abilities. The decision to go to the seminary was made by others and at a very early age. Their
lives had been shaped by the expectations of others.

A third recent American study was carried out by Hall and Schneider of Yale University, at the request of the diocese of Hartford, Connecticut. What struck these two non-Catholic researchers were two features of the priesthood which it seemed to them, made this calling unique among professional careers. One was the degree of personal involvement a priest must have in his priesthood. It is a "total style of life". The other was the Church's bureaucratic organisation. If the Church does not represent a completely total institution, they wrote, it does come closer to Goffman's criteria than do most other organisations in which professional workers are found. Priests, according to these authors, are greatly changed, as they operate within the framework of the Church.

In this study 550 questionnaires were sent out, with 373 eventually completed. 95 respondents were selected at random for interview, of whom 72 were interviewed. Of these a substantial proportion appeared to have made "important and difficult career choices during the years generally spent fantasising about a wide range of careers" - i.e. in childhood, or up to the end of high school. Over a third made their life-long commitment before they were 18.

The average level of 'psychological success' among assistant priests was found to be 'quite low'. Both at ordination, and on first taking charge of a parish of their own, priests felt a lack of preparation and training. In priests' first appointments as assistants, the study detected "an absence of ability to choose challenging goals for themselves, and a lack of opportunity to work autonomously at their own tasks". For many curates the activities they performed were not those of most importance to them. They reported a failure to attain work goals, and a lack of feedback of success. Priests tended to blame not themselves for their failures, but the Church, or the system. Authority seemed to be the one constant factor in a priest's life. Younger priests laid stress on shared authority, open communication, community involvement,
personal development, and a closer link between the Church and the problems of contemporary society.

An on-going study of 'vocation' is being carried out by Rulla. In an introductory work he distinguishes the cultic or priestly element in the 'priesthood' of the Catholic Church, and the prophetic element. (23) Asking whether the priesthood in any way essentially influences the total existence of the man who possesses it, he writes: "it is the prophetic calling which constitutes a calling that lays claim upon the total existence of the one called; in other words, a priestly ministry is not firstly defined by its function related to consecration, cult, or sacraments, not by a ministerial ontological power, but by its socio-ecclesial function. Because the reason for his priesthood is the proclamation of the word of God, the priest, since the beginning, acquires a missionary characteristic, and is in advance ordained towards a community. (24)

The Church sees herself as always in need of reform and renewal, always in need of the new prophetic breakthrough. Many of the present problems of the priesthood may be seen to arise not from the inherent task of leadership of the Christian community in this or any other age, but in the process of institutionalisation and priestly rationalising bureaucracy which Weber indicated. If priesthood as such is conservative, prophethood revolutionary, what the priesthood has conserved is often excellent, yet much of it is still adapted to a by-gone age. This is true especially of what we call clericalism, that peculiar mentality and life-style which grew up in the early Middle Ages, when feudalism divided men into those who fought, those who worked, and those who prayed. Clericalism has been enforced by celibacy, and by the seminary system of training, keeping young men away from 'the world' in their formative years. To lead the Church today into its modern tasks, the leadership must be shared by the whole community in different ways.
The priest, as president of the Eucharistic Qahal, is still by custom, in the Catholic West, a celibate male. Yet many of the ministries in the Church today, such as prophecy and teaching, are carried out by men or women, of all ages and conditions. If there is still a call in the Church for a full-time minister at the service of all the ministries, it is increasingly seen as one among many leadership functions, one special way of sharing the priesthood of Christ. (25) As one Church leader wrote in 1967, "the supreme danger for the priest, as for any other man, is failure of growth, failure to grow in the service of the community. Each one of us is the Church in miniature, and just as Christ must grow in the Church, so he must grow in each of us by our human efforts identified with his divine action, "until we come to the perfect Man, fully mature with the fullness of Christ himself". (Eph. 4, 13) (26)
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Chapter IV

WHAT KIND OF PREPARATION WILL THAT LEADERSHIP REQUIRE?

The Council of Trent in the 16th century decided that priests should in future be educated in seminaries, instead of by the medieval system, in which candidates were trained either by parish priests, or in Universities. (1) The ideal of Trent was a preliminary education in a minor or junior seminary, from about the age of 11, followed by a course in Philosophy and Theology in a major or senior seminary. One important rule in the seminary was that it was intended only for prospective priests. Some of the older junior seminaries in England, such as Ushaw and St. Edmund's, Ware did in fact include a number of 'lay' boys, and in Ireland the junior seminary as such was replaced by a diocesan college, run by secular priests, and catering for future priests and laymen alike. With the extension of the senior seminary course to six years, a student might well find himself in one college, junior and senior, for as long as thirteen years, before his ordination. (2)

The decree of Vatican II on 'priestly formation' still favours minor seminaries, while recognizing "the excellence of other schools", and recognizing also the importance of so-called 'late vocations'. (3) The decree lays down categorically that major seminaries are necessary for priestly formation. (4) In the seminaries students are to be made ready for the ministry in its various aspects – of the word, of worship, and of a 'shepherd'. Every programme of instruction is to be joined with "practical implementation" and directed towards the pastoral goal of the seminary. The seminary staff are to be chosen "from among the best". They are to be prepared painstakingly for their task. The decrees call for the future priests to be given very careful training in celibacy. (5)

* references begin p. 53
Even before these decrees appeared the ferment of Vatican II had begun to make itself felt in seminaries around the world. Initial reforms and revisions began to lead on to more radical ideas. In 1969, for instance, a report was published from a Congress, in Rome, of "National Vocations Directors", (priests who had been given responsibility in various countries for the encouragement of boys and men who wanted to become priests, because they thought they had a vocation for this work). (6) One point the directors noted was that students for the priesthood were expected to make a definite commitment before they entered the seminary; yet there seemed to be a universal fear among young people of making any kind of permanent commitment at the age of 18-20. Young people treated the seminaries with suspicion, as far too enclosed. One significant point was made in the report - seminaries should be seen no longer as places but rather as a time of formation.

In 1970 the Roman Congregation responsible for the education of future priests issued what was called the *Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis* - a basic plan for priestly formation. (7) This was to be a basis for different national plans, which had to be drawn up by the authorities in each country, approved by Rome, and then imposed. While some countries immediately set to work to produce such a plan, it was felt better in England to wait some time until the full implications of Vatican II could be properly digested. Pressure was then applied from Rome for the English *Ratio Nationalis* to be completed.

In 1973, Cardinal Garrone, a French prelate placed over the Congregation dealing with seminaries, complained of the way the Church in some countries had departed from the lines worked out for them at Vatican II. (9) They were paying dearly for their rashness, he said, having in mind perhaps the seminaries in his own land by then largely denuded of students. For the Cardinal, critics of seminaries had been linked "with those who deny that the priesthood has any ontological roots, and who see
it simply as a function in the Church delegated by the community to a layman." (10) Trent, he thought, never shut the door on further evolution — but simply drew the conclusions from the nature of the priesthood, which it had re-affirmed against Martin Luther. New ideas had been integrated into the seminary system, such as the 'personalisation' of educative work, student participation, and the importance of "keeping in touch with reality". But there was a world of difference, the Cardinal insisted, between 'creativity', and abandonment of the system.

In the same issue of the magazine Seminarium, two other writers complained of new ideas. (11) One attacked the notion of the seminary being replaced by a system in which the students lived together in small groups; the other condemned the French plan of sending the students out on stages — periods of time away from the seminary in the middle of the course, intended to give the students greater experience of ordinary life, and especially of the world of the worker. For the writer such stages were "a pseudo-experience of life". The distinction between the seminary as a place and as a period of time was also frowned upon. One innovation the magazine did approve was the idea of ecumenical seminaries; a young American priest working in the Roman Congregation wrote of these as a way of "breaking down ancient barriers". (12)

In Germany the ideas of Trent had never been completely applied, and it was easy enough to continue there the ancient practice of sending future priests to universities in order to study theology. In France, however, there were still 90 major seminaries, with 5,000 students at the time of Vatican II. But by 1968 this had been reduced to 4,223 students in 54 colleges. By 1971 there were 2,840 students in 33 major seminaries (and, another 5,474 students in junior seminaries, compared with 15,702 in 1963). (13)

Some of the thinking about seminaries which went on in France during this period after Vatican II may be
seen in an article by Lochet,(14) which deals with the initiation of a student into the life style of the priesthood by way of the life style of the seminary. Students should be led to live by the grace (or charism) of the priesthood, which is already active in them before ordination. This charism is forming them into a community, in which they have to discover what it means to be a priest, "by means of a progressive experience of the life and the activity of a priest". Three steps are involved. Firstly there comes the initial decision, not the same as commitment. It means a "free orientation of life, analogous to entry into the catechumenate by a new Christian, before Baptism". The student needs a time for reflection and experience, "orientated towards a clearer discernment of the vocation to the priesthood of the ordained priest, as distinct from the priesthood of the laity". This period involves a life of prayer and activity within the ecclesial community, and in the world of the priesthood.

This first stage concludes with the next step, that of 'first commitment'. A second cycle now begins, consisting of initiation into the life and ministry of the priest. This reaches its completion in the student's year as a deacon, when he takes up a ministry. Then follows ordination to the priesthood, the third step. The priest's formation is not yet completed; it will continue throughout his life, a time of permanent formation. For the seminary is no longer the place in which students prepare together for the priesthood; it is a time, during which the educators and students live together the same priesthood, at the service of the same mission. Such a perspective modifies the style and the content of relationships between educators and seminarists. The dominant note is that of common participation in the grace of the same priesthood.

Trent, Lochet comments, defined the priest by his powers, lacked by the laity, to consecrate and absolve. Such powers oriented the priest towards liturgical celebrations, catechesis, and the sacramental pastorate. All
this situated the priest at the heart of what was already an established Christian community. It produced a type of man and a style of life characterised by 'full insertion' in the Church. The seminary formed the norms for such a life style, and for the tasks that went with it. Today, however, Lochet continues, both priest and people are missionaries to non-believers. What must inspire the style of the priest's formation, and the life itself of both educators and students, must be initiation for a missionary priesthood. Together they share this mission; they live it together. There is no longer any need to create a distance between the priest and the rest of the human race; we have come a long way from that, when we seek to proclaim the Gospel to all. The student has to learn how to be a Christian as the priest is a Christian. There is a need for the establishment of unity within the person of the priest. So a new type of educator is required who can live with the students, and live with them in all the dimensions of the priesthood. No longer is the educator asked to be competent, pious, good at keeping rules, full of spiritual discernment; what is wanted now is someone in touch with the life of the diocese, capable of genuine dialogue, clear sighted. What must be made to work, Lochet concludes, is the team.

The first seminary in England to adapt itself to the demands of a team ministry by putting small groups of students at the heart of the seminary, was the Missionary Institute at Mill Hill, where the White Fathers particularly tended to be both cosmopolitan and alert to 'French' ideas. (15) When Wonersh set out to re-think its whole approach in 1966 the team or small group was put at the heart of the changes. (16) The ideal was for the students to meet each week, with one of the priests on the staff, to make a 'review of life' in a small group of ten or so members, drawn from different 'years' in the seminary. It was hoped that by using methods such as those of the Young Christian Workers and similar groups, the students would be able to work out for themselves the style of life and 'discipline' required for their preparation for the
priesthood, instead of having these imposed upon them from above. The reason given for this was two-fold: the students were not monks, but were preparing for the life of secular priests; and in the parish they would have to stand on their own two feet. The whole spirit of seminary renewal was at first very far-reaching, and the seminary went into a state of temporary euphoria, but almost inevitably rules began to creep back, and with them a reminder to the students that the seminary had not been radically changed; at the same time a sweeping revision of the course of studies took place, in which the original two-year course in philosophy no longer introduced the theology courses, but became integrated into them, after a one-year general introduction.

The next seminary to make a firm step towards aggiornamento was Ushaw, which began to send its brighter students to Durham University for their theology; this was accompanied by a decision to put all students on the same more relaxed disciplinary basis as the University students. While Oscott adapted itself more quietly and peacefully to the post-conciliar period, the senior students at Upholland have been moved to Ushaw, while the juniors from Ushaw have gone to Upholland. Allen Hall, the Westminster seminary, has left Ware and moved into Chelsea, from where its students can attend lectures at Heythrop College, formerly the Jesuit house of studies near Oxford, and now one of the constituent colleges of the University of London. The junior seminaries at Kirkby Lonsdale and Mark Cross have both been closed, (17) and so has the English College in Lisbon. This leaves three overseas colleges, at Valladolid in Spain, the Venerable English College in Rome, and the Beda College for late vocations in Rome.

So far in this chapter we have reviewed some of the developments that have taken place since Vatican II, without attempting to answer the question, what kind of 'formation' is required for the leadership of a Church in a world marked by alienation and/or anomie. Remembering Marx's words, already quoted, that "religious alienation is necessarily exemplified in the relation between laity
and priests", we can perhaps ask how it is possible to produce a priesthood of whom this cannot be said to be true. At first glance the seminary system of Trent might seem to be designed to prove Marx right, unless we also remember the way the 'seminary priests' came back to England from Douai and Rome, disguised as laymen, to be sheltered and guided by laymen, and ready to die for the laity, and with the laity, forging a bond between clergy and laity which is far less apparent in many countries which remained nominally Catholic after the 16th century. Yet there is always a danger of Marx's thesis coming true, even in this country, and laity are often prepared to blame the seminaries for the clergy's ignorance of lay problems. If we are to subscribe to the notion that a seminary is not a place but a period of time, designed not to distance the student from the people but to fill him with a sense of mission towards the entire population, we may be better prepared to acknowledge that the alienation between clergy and laity Marx describes is not inherent in the priesthood itself, nor in the seminary 'system' as such, but rather in the model of the Church it implies, based on a fundamentally un-Christian division of life between the sacred and the profane. If the priest is a sacred man, belonging to a sacred world, mediating between a distant God and the laity, who live in the profane world, Marx is clearly right. But if the laity are, like the Israelites before them, the People of God, a royal priesthood, called upon to play an indispensable part in the preaching of the Gospel "to the whole of creation", the ordained priest is certainly not meant to be an alien to haman, any more than he is meant to dominate them.

The decrees of Vatican II call upon the seminaries to lay great stress on 'pastoral formation' of the future priests, and we have seen how the French Church has thought this out, in the context of a strongly anticlerical working class. It is all too easy to criticize the French hierarchy's willingness to lose many 'vocations' by exposing the students for the priesthood to the 'stages',
months or years spent in industry or in some way or other close to the ordinary people of France. It may be true that few of these men will persevere to ordination, especially if the Church they expect to be leading has not yet fully adapted itself to the new missionary emphasis. In this country, however, the situation is still very different from that in France, or it appears to be, if we think of the Church as designed merely to care for its own members. Once the new missionary spirit does begin to seep into the mind of the Church, (and it is long in coming), English Catholics will need to think more along the lines of the Church in France, as the Church of England has already begun to do.\(^{(21)}\)

Still thinking of powerlessness, we need to bear in mind the findings of the American surveys of priests, that the main complaint of the clergy was of the way they were deprived of power by authority. The notion of a hierarchy of power, with its stress on authority at every level, has entered deeply into the mentality of Church leadership. Since Vatican II there has been some shift of emphasis, in an attempt to alleviate the old-time discipline, in favour of some effort to foster the growth of 'self-discipline'. What needs to be examined is whether or not these attempts have done more than scratch the surface. One recommendation of Vatican II that has not yet received much attention is that the educators of future priests should be not only selected but also trained carefully for their task.

Seminaries may be seen either as places or as periods of time, but basically they consist neither of bricks nor of hours, but of people, both teachers and taught. It is the underlying value-system, the 'meaning' of the Church and of mankind, the philosophy which these individuals bring with them into a seminary which ultimately makes it what it is. The seminary may get ahead of the Church on some issues, lag behind in others, but in the end it is the "structures of the life-world" of the mass of people in the Church, as it exists today in our pluralistic society, which will shape and determine the development of future priests.
However those priests are to be prepared to exercise leadership of a prophetic Church, offering a meaning to mankind, in some way or other their 'seminary', whatever shape it takes, will be expected to encourage them to "read the signs of the times in the light of the Gospel". But how? Simply putting students into small groups and telling them to get on with it does not appear to have worked very successfully. The signs they read are largely those of their own powerlessness, and instead of reading these in the light of the Gospel, which might induce them to feel compassion for the powerlessness of the bulk of the human race, they tend to turn in upon themselves, at a time when they should be opening out. Small snippets of 'pastoral experience' are hardly adequate for the transformation demanded of these future priests. Is what they really need something along the lines of Lochet's first period of initiation, before commitment to the priesthood, when they can acquire their experience of modern man and his problems, and of the Church at work in the service of modern man, not in small doses of outings from the seminary, but from within the mass of people in the Church, within society? Perhaps the Bishop needs to arm himself not only with well-chosen educators in the seminary proper, but with a whole army of men and women, priests, religious, laity, prepared to play a counselling role in the preparation of future priests.

A seminary today should be a school of prophets, engaged already in the joint mission of educators and students, constantly motivated by an on-going revision de vie culminating not just in words or in action, but in a permanent dialectic between reflection and praxis. So too should it be a school of 'conscientization' in touch with the mass of the people among whom the whole Church is called to bear witness to the Gospel. If the leadership of the Christian community which offers fulfilment, plerema, to mankind, must itself be growing in wholeness, completeness, authenticity, the development of the educators and students alike must be an integrated human process; no longer can they offer a spirituality splintered
off from the rest of life. Yet this is implicit in the whole fabric of the old Tridentine seminary system, the epitome of the sacred plucked away from *the* profanity, of the soul divorced from the body, the Word cut off from the flesh. One problem raised by this line of thought is celibacy. The old seminary apparatus, with its long years of 'trying out a vocation', insulated the students from women and girls at a crucial time of human development. If celibacy is ultimately abolished or made a matter of voluntary choice for the secular priest, or if the idea of the 'ordinary married layman' assuming some of the present tasks of the ordained priest also becomes generally acceptable, the real *raison d'être* of seminaries may well melt away. On the assumption that neither of these occurrences will in fact happen, and that some form of seminary does remain, complete with students willing to offer themselves to the work of the Church in a celibate priesthood, a more positive approach to this exceptional vocation is indicated. Such an approach suggests a more intelligent preparation of the future priest for the strains and stresses which lie ahead of him, when accepted norms have altered so drastically in the sphere of sexual behaviour.

On the assumption that alienation will continue to accompany the students through the front doors of the seminary, both when they arrive and when they leave, the problem remains of how to make the seminary process into a genuine community, based, as Lochet recommends, on a shared sense of mission. Here the size of the community is important, and this has led to experiments in replacement of seminary communities by smaller teams of students, a dozen or so, living together in a priest's house, joining in the work of the local Christian community, and attending lectures at a University or similar academic centre. This has been attempted experimentally in such places as Barcelona and Turin; it also has a long history in the diocese of Southwark with its house for late vocations in Walworth, in South London, where students were prepared for entry to a major seminary by evening study.
Experience of attempts to create a sense of community in post-Vatican II seminaries has shown some of the problems involved. At Totteridge, the White Fathers deliberately encouraged the small group system, with the students in a group occupying — and decorating — one corridor in the large college building; this was done because these students came to London from all over the world, and needed to find their feet with the help of a small group. One feature of this system was that priests were not necessarily a permanent part of the group; another noticeable feature was the disappearance of the old 'community' atmosphere of the college as such. The small group, replacing as it does in our society the extended family, can exercise a strong emotional grip on the individual, who may feel lost away from it; this was not unknown when young White Fathers began their work as ordained priests on the missions in Ghana or Uganda, within a group of priests, but not a group of their own age, or interests, or sense of close cohesion, especially in joint decision-making.

In other seminaries the effectiveness of the group has varied with the priest attached to it, or with the presence or absence of one or more members able to weld it together and give it a sense of purpose. At the same time the overall atmosphere of the seminary, whether of general contentment and well-being, or of unrest and disaffection, has conditioned the success or failure of the group system. Karl Marx's 'religious alienation' between laity and priests may be felt most acutely in a seminary, the very place where one might hope to see it allayed. Community cannot be forced on anyone. There is no ready solution to the problem of human estrangement. If ever it were possible to create a non-alienated seminary for happily fulfilled human beings, it would be a poor preparation indeed for the work of kenosis.
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Chapter V

THE PRELIMINARY STUDY

The obvious place to begin a study of the seminary system, and the socialization of future priests, might well appear to be within the seminary itself, especially if the researcher happens to be living in one. In fact this situation produced its own difficulties, once I had decided to make such a study, and began to talk to students, to try to work out with their help the best way to set about it. The students approached immediately 'closed up'. They were only too happy to chat away 'off the record', but suspicious of any likelihood of their views being put on record, no matter what the confidentiality. They were living, it was apparent, in fear of authority. This led me to decide to interview students after their ordination, when they might feel more free to respond to questions. It would also have been valuable had I managed to interview a number of these students who had left the seminary without being ordained. As things turned out my own situation changed, and I found myself on sick leave, and glad to talk to anyone I could get hold of easily; in the end I confined my enquiries to recently ordained priests.

I decided to interview as many former students as possible who had been through Wonersh in the years between 1966 and 1971, (when I was a member of the staff). As time went on I took the opportunity to interview a few young priests from other seminaries. When I had talked with twenty in all, in a series of two-hour interviews, I decided to call a halt, to review my findings. The twenty interviews were made over the course of a year, when I was not too fit. Perhaps my state of health helped to alleviate the 'Us and Them' complication; in fact all but one of those interviewed were very helpful and open; what they had to say made an important contribution to the overall study.
In The Month for June, 1973 (Vol. ccxxxiv No. 1270, pp. 195-201), I presented some of my findings in an article which the then editor entitled: "Priests, Alienation, and Hope". I reproduce it here to show the way my thoughts were moving at the time. I was particularly struck by the 'serendipity' of my discovery, that, while the priests had little or nothing to say about the connection between their ministry and the 'alienation' of the mass of people among whom they worked, they all had plenty to say about tensions among priests. (It felt like turning on a tap.) Here is the bulk of the article, including the foot-notes and the conclusion, although some of this matter has already appeared in the opening chapters, under the review of literature. (See Appendices VIII and IX for fuller details of the interviews, and reflections on them.)

PRIESTS, ALIENATION AND HOPE

In the course of 1971 I managed to waylay and interview twenty priests, all of them ordained in the previous four years. I was interested in discovering how the products of post-Vatican II seminary changes were finding their feet in the ministry. Most of those interviewed came from one particular seminary near London. Four others, including an African, had been trained in Rome, and one had been to an Irish seminary. The twenty cannot be called a random sample, so we must not generalise from what they had to say. But they were a 'cross-section' and the overall impression I took away from the interviews provided me with the raw materials for 'grounded research'.

Originally the main object of the interview was to put a series of questions about the role and function of the twenty priests, as they saw them, and as others did. For this I wanted to know what reference groups were important for these men, and when and how they came to acquire their present understanding of the priesthood. These are still important questions, but much of the data collected has been omitted from this article since the answers given to two other sets of questions turned
out to be far more interesting. However, some of the ideas expressed about role and function have a bearing on what follows, so I shall reproduce them here.

Some gave the traditional answer: the main function of the priest is to say Mass and administer the sacraments. One man said his main function was to be a sign— a sign of Christ around the place, caring and understanding and sometimes teaching; being a unifying person for Christians, someone for them to relate to. For another the main function is to wake people up to the work of the Spirit in them. One priest quoted Rahner: the main function of the priest is to be a preacher, a minister of the Word.

The people the priests thought, wanted them to be human and approachable, someone who cares for them. They want a personal relationship with priests. Some want the priest to do everything for them: "If you read out The News of the World on a Sunday morning, the people will say 'Thanks be to God'". Asked to recall memories of how they had thought about the priesthood when they first entered a seminary (which three of the twenty had done when they were 14), several respondents spoke of a sense of awe. The priest was a man set apart. One or two still felt that way at their ordination. But others had been very perplexed by then. One said he left the seminary as a purely secular man. Ideas had opened up in the seminary for a number of them; they had come to see priesthood more in terms of service.

The African spoke about the influence on him and his classmates of a young Italian lecturer, who told them that theology "is the sign of the times, a call to the Church to reformulate the Christian message in language understandable by the people and related to their needs". He said he had come to see his priesthood "in the perspective of commitment, of total service to the whole of the local community".

This seemed to contrast with the rather more 'inward-looking' attitudes of the home products. One English priest spoke of his own seminary days when there had been
for two years 'an honest open-minded look' at the seminary. This, he said, and the community he had experienced at the time, had had a tremendous positive and practical bearing on him; he regretted its passing. One respondent said that most of what he had learnt in the seminary was irrelevant. The priest today must be able to lead competently. But the old system was designed for training obedient priests who would keep the system going. What was needed was a practical training, such as nurses were given. One of the Romans said that by the time he left the seminary there were no rules or regulations left. He said the change was essential. With abolition of the meditation rule people began to pray, not because they had to, but because they were interested.

Reflecting on all this, I had the impression that most of these priests were not very clear about their rôle or function. Nevertheless, they were beginning to see their priesthood more and more in terms of deeper relationships between themselves and other people, and through their ministry, between others. Yet if students were still dehumanized in seminaries, how were they to become unifying persons, relating figures?

Apart from two University chaplains and two students, the priests I interviewed were all assistants in London parishes, or in towns in the Home Counties. Eight were in working-class parishes and eight in mixed areas. I asked them all to describe briefly the people they were mostly involved with in their work. I wanted to see what they put in and what they left out, in speaking of the situation of their people. I was also interested in the socio-linguistic problems encountered in working-class areas by young men trained for years in 'bourgeois backwoods colleges'. I have arranged the answers according to the type of parish or ministry.

THREE INNER-CITY WORKING-CLASS PARISHES

"It is a one-class society, very materialistic, with the people living a day-to-day existence. Even in the East End one can see the traditional environment being
more or less torn up by the roots. What was one huge family is now segmented, afflicted with individuality and apartness. In one block of flats I know, the old people are cared for, but there are no relationships, no common understanding binding the people together."

"There is an almost total lack of culture - bread and circuses, narrow vision; most people live in tower-blocks. There is no unemployment yet no one is happy."

"The people in the twenty-storey flats don't seem to trust me. They are totally irreligious, interested in nothing but accumulating money to buy more carpets, to get better standards of living. Religion does not come in. But after I have visited a family I'm no longer a threat; I can smile and smoke a cigarette. I am vaguely human."

Though each of these three came from a working-class background, there seemed to be an element of culture-shock in their answers. If the observation of the first priest is correct, a sense of anomie hits people not only when they move away to a new district or move up into high-rise flats; 'apartness' seems to have become part of the general atmosphere.

FOUR SUBURBAN WORKING-CLASS PARISHES

"There are 40,000 people here, transplanted from London before the war. They live in identical houses. They are fairly well-off - but highly inadequate to face life. Many cannot hold a job. The district is totally dechristianized. One in five of the Catholics goes to Church. No one else does."

"Most of the parishioners are Irish; 10% are Goans from East Africa, professional people now living in damp and misery. The parish is a resettlement area; the newcomers live in tower-blocks, and they do not know their neighbours."

"The problems of the people are loneliness, the breakdown of families, immigrants trying to adapt, the pressures of suburban life, a low level of education, inability to cope. People are not particularly happy."
They are subjected to the stresses and strains of modern life and the rat race. Bringing up children is a strain. Many are inclined to rush back to the security of Ireland to protect the children from the influences on them at school. People have a problem of relationship in marriage, a lack of mutual support. There is a demand for spiritual rejuvenation; yet their lives are centred on seeking contentment by escapist activity."

"There is a tremendous loneliness. The people here were re-housed ten years ago, but they are still not settled. They have little sense of community. There is a general inability to meet other people, because of the set-up of the place. They do have a desire to get friendly with more people - but it doesn't work."

The last two priests indicated not only the loneliness but part of the reason for it - the inability of many people to establish relationships. All four priests quoted suggest reasons why this is so, and mention the various stresses and strains of modern life. There seemed to be more of a note of understanding in these assessments, than in the other three already quoted, less sense of dismay. The socio-linguistic problem did not show up in the answers.

MORE MIDDLE-CLASS AREAS

"The people here are fairly settled, English mostly, with quite a number of converts among them. They look forward to a visit - they make me very welcome. Quite a lot of young people attend Mass and have some sort of faith."

"Half the people can be described as middle-class; they are mostly in small businesses. A fair number are Irish. Some are elderly. They are not unduly under pressure. Only a third to a quarter practise. Just under 1,000 come to Mass. Other Christian congregations do not have more than 100. I visit six schools; one is a Comprehensive where I am chaplain to the Fourth Year. If the children there still go to Mass it is mainly because they do not want to offend their parents. The two top streams think with a slightly more adult mentality, and want Christianity
as a practical philosophy of life. Teachers are unwilling to teach religion because they are so much at sea."

"The middle-class people here are happy, so far as they can be in the rat race. There is a working-class estate in the middle of a prosperous area, where the people are non-practising. I find the estate pretty hideous; it has an enclosing effect."

In the youth club the working-class members feel unwanted. I get on better with the middle-class ones."

I find it hard to make contact with working-class people. The Family Circles are mostly middle-class."

"Most of the people (in a seaside parish) are retired; they live in cheerful resignation despite the rising cost of living. They feel at home; they are not strangers in a foreign land. There is a council estate that is a community within the community. Local teenagers have to leave home to find work."

A University chaplain said that among the students there was more concern for the Gospel than for the Church. One student priest said students were lonely; the religious knowledge of Catholics was childish. The other spoke about Anglicans he knew; they were trying to be good without knowing why. I had the impression that in some of the parishes the RCs had quietly taken over as the Church by law established: priests were sent for by people with no connection with Catholicism. In a number of areas the thousand or so Mass-goers appeared to be the only 'practising' Christians. But Mass attendance itself was low, especially in areas of relative deprivation. One priest said the local clergy were happy because the children in the top class of the Catholic primary school were still going to Mass. Another effect of 'relative deprivation' would seem to be the inability of priests in socially mixed parishes to communicate with working-class people, including the youth; no such problem was reported from the completely working-class districts.

Apart from comments on employment figures and on the
'rat race', none of the priests made any mention of the working life of his people. This was a significant omission, not only because of its mute witness to the restricted 'consciousness' of priests but also because it meant they did not become aware of the alienating effect of working life on their people. Later in the interviews I attempted to explore the relationship between the ministry of the priest and alienation, by means of a series of questions, loosely based on Seeman's five categories of alienation (1). Each question was based on some aspect of the ministry of the priest, as it might be expected to respond to the alienating situation of his people, and to their subjective feelings of alienation.

Thus one question, based on Seeman's category of powerlessness, asked the priests how they thought their ministry affected the dignity and self-respect of the mass of people they served. (This pre-supposed a great deal. How many of them did think of their ministry in terms of serving a mass of people? And how many of them had given much thought to 'dignity and self-respect', let alone to powerlessness?) In the event these questions puzzled most of the respondents, and the answers did not come to very much. I give some of them here, to illustrate the contrast between them, and those to a later question, on tension among priests.

**HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR MINISTRY AFFECTS THE DIGNITY AND SELF-RESPECT OF THE PEOPLE YOU SERVE? ('POWERLESSNESS')**

One man said that far from enhancing people's self-respect and dignity, priests were in danger of reducing it (2). Six of the twenty respondents said they did not think their ministry affected people's dignity or self-respect one way or the other. One of them explained that he had in mind a subjective feeling on the part of the people; priests belonged to the sacred sphere of life. In his words: "Priests are to do with the 'religious' part of life. They don't come into an appreciation of people's social awareness and self-importance, except 'God loves me'. I would like to think my ministry would help people to greater self-esteem. It might do so at a personal level..."
level, where people are personal friends."

At least one respondent appeared to share this popular view: "I don't think being a Catholic or a Christian has anything to do with self-respect and dignity. By the pious and devout you almost expect to be treated like dirt. To me personally, it is always unconvincing, the dignity of man, and the dignity of work."

This was offset by the priest who said: "My ministry consists in falling in love on a vast scale with the poor and the wretched." Another said, more soberly, "Presumably any Christian life does affect human dignity." And one man concluded: "To think each person important pin-points the whole life of the priest. But it does not impinge at all on the mass of the people. They are in a state of half-consciousness."

The brevity of the answers may have been due to a lack of clarity in the question. The answer of the priest who did not find 'the dignity of man' convincing may have been not so much an expression of lack of concern for humanity as a distaste for abstract language. I found the negative tone of these answers disturbing, in view of the 'fierce regard for human dignity' proclaimed by Gaudium et Spes and Populorum Progressio.

**HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR MINISTRY HELPS TO GIVE A MEANING TO THE LIVES OF THE MASS OF PEOPLE YOU SERVE? (MEANINGLESSNESS')**

The respondents had even less to say about this than about the previous question, and possibly for much the same reasons. The few who spoke about it were concerned with their ministry rather than with meaninglessness among the masses. As one man suggested, life can be meaningless even for priests: "I would like to think that a priest stands for a belief that life does have a meaning, despite all the signs. It is part of the priest's own crisis that he is taken to stand for something clear, which in his own life could be false."

Another comment on the rôle of the priest in helping
people to relate to God, and thereby finding a meaning in life: "In this business of relating to God, sometimes it cannot be done without the people relating to the priest. If I were irrelevant to them, the Church would become irrelevant."

One developed this point more positively: "when priests come, the people are reminded that they are important to God. 'This is God coming, a messenger from God. God cares'. Priests spend a good deal of their time preaching, teaching offering advice and counsel. But these activities were not seen as 'giving meaning' to the people still less to the 'masses'.

The priests to whom I spoke in these interviews belong to a generation caught in cultural cross currents. If they themselves found life totally meaningless, one would hardly expect them to have become priests. Yet quite possibly the world-picture of many of their parishioners, which they themselves were expected to embody and personify, was not one that appealed to them.

**HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR MINISTRY HELPS TO DEVELOP ADULT CONSCIENCES? (‘Nornlessness’)**

One replied: "Something or somebody seems to have been doing just the opposite". Another said: "A lot of Catholics have child-like consciences and many have no conscience". No one blamed priestly paternalism for this, but one man said, "People don't want to have their own conscience. The priest is a slot-machine. They just want to ask him questions".

Confession was one way of trying to develop consciences: "They have their consciences formed one way or the other by the time they reach adulthood. Opportunities to change consciences are very limited, except in confession". But confession itself can keep consciences undeveloped; it depends how the priest makes use of his opportunity: "I use the confessional – as I was trained to do – to cut out the washing-machine approach, and cultivate instead a personal approach".
Other means of developing consciences were mentioned. "I try to form consciences through sermons, though only time will allow the opportunities for people to open up and discuss things informally. This can be done through house-groups, where people can explore together what it means to be a Christian."

One priest was aware of a growing normlessness in himself; he was discovering that moral norms, which he had previously found acceptable, were no longer proving so. He spoke of his efforts to lead people to an adult conscience which did not turn to the priest for all the answers: "There is more hope in the University of leading people to make decisions, to seeing the problems in their faith 'within Christ', without necessarily giving them any clear answer. I find myself, more and more, giving less in the way of answers, and helping people instead to explore a line of approach. Yet even young people find this bewildering and the process painful. They are not used to such responsibility. I find myself moving away from norms that used to be very clear."

HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR MINISTRY HELPS TO LEAD THE MASS OF PEOPLE YOU SERVE TO COMPLETE SELF-FULFILMENT? ('SELF-ESTRANGEMENT').

Priests urge their people on to holiness of life. I wanted to find out to what extent they saw this holiness in terms of wholeness, completeness, and what contrast they could see between such a goal and the present state of their people. In the event my question led most of them to reflect on their own contribution rather than on what it produced or sought to produce in the people.

"Every word I utter is to lead people to a deeper participation in the Mass and the sacraments, to lead them to God as much as possible."

"I try to help people by getting them to discover the depths of themselves."

"I am not interested in making people Christian, but in getting them to reflect - not to take the surface
clichés for granted; to penetrate the thick wall of the mass media; to give them a sense that life is depth."

The priest's own fulfilment was seen to be important: "The question presupposes a fair degree of self-fulfilment in oneself. Until one has found it, and is convinced of it, it is not possible to communicate it to others."

"I meet people who are estranged and who no longer want to be estranged. They become less estranged if a priest is successful in communicating himself as another Christ."

One priest saw a barrier to self-fulfilment in the way Catholics are brought up: "I see the question in terms of man fully alive. I like to think my preaching leads people to a fuller life. I do not know how effective it is. Too few people around are alive, full of life. Too many Catholics are timid, and their timidity and anxiety are due partly to the anxious upbringing they have had."

Another source of self-estrangement was suggested: "The flats cause a terrible breakdown. There is no common bond of feeling. People live in a rabbit-warren. The women never talk to each other because their husbands do not let them. Wives are virtually slaves. I am working to build up the YCW to try to help people to break out of the pattern. But from an early age these people are bound up with sex, with boy friends and girl friends; and once that has happened, you have virtually lost them, as they are in the grip of emotions and self-interest."

This priest saw his task rather as Weber saw the work of the prophet - to effect a breakthrough; in this case via the lay apostolate, involving small groups of young workers. But another priest was pessimistic about such methods: "Our time is taken up almost exclusively catering for our own people. I doubt whether we are forming apostles. We are not even scratching the surface."

These priests did not seem to have a very clear picture of what complete human self-fulfilment would mean for a Christian, apart from a notion of depth contrasted with present superficiality. This seemed to preoccupy them.
"We have no genuine community. The question facing priests is: How do you build it? You wander round, virtually the only bloke who has a real relationship with so many different people. They have relationships with small groups, but there is hardly anyone to whom so many people can relate. Just knowing people is the first stage of the effort. It really means trying to draw people together in some way. Groups try to draw them, but most are virtually untouched."

"A genuine community is not necessarily something people do when they are together: it is, rather, a unifying frame of reference, not necessarily intellectual, where their link with each other is something more than their link as human beings. My ministry is not a question of forming a community already there, but of establishing relationships on a different scale."

"We have group activities in the parish to try to give people friends. They need people to trust, people they can talk to and rely on. But as for building a real community in the area, you get nowhere. It is a process of realising more and more how distinct people are, class-wise."

"Community-building cannot be done unless you can create wheels within wheels, cells within a larger organisation. Breaking a parish down into street groups is part of the answer. We have to recharge the groups we already have."

"What people want is a charismatic leader, a new Moses. It is not a rôle I want to fill myself. There is not much sense of community, but the people are not lonely or isolated. They are too busy for that. They want things to be laid on, to make them part of the community when they want to be part of it. The rest of the time they want to be on their own."

A few of the priests dwelt on the part played by the
liturgy in the creation of 'community'. For one, "The Catholic community is obviously centred on the Eucharist." For another, "Good liturgy will bring this, but people are not involved in it yet. It is still 'the priest up there doing something'." And another commented: "As soon as people do participate in the activities of the parish, and of the liturgy, they stop feeling that there are just a few 'holy ones'."

In his study of a Liverpool Parish (Priests and People, 1965), Conor Ward concluded that only a small nucleus of parishioners felt themselves to be members of a parish community, which might serve as an antidote to anomie. But the rest of the parishioners did have links with the priests, and thus did have some sense of belonging to the parish. Such a relationship was noted by the first respondent quoted in this section. The priest, in the words of another man, is in his own person, and in what he symbolises, a unifying frame of reference. What I found missing in these answers, despite the thoughtfulness of much of what was said, was any sense of the isolation of the mass of people, once beyond the Catholic parish. Nor was there any sense of vision, with regard to what could well be a highly relevant function for priests: to express in themselves, for the whole of society and not just for a small inner nucleus of their own people, 'the unifying frame of reference'.

TENSIONS AND LEADERSHIP

I asked the respondents if they were aware of tensions among priests they knew. Stress, resulting from tension, prevents effective communication. In noting the various things the twenty 'did not say' in their answers to the preceding five questions, I wondered to what extent tension, especially that arising from celibacy, might be contributing to the negative response. Though I did not refer to alienation in the question, I have arranged the answers under Seeman's five headings. There is some overlap, but this cannot be avoided with open-ended questions.

'POWERLESSNESS'
"I am aware of tensions among priests, arising from the way authority is exercised in the Church, and from the way leaders fail to see priests' problems."

"I know of priests who cannot fulfil themselves, because they have no responsibility. Some are so dead because of this that they can be considered as inward drop-outs."

"Lack of proper leadership is tremendously damaging to young priests. Basically the tension is caused by the Bishop, because there is no diocesan strategy, no concerted policy at deanery level. Parish Priests are autonomous little tin gods. It is not taken into account that priests are human beings - persons - with all that goes with that - human dignity. We are very much numbers. Any potential an individual may have is not realised. Square pegs go into round holes."

"The only tensions I am conscious of are ordinary fatigue and some opposition from lay people to my preaching. My generation has called the bluff of the Parish Priests. We have the law in our favour. The younger clergy are not getting on with the job or being allowed to, but this will not last."

"MEANINGLESSNESS"

Only two priests saw the so-called 'crisis of faith' as a source of tension (5).

"The crisis of faith is very widespread among all ranks, young and old. Something has gone wrong somewhere. Many hide this crisis by a life of feverish activity, so that they do not have to reflect. Only those who are complete cabbages are not affected."

"The basic tension for all priests is caused by the apparent absence of God in modern society, and reaction to this in different ways. If priests were happy in their priesthood celibacy would sort itself out."

"NORMLESSNESS"

"Priests are befogged by spiritual tensions and the lack of a clear role in an ever-changing society."
"There are too many jobs to be done for a priest to be able to do any one thing well. But I do not get a sense of priests wasting their time. Where Church-going is relatively good, priests have a sense of work."

"Priests are worried about the 'identity thing' - an unsureness about their mission."

"There is a tension between the 'sacred ministry' and the more 'welfare type ministry'. There is a sense of irrelevance. At root my ministry is not irrelevant but it gives me a different approach to life. The system of the parochial ministry is not designed to be of use to the people. We ought to be considering how to improve it, even if we can't. Nothing in the parish is organised, except the provision of the sacraments and financial administration. Celibacy is a secondary problem, though it does take on an importance in the lives of priests. It is the problem of identity and of the meaning of the priesthood that is upsetting them."

One priest expressed dissatisfaction with 'normality', but satisfaction with the priesthood as he lived it; it was the conflict between different rôle interpretations that caused him tension, not the priesthood itself: "I experience tension between living the priesthood first hand and living it second hand. I happen to be this kind of person, and given all that I am, I am a priest; it is very much part of me. But then sometimes I act the part of Father N. I don't want to be a normal priest. One of the tensions is living as a priest as I should like to be, rather than as one is expected to be. A lot of priests do not have tensions, because they have failed to face the fact that they are not living as full human beings."

'SELF-ESTRANGEMENT'

Rosemary Haughton has suggested that many priests are suffering a crisis because they cannot face the fact that there is nothing left for them to do except to represent God. Perhaps this notion lay behind the remark of the respondent who said: "that priests should want
to get married is only a symptom of a deeper tension, and it seems often to be an escape."

Some did see celibacy itself as a source of tension. One said, with some feeling: "I know of priests whom celibacy has turned into crabbed bachelors." Another said he saw symptoms of tension associated with celibacy, such as drinking. One priest linked celibacy problems with anomie and general self-estrangement: "The trouble with celibacy is that non-celibates are priests - people who should be enriched by marriage. A lot of priests are going through difficult times; there is none with a clear settled view of things. There is a general depression at the tawdriness of existence. A number of priests have just gone away."

Is this last respondent suggesting that the 'general depression' is a tension which priests share with many other sensitive and reflective citizens? Priests may experience a special self-estrangement if they feel their priesthood and the Gospel should be able to counteract the tawdriness, but simply fail to do so, even in themselves.

'ISOLATION'

Isolation, and the loneliness resulting from it, was the cause of tension most frequently reported by the respondents. It is not so much a feeling of isolation from the people as of isolation from one another. Celibacy brought loneliness, not only because the priest remained single, but also because he had not been able to learn how to relate deeply. Perhaps the concern expressed earlier on for the loneliness of people was a form of projection on the part of lonely priests.

"Celibacy does bother a lot of priests; not lack of a sexual outlet but lack of companionship, which is not supplied by deep relationships with other people. I was so lonely I got a canary - but put not your trust in canaries."

"Celibacy is a source of strain, only if you are in
a quandary about it. Nobody accepts it completely, but it is not a major source of tension. Older priests are a source of tension, especially if they are apathetic or pessimistic."

"Priests are lonely but will not admit it."

"There is a tension between the tremendous number of contacts one has, and loneliness. The loneliness comes either from living by oneself, or from living with someone who is not particularly compatible."

"Priests suffer from isolation and loneliness. This can happen when you cannot share your vision with anybody, or cannot be sustained and helped; when there is no team."

"When priests come together it is an artificial, superficial gathering. We are all too ready to sneak off in our own sweet little ways. Many have given up without going off."

"There is a terrible tension between the old school of priests and the younger ones. There is a lack of teamwork. Priests are very alienated from one another - it is a forced marriage. If only priests with the same ideas could get together, what a tremendous amount they could do."

Not everyone complained of loneliness. One man said he had no tensions; another that he had no identity crisis - there were not enough hours in the day for him. And yet another told me I should have put in a question on the joys of the priesthood, which he proceeded to enumerate.

All through these interviews there was an emphasis on the problem of relationships in depth among both people and priests. The respondents seemed to be more alert to tensions among priests than to the alienation of the people. If alienation is a process, the problem of in-depth relationships originates in the dehumanising effects of powerlessness, meaninglessness, self-estrangement and anomie. The powerlessness may be that of older priests denied any real responsibility in years of ministry, or,
it may be the powerlessness of the younger man who wants to exercise his ministry in ways that differ from the demands of tradition and routine. It may be an arrested powerlessness that stems from seminary training, six years or more of total institution. Or it may be the general powerlessness, common to the men of our time. Similarly meaninglessness and anomie may be examined from each of these points of view. One kind of alienation reinforces another: the end result is isolation, a society reduced, in Durkheim's vivid words, to a dust of individuals.

All that a limited study of this nature can do is to point the way to more rigorous research. But these twenty interviews suggest that young priests are conscious of isolation among their people, and of the difficulty in establishing a sense of community. What seems to emerge most clearly from this study is the feeling that far from being able to act as relating figures for the rest of the population, priests themselves are alienated, dehumanised, unable to relate. This inability will also have its roots in the process of alienation, and the alienation of future priests in seminaries needs to be explored.

The term alienation has been much used. It is found in Karl Marx, and he applies it specifically to our question: "Every alienation of man from himself and from Nature appears in the relation which he postulates between other men and himself and Nature. Thus religious alienation is necessarily exemplified in the relation between laity and priests, or, since it is here a question of the spiritual world, between the laity and a mediator." (Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, 1844). But Marx has no monopoly of the term or the idea, any more than he has of the dialectic. Cardinal Cardijn, founder of the Young Christian Workers, used the idea of a dialectic between the truth of faith and the truth of reality. It is at the heart of the révision de vie and the 'see, judge, act' process. It was reflected in the insistence of Vatican II on the need to "discern the signs of the times and to
interpret them in the light of the Gospel" (Gaudium et Spes, 4). The more recent notion of 'conscientisation', which has swept through Latin American Christian thinking, basically amounts to the same message: men must be made conscious of the clash between the way things are, and the way things ought to be. As men become aware of their alienation, the dialectic of the clash eventually gives birth to a new order of things. And in all this process there is need of leadership, of a charismatic prophetic type, able to help men to help themselves to grow towards full manhood.

One encouraging conclusion can be drawn from this study: far from feeling irrelevant, priests are entitled to see their role as having the greatest possible relevance for the very existence of society. What priests have to offer must be offered, it must be re-expressed, put into new wineskins, poured out with skill and with care.


Seeman took the ideas of Marx, Weber, Adorno, Mannheim, Durkheim, Merton, Goffman, Nettler and Fromm, and other sociologists who had written about alienation, and arranged them under the five categories of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement. Seeman's interpretation is concerned more with the subjective experience of feeling alienated than with the objective conditions liable to produce alienated individuals. More recently he has divided his category of isolation into Value-isolation and Social-isolation (cf. his chapter on 'Alienation and Engagement' in The Human Meaning of Social Change edited by Campbell and Converse, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1972).

(2) In speaking of the way in which certain status groups exercise their authority by the claim of legitimacy, Max Weber instanced the relations between priests and the masses. He spoke of a 'constellation of interests' among priests, vis-à-vis the laity (cf. Bendix, Max Weber, an Intellectual Portrait, New York, 1959, p. 290).
(3) It is useful to talk about 'meaninglessness' only when an existing world-picture has apparently collapsed, or proved useless to a man in the business of interpreting the events of life. In *The Social Construction of Reality* (London, 1966) Berger and Luckmann discuss the part played by priests in helping to establish the legitimacy of world-pictures on which societies rest (cf. e.g. p. 102).

(4) 'Community' (like alienation) is treated with suspicion by many sociologists, who feel that efforts to create it or to maintain it are a veiled defence of the status quo. I was interested to see how respondents would react to the notion of community, since it is often represented as a good thing in ecclesiastical documents. In the event 'isolation' turned out to be the facet of alienation to which they seemed to have given most thought.

(5) In *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950, pp. 617 ff), Adorno associates meaninglessness with prejudice and with fascism. It is possible that men with a tendency towards an authoritarian personality may also tend to complain of a crisis of faith.

I presented the gist of this article, in somewhat different language, in a seminar at Surrey University. In the course of the discussion some of those present questioned the validity of my attempt to classify the answers to the question about tensions among priests by an arbitrary allotment of each response to one or other of Seeman's given categories. Even more serious for my approach was a criticism of the whole Seeman method of trying to lump together in one list concepts so fundamentally diverse as Marx's alienation and Durkheim's anomie. I was referred most fruitfully, as it transpired, to the article by Horton in the *B. J. S.* for December, 1964. Reflection on this article led me to adopt a basically new approach to my whole study. This I pointed out in an article written in 1973, entitled *Seminary Polarities*. Again I have decided to reproduce this article though it also repeats some of what has been said above.
in the overall review of literature - because it marks another step in my thinking, and in the preparation of the next stage of my study. In writing this second article I took care to produce further material from my twenty interviews, not previously published in the article in The Month.

SEMINARY POLARITIES

In 1965 the second Vatican Council issued a decree on the formation of priests. While deciding to preserve the Tridentine seminary system, the bishops introduced an element of aggiornamento by stressing the need for pastoral formation. "Every programme of instruction, whether spiritual, intellectual, or disciplinary, should be joined with practical implementation and directed towards the aforementioned goal." They laid down that: "the norms of Christian education are to be religiously maintained, and should be properly complemented by the latest findings in sound psychology and pedagogy". And they went on to say that "by wisely planned training there should also be developed in seminarians a due degree of human maturity, attested to chiefly by a certain emotional stability, by an ability to make considered decisions, and by a right manner of passing judgment on events and people."(1)

In these cautious words the decree sets out the basic dilemma not only of the modern seminary but also of the modern Church. Both Church and seminary are caught between the 'norms' inherited from the past together with the whole way of seeing the world which they enshrine, and for maturity, for growing, for total development, for liberation, for a true consciousness as opposed to a false one. There is an ancient polarity in Church and seminary between nomos, the law, the things that have always been said and done, and pleroma, the goal of growing, completeness, fulfilment, 'omega point', to use Teilhard de Chardin's phrase.(2)

As one who taught sociology in a seminary at a time when attempts were first made to implement the spirit of

* references begin p. 97
Vatican II, I made it my business to interview in some depth twenty priests ordained between 1967 and 1971. I was particularly interested in trying to find out how they saw their ministry in terms of the underlying problems of the 'mass of people' around them, and accordingly I based a series of questions in the interviews on Melvin Seeman's five-fold categorisation of alienation. Seeman had gathered together what a number of different writers had had to say concerning the effects of industrialization on human relationships; he offered a suggestion that alienation could be measured, provided one is looking for the subjective experience of its effects rather than any index of the objective causes of such experience. He based his ideas on those of the psychologist, J.B. Rotter, who had made use of attitude scales to measure expectations.

Seeman, however, had his critics, and he has subsequently admitted the force of much that was said. One notable critic was J. Horton, who rejected Seeman's inclusion of 'normlessness' or 'anomie' in the list of categories of alienation. Horton prefers to regard alienation and anomie as respectively Marx's and Durkheim's metaphors for a radical attack on the dominant institutions and values of industrial society. Durkheim, with his notion of anomie, concentrated on the barriers to an orderly functioning of society, whereas Marx, with his concept of alienation concentrated on the barriers to the productive growth of individuals, and, by extension, to the adaptive change of the social system. Or to put it more simply, anomie comes from a reformist mind, and alienation from a radical one.

Durkheim adopted the word anomie from nomos, the Greek word for law. In his doctoral thesis: The Division of Labour in Society, published in 1893, Durkheim was interested in the way social order rests upon the non-contractual elements implicit in the laws of a country. With the coming of industrialization and the increasing differentiation of industrial tasks there seemed to Durkheim to be a lag between previous acceptance of moral codes which underlay the laws of the pre-industrial society, and
the development of new moral codes more appropriate to
the new situation. With this lag there came a state of
uncertainty in many minds regarding the basis of laws,
which Durkheim christened 'anomie'.(7) When he came to
write his study of Suicide four years later, Durkheim
somewhat shifted his understanding of the word he had
coined. Some people were committing suicide, in his opin­
ion, for anomic reasons - in other words, because as
individuals they felt under-integrated with their social
group, because they no longer shared the norms of that
group.(8)

In a later development of 'anomie', Robert Merton
used it as a tool for analysing the delinquency of under­
privileged American youths who wanted to achieve the
goals put before them by American society, but who be­
haved in an anomic way because they were unable to
achieve those goals by means which were legitimate accor­
ding to the norms of society.(9) Talcott Parsons, in an
attempt to synthesise the thinking of Durkheim, Weber,
and Freud, spoke of a 'continuum of institutionalization'
as individuals in society succeed in varying degrees in
internalising the norms of society.(10)

For Peter Berger "alienation is an entirely different
phenomenon from anomie".(11) He described anomie as a
"radical separation from the social world", by which the
individual loses his "orientation in experience" and may
even lose his "sense of reality and identity".(12) When
Berger speaks of 'social world' and 'reality' he is think­
ing in terms of his sociology of knowledge, according to
which we see 'reality' or 'the world' through the specta­
cles provided by our membership of a group with a common
culture.(13) For Berger every human society is an 'enter­
prise of world-building'.(14) By their membership of a
society "a meaningful order, or nomos, is imposed upon
the discrete experiences and meanings of individuals".(15)

According to Berger, the individual needs society
as a protection against anomie. One such form of protec­
tion is marriage. Berger has written of marriage as a
"nomos-building institution", which constitutes "a social arrangement that creates for the individual the sort of order in which he can experience his life as making sense". (16) In marriage husband and wife set about the construction of a new 'world', and once the new world is constructed it needs to be kept going by constant validation. This the partners achieve by their ongoing interaction, expressed mainly through their daily conversation with one another. Marriage brings about a 'decisive phase of socialization' in the biographies of the individuals concerned. (17)

Religion is another social institution which Berger sees acting as a bulwark against the terrors of anomie. He describes it as a powerful 'agency of nomization'. (18) And here we return to the distinction between alienation and anomie. For Berger the alienated man is in a state of false consciousness regarding the 'world' he inhabits, the socio-cultural world which he and other individuals in his society have jointly constructed and legitimated by their ongoing interaction. The alienated man thinks his world is not something he is himself constructing, but something imposed upon him "by the gods, or by nature, or by the forces of history". And religion, Berger tells us, is the most powerful agency of alienation, and therefore of false consciousness. It is just for this reason that religion is a powerful agency of nomization.

It might appear to the casual reader that Berger is here attacking religion, and the basic Christian assumption that God is making us and all things out of nothing. In The Secular City Harvey Cox drew a useful distinction between 'religion' as such, understood as the norm-setting institution which ties men down to a fixed pattern of existence as happened under the priests of ancient Egypt, and the Judaeo-Christian tradition of a God who acts to set men free by making them his sons and leading them away from the slavery of Egypt by the liberating Exodus. (20) Yet the evidence of history is clear that within the Judaeo-Christian tradition itself the forces of religion have been constantly nomos-forming
and alienating, as much as liberating.

Marx did not invent 'alienation'. The German word which he used was *entfremdung*, and has been employed by Martin Luther in his vernacular translation of the epistle to the Philippians (2, 7) where St. Paul says that Christ emptied himself, taking the form of a servant. Marx derived the word, and the idea of alienation, from Hegel. In 1844 he wrote his Economic and Philosophical manuscripts, reflecting on the effects of industrialization on the factory worker. For Marx the dehumanizing labour involved made the man *unmensch* or unmanned, emptied of his manhood, an alien to himself, as well as to the product of his labour, to the materials he worked with, to his employer and to his fellow workers. And Marx saw the idea of God in the mind of man as the root of all alienation, for this idea made man into a dependent creature, and made him cease to be the free master of his own destiny which his manhood demanded.\(^{(21)}\)

It is this Marxist concept of alienation which underlies Seeman's two categories of 'powerlessness' and 'self-estrangement'. But for Marx alienation means a false consciousness; the man who is a stranger to himself is not conscious of the human dignity of which he is robbed. This is where Seeman's attempt to measure powerlessness by a scale of expectations falls down. To these basically Marxist concepts, Seeman added 'meaninglessness', 'normlessness', and 'isolation'. In one way meaninglessness can be interpreted as an extreme form of anomie, but it goes far beyond anomie, for it implies that for the individual concerned the whole 'world' has collapsed, and not just some of the norms of that world. Adorno spoke of meaninglessness in his description of *The Authoritarian Personality*.\(^{(22)}\) It was the kind of phenomenon which involved many Germans after the first world war, and the subsequent inflation, which led in its turn to a great hunger for strong leadership, a new 'world' and a new 'nomos', and above all a violently irrational demand for a national scapegoat.
By 'isolation' Seeman originally meant the alienated feeling of an intellectual, for example, in a society of non-intellectuals. In his later categorization Seeman has labelled this 'cultural isolation' and he puts after it another form of alienation which he calls 'social alienation', the expectation among individuals and groups, such as old people, that they will be unable to establish relationships with the society around them. One suggestion Seeman has not accepted is that put forward by a number of sociologists from Whittier College to the effect that alienation can be seen as a process, by which powerlessness, meaninglessness and self-estrangement lead on to normlessness, and so produce isolation. What Seeman does concede is that every type of alienation alienates, and therefore tends to isolate individuals and groups from each other.

As with anomie, one might well speak of a continuum of alienation. Theoretically a man can be totally alienated, totally in a state of false consciousness. Or he can be moving away from this state, first of all into a consciousness of what he is and of what he should be, and then by degrees towards a more fully human existence, in which he is alienated neither from himself nor from others, not from matter, nor from God. And, for the Christian, God is not the alienating concept that Marx described, but the one who raises up from alienation, not only Christ, (as in Phil. 2, 9) but also every man with Christ (as in Eph. 1, 10). From St. Paul we can derive a useful word to express the goal of human progress, away from alienation. Berger speaks of de-alienation, and of re-appropriation, but as he himself has introduced 'nomos' into the English language, we may follow his example and introduce Paul's word 'pleroma', meaning fulfilment, completeness, integrity. Paul speaks of Christ as having "all the fullness of God in him" (Col. 2, 19). "You have come to fullness of life in him, who is the head of all rule and authority" (Col. 2, 10). "We are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ" (Eph. 4, 15).
Paul VI, in his encyclical *Populorum Progressio* applied this theme specifically to working life, when he wrote that "man's labour means... for the Christian: the mission of sharing in the creation of the supernatural world, which remains incomplete until we all come to build up together that perfect man of whom St. Paul speaks 'who realizes the fullness of Christ'. And the Pope goes on to quote the pastoral constitution of Vatican II on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spe*), where it tells us that "the ferment of the Gospel rouses in man's heart a demand for dignity that cannot be stifled". These Pauline and papal utterances are reproduced here, because they help to explain the meaning of the word 'maturity' mentioned in the decree on priestly formation. This demand for development, not only for future priests but for each man and for all men together, as the whole of *Populorum Progressio* brings out, is one of the key norms put before the student on his arrival in a seminary.

Yet we have to acknowledge the validity of Berger's observation that organised religion spells both nomos and alienation rather than freedom and growth towards full human development, the conservative in-group rather than a concern for the pleroma of all men. The newly arrived seminary student, learning like the newly-wed husband to construct a new world in his mind, will be confused in the course of time, when he discovers the two polarities the seminary has to offer him. One polarity is Nomos-Anomie. He will be urged to internalize the seminary norms, such as they seem to be presented to him. He will do so with varying degrees of success, and he may well come to find that even if he acknowledges the legitimacy of these norms they are not very easy to live by; so he falls into some kind of anomie, the more painful to him the more he has internalized the norms. (He may of course be suffering even more from other forms of anomie derived from norms he has internalized before - or since - he entered the seminary, which do not derive from the seminary as such.) On the other hand he may come to think of himself as alienated, with a duty to grow in every way; and the more
he tries to move along the continuum between alienation and pleroma, the more he will tend to move away from nomos.

It might at first appear that there is in fact only one polarity, if alienation is tantamount to nomos. This would imply that any move towards freedom and development would also involve anomie, or 'chaos'; and this is sometimes the way in which seminary authorities do interpret such a movement. But remembering Horton's critique of Seeman, we can see that the whole notion of 'nomos-anomie' really belongs in a different socio-cultural 'world' to that of 'alienation-pleroma'.

If one is to attempt to apply such speculation to seminary life, to see if it has any validity, an extensive study is necessary, but what follows is at least an attempt to provide concrete examples of the points that need validation, if one is to generalise from them. In my preliminary study of twenty newly-ordained priests I included questions regarding their assessment of seminary formation, and I asked each one to recall, if he could, the way he had understood the priesthood at the time he had entered a seminary (junior or senior) and at the time of his ordination.

In my sample of twenty priests three went off to the junior seminary when only 14. Each of these said he had been attracted to the priesthood by priests he had known who seemed to be happy people. By the time he was ordained one of these had come to see the priesthood (he said) not as an achievement but as "really a question of being there for the people". One had been worried by talk in the seminary about the relevance of the priesthood but it was when he was working in a parish as a deacon that "I found I had a relevance, after all the junk we'd had in the seminary". The third, an African who had finished his studies in Rome, said he had come to see the priesthood in "a perspective of commitment to the new ideas current of total service to the local community, from a social, political, and religious point of view".

At least five of those interviewed admitted they had
started off in the seminary with a monastic ideal of the priesthood. As one said, he had had an image then of the priest as 'one of awe' - for priests were 'men set apart'. One of these said he still saw the priesthood as something very sacred when he was ordained; one said he had discovered a sense of purpose in the Church, of which he was now a representative; for another the prayerful side of the priesthood had developed even more. But another one said he had left the seminary "as a purely secular man". "The religious side, a relationship direct with God, had been pushed out." He explained that he had got like this when the 'new system' came into the seminary after Vatican II. "When the brakes came off one started to measure everything radically."

In these different students for the priesthood we can begin to see varying degrees of 'nomos-formation' and of anomie.

Three of those interviewed, all older candidates when they began, said they had entered the seminary with the idea of serving people. As one put it, this was a "rather romantic conception of liturgy, the Mass, an image of relationships, of respect, what one could achieve through this". At ordination one of them had come to think in terms of liturgical leadership, "from which followed a whole pastoral line of concern for people of all types and conditions". "Still an image of a traditional pastoral priest", he admitted, "though there was much in the tradition I disagreed with". One said there had been no significant change in his ideas; the third that there had been a rapid process of change in himself from his third year at the senior seminary. He said he had come to see the priesthood in terms of service, as an opportunity of being in contact with large numbers of people, plus "a fear of being identified with the clerical thing".

This last phrase, 'the clerical thing', sums up one important norm in the seminary nomos - the need for students to conform to a certain style of dress and outward behaviour, to a certain style of living, of speaking, of
thinking, which seemed to be attached to the word 'cleric' rather than to the word 'priest.' But this was certainly not the only norm put before the students. One man who went to the seminary "to exorcise a vague feeling that I wanted to be a priest" recalled how "an evolution had taken place in his own thinking pari passu with that of the seminary system itself, between 1961 and 1968." He thought he had become less remote, less of a man apart. He had come to consider the priesthood as of value in terms of personal influence on people, on to which the whole sacramental system could be integrated.

Later in the interviews, when I asked each priest to assess his own seminary formation, in terms of his short experience as a priest, reference was made to the changes in the system introduced at the time of their training. One man commented that there had been for two years what he called an honest, open-ended look at the seminary. This, and "the community we then experienced," had a "tremendously positive and practical bearing" for him. It had been "an assessment of freedom and an attempt to sincerely accept in faith the inevitable chaos that I suspect caused the panic and reaction."

Another said that he could not remember how he had understood the priesthood when he was ordained because the whole seminary was in upheaval. "Nobody knew whether they were coming or going. It was utter chaos." It is interesting to find two men using the same expression, while differing widely in their reaction to the chaos. For the latter priest chaos meant anomie; the state of affairs from which nomos shields us. For the other, it was something "to be accepted in faith", as the price to be paid for escaping from the old order of things. For him the great value was 'the community', understood not as something imposed on the students from above, but as a warm sharing of hopes and risks, a collective experiment in freedom.

Elsewhere in the interviews reference was made by the priests to the difficulty they and others experienced in relating to people. Commenting on the seminary one
man said priests were very inadequate at relating to people "at a deeply personal level". Students for the priesthood, he thought, were dehumanised - since the seminary was "run by priests who had themselves been trained by priests". One said that most of what he had learnt had been irrelevant, because "the priest today must be a leader of men, capable of taking the lead himself, competently". He explained that "the old system had been for training obedient priests to keep the system going".

Yet these respondents acknowledged that the seminaries have continued to change, since they were ordained. The seminaries today are on the move, in more ways than one. Debates continue, more among staff than among students, as to what priests are for, and how they should be trained. For some the priest's main work is "to understand and help people in different walks of life". So he needs to be given every opportunity to get out of the seminary and meet people. For others his main contribution to the world around him is to be, not a kind of social worker, but primarily a preacher, versed in the Scriptures and theology, a communicator of the word, who should have his nose kept to the academic grindstone in his years of preparation.

Both these avenues branch away from the traditional nomos of the pre-Vatican II seminary, with its great pile of Victorian brickwork up the end of a country drive. The first norm that used to impress itself on the new student was that training for the priesthood, and by implication the priesthood itself, was to be 'set aside', away from 'the world', in a haven of peace and quiet. Within the seminary this seemed to be reinforced by the apartness of the priests on the staff, and by the very shape of the chapel, often a long monastic-type building, arranged with choir-stalls facing each other, with the high altar seeming to be a long way away from the student body, and the small area reserved for the laity even further away.

The geography and shape of a building, however, need not bring about a 'decisive phase of socialization', unless they serve to reinforce the general approach of the author-
ities of a seminary. Nor will the authorities themselves make much permanent impact, unless they too are reinforcing the earlier socialising influences, and the on-going influences, which have gone and are going to shape the inner attitudes, the socio-cultural 'world' of the students who come their way. A seminary may seem to be an excellent example of one of Goffman's total institutions, but they still remain sufficiently open to outside influences, not least through the attitudes and values of the incoming students. I propose, therefore, to outline a model by which the forces reflected in the states of anomie and alienation, and their opposite poles of nomos and pleroma, may be seen to be at work within a seminary. These forces will be mediated to the seminary in a great many ways, but for the purposes of the model I have reduced these to four: the student's family of origin, the dominant culture of the country, the youth sub-culture, and the Church.

POLARITY I. NOMOS — AROMIL

A. NOMOS

(1) Via the Family.

For the seminary, as much as for any other educational institution, the families of origin of the students are likely to have been and to have remained important socialising influences. Any attempt to reshape the student's whole 'world' must reckon with the strength of the norms he learned at home, and these norms are likely to be affected by the socio-economic background of his family. In my twenty interviews I did not enquire about this background, but from my personal knowledge of the respondents, and from the evidence of their educational history, they mostly came from 'respectable working class' or lower middle class families. Of the twenty, three went to independent public schools, and six to independent preparatory schools, the rest to local authority (i.e. State) schools.

When these men were boys the Mass they went to was a profoundly mysterious ritual, attended by people whose
piety was individualistic, presided over by a priest
talking in Latin with his back to the congregation. The
people expected the priest to visit their homes but not
to do much outside the round of parochial duties. It was
war-time experiences that began to draw Catholics of the
Church-going class away from their somewhat enclosed
'world'. After the Education Act of 1944 the new sec­
dondary school-building programme helped even more to
loosen Catholics from the parish.

As Catholics became more affected by the surrounding
climate of secularization and permissiveness and began
to question the very basis of the Church's moral teaching,
there has been a growing change in the socialisation of
Catholic children which is beginning to show itself in
the seminaries. There was a time when the seminary could
assume a solid basis of Christian doctrine and values in
the ordinary candidate, learned first of all from Catholic
parents and reinforced at a Catholic school and a junior
seminary. But if this no longer holds good, another change
is also beginning to make itself felt, as families tend
to retreat more and more into the 'private sphere', a
small patch of life where father and mother can be them­
selves, and control what happens to them, as far as they
are able. This can affect the young in two ways. They
may find the 'private sphere' too stifling and break away
from it or they may internalize their parents' hunger for
it and carry it with them when they leave the home.

This may be seen already in certain aspects of semi­
nary life, such as a dislike shown by students for attempts
to herd them together into large communities, or into
smaller face-to-face groups which are not of their own
choice and creation.

Via the Dominant Culture.

Perhaps the key feature of the dominant culture today
is the so-called consumer society. Few students are af­
fluent, but they need money for basic needs, and this has
affected the pattern of a student's year in so far as he
feels impelled to work in the vacation and comes back to
the seminary tired. And somewhere along the line in his socialisation the student begins to acquire the notorious concern of the priest for money, which so often seems to creep into pulpit utterances. Perhaps this is basically a survival of the country-estate made of living in seminaries, in which students of comparatively humble origins were given extravagant life-style expectations, a relic perhaps of the Victorian dominant culture enshrined in the seminaries.

(iii) **Via the Youth Sub-Culture.**

Seminaries are now far more 'open-ended' than they were, and the student has greater opportunities to mingle with his age group during the term as well as during vacations. The number of students who have been to University before or during their seminary studies is now on the increase, as is the number of 'late vocations' of men with some experience at work before entering the seminary. As far as they are permitted seminary students tend to conform to the norms of their peer group in matters of hair-style, dress and musical taste. But how far these externals demonstrate acceptance of deeper currents of thought and mood among the young is open to investigation, as is the whole question of how 'typical' of their generation seminary students may be.

(iv) **Via the Church.**

Seminary students meet the Church in odd ways. They do not have a great deal of contact with ordinary parishioners. They hear the Church's official doctrine expounded in bits and pieces throughout their course of studies, and tend to see it in terms of examination fodder, to be hastily digested and then forgotten. Unless they have some exceptional interest they are not likely to read new Church documents such as papal encyclicals, or even the documents of Vatican II, except as part of their studies. The Church of the New Testament and of Church history tends to be remote from them. So, frequently, are their bishops. Where they do meet 'The Church' is in the person of the Rector and the staff, and in the daily liturgy.
The liturgy incorporates many norms, including the rich variety to be found in the Scriptures. Though Latin may be nearly extinct, the vestments and the altar furnishings continue to link the participants with an ancient tradition, but the principal norm which the liturgy has to offer the student is that of Christocentric prayer. Yet seminary liturgies tend to re-emphasise the division of life into sacred and profane, and for many students, the daily Mass, for all its changes, tends to be boring and unrelated to ordinary life.

Ultimately it is the priest in the seminary who is the most expressive vehicle of the Church's norms for the ordinary student. The priests interviewed testified to the importance of individual staff members for them as reference figures. The decree of Vatican II on priestly formation urged the establishment of staff colleges, but so far there appears to have been no move in this direction, nor has there been much collaboration between the staffs of the different seminaries. One of the norms still offered to students by their priests seems to be one of sturdy individualism.

B. ANOMIA

(i) Via the Family.

A student's family may be suffering from various forms of anomia; they may be immigrants from Ireland or Italy or Poland who find themselves disoriented in contemporary English society. They may be suffering from recent changes in the Church, especially if they were numbered among those Catholics to whom the unchanging rock of Catholicism once meant a great deal. Individuals in the family may suffer from anomia, because of new working or living conditions, or because of a break-up of family life for one reason or another. All this could well be communicated to the student, or shared by him in the first place. It would seem that many Catholics find they cannot accept the Church's teaching on birth-control or divorce, and the student may be aware of this source of strain at home. He may sympathise or he may take issue
with his family on the matter. Either course may prove anomie as far as he is concerned.

(ii) Via the Dominant Culture.

The student may come across anomie personally, or through his studies of the roots of violence, alcoholism, drug addiction or suicide. He may also find it on his pastoral studies if he goes into areas of daily life and work where anomie is present as a continuing source of unhappiness and frustration. Meeting coloured immigrants and studying prejudice and discrimination, the student may come to share, as far as he is able, the anomie of those on the receiving end of the dominant culture's attitudes. Yet, despite his Christian allegiance, he may very well share those dominant attitudes, because of his social origins and his education, or because of his personality. It could be the dominant culture which has itself pushed the student towards the priesthood, because he could not accept its norms, or because he could not accept the strain of the 'rat race'.

(iii) Via the Youth Sub-Culture.

Potentially this is the most disturbing medium by which anomie may affect the student, if the sub-culture implies a sharing of the sexually permissive ethics of his peer-group. In fact this problem seems to cause less anomie for the celibate student than it does for the celibate priest, who may be thrown into much greater contact with the youth sub-culture, and with the opposite sex. The youth sub-culture may lead the seminary student to question many of the norms put before him; he may be led to rebel, or like most of his contemporaries, to become apathetic.

(iv) Via the Church.

Since Vatican II there has been plenty of anomie within the Church itself, both among those distressed by all the changes, and by those who feel the changes have never really begun. Both versions may be found in seminaries, but the present generation of students did not
experience the high hopes of their predecessors that all would suddenly be well. They may be affected, however, by visiting priests and members of staff.

**POLARITY II. PLENOMA - ALIENATION**

A. PLENOMA

(i) Via the Family.

Seminaries are beginning to recognise the part a student's own family can play in helping him to fulfil his human potential. Students are allowed to spend far more of their time with parents and siblings, and this recognition has combined with financial considerations to undermine the case for junior seminaries. A student may hope to learn from his own family the art of human relationship, especially from the one-to-one relationship of his parents.

(ii) Via the Dominant Culture.

The dominant culture puts before the student not only the values of industrial capitalism, but also much criticism of those values, to be found not only within the Socialist traditions, but also in literature, in such writers as D.H. Lawrence and Erich Fromm (both read by priests who were interviewed). Even capitalism itself has led on to a consideration of environmental problems and of the whole question of world development and underdevelopment. Students for the priesthood may not all be open to such influences, but they are likely to be affected indirectly through the mass media and through other students as well as through their studies.

(iii) Via the Youth Sub-Culture.

Though by no means all young people take an interest in the third world or environmental problems or politics, or are actively working towards the creation of a counterculture, students for the priesthood are liable to be influenced by those who do so where contact is made. Students for the priesthood may also be insulated from such enthusiasms by their own anomie. Contact with young people
who are suffering from 'meaninglessness' may well have the
effect on a seminarist of challenging him to try his hand
at helping to reconstruct their 'world'. Not infrequently
students for the priesthood can communicate effectively
with other young people, and this success is an encourage-
ment for themselves in their own human development.

(iv) Via the Church.

It is from the Church herself, which some might regard
as the most alienating thing in his life, that the student
for the priesthood can acquire the greatest ideal of human
fulfilment and completeness. The modern Church has become
increasingly a voice crying out against injustice and ali-
enation in the modern society. In Populorum Progressio Pope
Paul VI called on all members of the Church to work for
complete human development, in individuals and in the
whole of human society. Yet many students seem to remain
defeas to such exhortations because of their early individ-
ualistic 'nomization'.

B. ALIENATION.

(i) Via the Family.

On Berger's thesis it is the product of a devoutly re-
ligious home who is most likely to be alienated in the
seminary, as long as his religious background keeps him in
a state of false consciousness, and he is unaware of the
need to grow up and begin to create his own world, or ra-
ther, to realise that the world he inhabits is something
that he is already helping to create, and not something im-
posed upon him. A student may have experienced, conscious-
ly or unconsciously, other kinds of alienation, which he
may bring with him into the seminary, and which makes him
perhaps into a potential rebel against the status quo. His
family may have suffered from unemployment or from such a
situation as that in Northern Ireland, or in the immigrant
areas. His family may have encountered 'meaninglessness',
with their whole world falling apart, as could happen with the
abandonment of religious belief. Or the student's
family may be a source of alienation to
him personally, because of religious or educational differences.

(ii) **Via the Dominant Culture.**

This may have affected the student through his family, but on the whole seminary students, like priests, tend to be sheltered from the economic domination and powerlessness which Marx equated with alienation. To a certain extent few citizens today are not in some way alienated in an Orwellian '1984' sense, in the face of modern urbanization and economic power structures, to say nothing of the threat of violence and war. But the form of alienation derived from the dominant culture which is most likely to come home to a seminary student is a sense of inauthenticity, as he feels his priestly vocation and his celibacy questioned by the values expressed in the mass media, and especially as he gets a feeling of failure to contribute to society by any 'useful work'.

(iii) **Via the Youth Sub-Culture.**

Young people are alienated when they are denied a full participation in the organisation of society, and especially of their education. A seminary student may become aware of his own share in this form of powerlessness if he attends a university before or during his time in the seminary, or if in some other way he is able to make contact with his contemporaries. He may set out consciously to identify himself with alienated students or young workers from pastoral motives, or he may find himself somewhat oppressed by the generation gap in the seminary or in the Church generally. But as a seminary student he will be given considerably more respect as a young man than he could expect to receive without his embryonic clerical status.

(iv) **Via the Church.**

The Church may proclaim human development and fulfilment but within her own ranks authoritarian attitudes can cause a widespread alienation, and resentment of authority. (33) This belittlement of the individual human person
is not simply the unfortunate product of the rise to power of authoritarian personalities; it is incorporated in the very heart of the Homos which greets the student as he arrives at the seminary's massive front door. It is a norm that is preached in the name of religion, that "most powerful agency of alienation". It is reinforced powerfully by the self-estrangement entailed in celibacy, when that difficult calling is understood only in negative terms. It is a norm that all too frequently is invoked to block the working of that other norm which bids the student reach out for human maturity, even at the cost of 'chaos'.

From within the seminary, too, a student can meet isolation, both cultural and social. The latter will result from the failure of himself and of the rest of the student body to develop as they should, and to develop especially the art of communication with others, the ability to make personal relationships. And this failure to communicate is compounded by all the tensions which flow from the anomic and the alienation of students and staff, for tension is a sure block to proper communication and feedback.

In all of these ways a student may be living in a state of alienation, of which he may be blissfully unaware, the more so the more religiously he accepts the Homos wished upon him. A sad result of an emergence from false consciousness and the beginnings of a will to grow is that all too often the student leaves the seminary, instead of becoming a mature priest.

CONCLUSIONS.

Given that such polarities do exist in seminaries, as this model has suggested, one may expect to find the students (and the staff) dotted along the roads between the poles, at different stages of their seminary career. As with any other dynamic social institution a seminary is best studied with a movie camera, rather than with snapshots. A complete longitudinal study would pursue a cohort of students from the cradle to the parish Priest's
Given the limitation of resources at one's disposal this may not be possible, nor may it be easy to make the kind of micro-sociological study which should accompany the broad outlines of investigation sketched out above. It would be of the greatest interest to explore the small-group relationships of a seminary but without bugging the rector, the staff, and the students, or persuading them to shed the customary reserve of clerics faced with sociological enquiry, it is hard to know how this could be successfully undertaken. What has proved useful in the past, a series of interviews with recently hatched ordinands, may still prove the most successful opening for an inspection of the ways in which tomorrow's priests are socialised.


13. P. Berger, op. cit., p. 22

14. P. Berger, ibid., p. 3.


18. P. Berger, op. cit., p. 87


26. He does acknowledge the possibility of religious legitimation of de-alienation, in op. cit. p. 96.


Dewart defines clergy as a "sociological and juridical reality embodied in manners, mores, attitudes, and other formal and informal institutions which make up the clerical cultural complex which has long constituted the sociological heart of the Catholic Church, and
which, to a rapidly diminishing but still decisive degree, still does so today". He adds that "clerkship has in itself nothing to do with sacred orders or with ministerial charismata or with hierarchical authority, and least of all with the nature of the Church". (p.487

28. See, for example, Erik Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, Ch. 7: *Eight Ages of Man*, Pelican, 1970. p. 241, where he says "Mothers create a sense of trust in their children by that kind of administration which in its quality combines sensitive care of the baby's individual needs and a firm sense of personal trustworthiness within the trusted framework of their culture's life-style. This forms the basis in the child for a sense of identity which will later combine with a sense of being 'all right', of being oneself, and of becoming what other people trust one will become."


31. See J. Brothers, *Church and School*, Liverpool, 1964
33. A. Greeley, op. cit., p. 154. "What we are witnessing is not merely a disagreement between those who have power and those who do not, but a disagreement among those with opposing ideologies about the nature of reality whose power structure is the subject of disagreement."
CHAPTER VI

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In the article on Seminary Polarities I set out a fairly complicated hypothesis. At first I hoped to test it by visiting each of the seminaries in turn, interviewing in each establishment a representative number of staff and students. (The visit to Totteridge, described in Appendix I, was meant to be something of a trial run.) However, my health again intervened, and I felt compelled to do what I could with the help of a postal questionnaire, in which I hoped, somehow or other, to incorporate the Polarities hypothesis. After two pilot studies, sent out to priests ordained around the same time as those I had interviewed, I finally settled on my Questionnaire (1) and sent it off to every priest ordained for a diocese in England or Wales, in the years 1971, 1972, and 1973, of whom 295 were listed in the current Catholic Directory. In the pilot studies I had sent out two series of reminders, after each initial posting, and on each occasion the response had just reached one third of those to whom I had written. I therefore decided to be content with a one-third response; in fact I got back one hundred completed Questionnaires, along with several letters of apology from priests who did not wish to take part, several verbal apologies and unfulfilled promises, and two letters from parish priests informing me that priests to whom I had written had left the ministry.

The one hundred completed Questionnaires came back from priests who had been trained in 15 major seminaries. Table 1. shows the response: from each year of ordination.

(1) See Appendix II.
The Seminaries. The Beda College in Rome was founded after the first World War to train 'late vocations', offering a short course of four years, as opposed to the usual six. Of recent years it has been filled with 'younger' men in their twenties, which has led the other seminaries to take in older men, and offer them special shortened 'Beda-type' courses.

The Venerabile, or Venerable English College, is housed in Rome on the site of the ancient English pilgrim hostel. It became a seminary in 1576, originally staffed by Jesuits, many of its ordinands were martyred on their
return to England. It has in recent years acquired, rightly
or wrongly, the reputation of being an elite seminary for
future Bishops; the students do need to be of sufficient
intellectual calibre to follow the courses provided in
the Roman Gregorian University, (staffed by Jesuits).
Since the Beda filled up the English college has taken
over the former Beda function of housing young priests
sent out to Rome for post-ordination studies, and this
may possibly indicate the future of this college, given
the present concern that future priests should be provided
with a pastoral as much as an academic formation.

Lisbon, founded in 1626, no longer exists as a seminary,
though the future use of the college buildings is
still uncertain. (Valladolid, in Spain, which still con­tinues, provided no responses.) These overseas colleges
are the heirs of a long tradition, going back to the exo­
dus of Oxford recusants to Douai, under Elizabeth I. Ox­
ford-in-Flanders soon became transformed into a seminary
as envisaged by Trent, and other English colleges, along
with convents and monasteries, such as the perambulating
Carthusian Sheen Anglorum, sprang up in various Catholic
countries, to keep the English mission supplied with
priests, and martyrs.

Upholland was established in 1883 as the seminary
for Liverpool Archdiocese. In 1974 the major seminary
amalgamated with the major seminary at Ushaw, while the
students from the junior seminaries at Ushaw and at Kirkby
Lonsdale in Cumbria moved to Upholland, which now (1976)
provides what is virtually the only remaining junior semi­
inary in England. Upholland now houses, in place of the
major seminary, The Upholland Northern Institute, a centre
for adult education in the faith, and especially for the
in-service further education of priests.

Ushaw, along with Ware, began at the time of the
French Revolution, when the students at Douai (founded in
1568) were compelled to return to England. It has in
recent years sent a number of its students to Durham Uni­
versity, not far away, for part of their theology course.
It has at the same time placed considerable emphasis on
pastoral formation, with intensive spells of 'pastoral work' undertaken by the students for a block period at the end of each academic year.

Oscott (founded 1838) is the seminary for the Archdiocese of Birmingham. (None of the diocesan seminaries caters exclusively for the students of one diocese.) Like Ushaw it was established near an industrial centre.

Allen Hall, Ware, named after the founder of the college at Douai, has now moved into central London, and houses its students at Chelsea, on the site of Thomas More's establishment there, leaving Ware to the public school which grew up from what was once the junior seminary. Some of the students of this seminary attend Heythrop College, now a constituent college of the University of London, for their theology lectures.

Wonersh (founded in 1891) is the seminary for the Archdiocese of Southwark, and for the diocese of Arundel and Brighton, in which the seminary is situated, (Surrey and Sussex having been cut off to form a new diocese in 1965). Wonersh originally housed a junior seminary, which was hived off to Mark Cross in Sussex in 1924, but which came to a close in recent years, with the economic substructure deciding the debate about its survival.

All Hallows in Dublin is staffed by the Vincentian Fathers, an educational order established by St. Vincent de Paul. It has a tradition of training Irish priests who intend to work overseas, including the 'English mission'.

Maynooth is a famous name in Irish history, being the national seminary, enjoying university status and something of an elitist reputation. In former years many Maynooth trained priests came to work in an English diocese for a few years 'on loan', but with the falling off of vocations in Ireland, plus the greater attractions of working in America, the number of such priests has considerably diminished.

The remaining Irish seminaries are diocesan, mostly catering for students from the Irish countryside. Waterford
claims to be the oldest seminary in these islands, still surviving.

To preserve the anonymity of the respondents, especially in seminaries with only one or two of them, information will be classified under the five general headings: Overseas, North, South, Irish general, Irish diocesan. To do this means bracketing together the Beda and the Venerable, which at first sight seem to have little in common apart from the Roman weather; doubtless Oscott priests will object to being put in the South, but neither are they Northern, except to Southerners.

A note on response: As will be seen, the overall distribution of the responses over the three 'years' was remarkably even. In writing to the priests listed in the Directory as having been ordained in these three years, I could but guess as to which seminary they were from, apart from Wonersh. The good response from the 1973 year at Ushaw may be explained by the fact that I had visited that college in connection with the Y. C. S. group there, and of course I was known to the Wonersh students - in itself no reason why the response should have been better rather than worse. In fact my personal knowledge of Wonersh offers me an explanation of why there are variations in response from year to year in all the colleges. The 1972 year at Wonersh, which supplied seven responses, had originally numbered 34 students, back in 1966, (a record entry to the seminary, which then had over 100 students). About two-thirds of these 34 students left the seminary before ordination, though a number later completed their studies after 'time out'. Each 'year' in the seminary developed a different morale in face of the tribulations of rapid change, (or of what some students regarded as insufficiently rapid change); the experience of each 'year' was slightly different from that of its immediate predecessors and successors, and so of course was the 'chemistry' of the group, the mixture of personalities involved, and their collective reaction to events. Some groups seem to cohere better than others, even in seminaries, and I suspect this considerably influences reaction to an invitation to participate in a Questionnaire.
Table 2 (a) Age at Ordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish G.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average: 26.6.

Table 2 (b) Years spent in seminary study, including Junior seminaries, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>Junior seminaries, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish G.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish D.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average: 7.9

Thirty-three students studied in junior seminaries with an average of 5-6 years; 16 did 7 years. Twelve students went to Osterley, or some similar institution to prepare them for entry into a major seminary, where they could catch up on their Latin and English. Only one student of the 100 had undertaken 'time out' during his seminary course.

These figures do not bear out the widespread assumption that the age of ordination is moving upwards, away from the canonical minimum of 24. In fact 12% of these priests were ordained at 23. They spent an average of 7.9 years in seminaries, major or minor, though two-thirds of them did not attend a minor seminary. It should be borne in mind that the Irish students do not attend minor seminaries as such, but many of them do attend diocesan colleges catering for 'lay boys' as well as for Church students. (One of the last surviving junior seminaries in England, at Tollerton Hall, has recently changed over to this system, and a few 'lay' students are to be found in
the seminary at Upholland, which now groups together junior students from Ushaw and Kirkby Lonsdale.)

Table 3. Religious Background of Family of Origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Other than British</th>
<th>Respondent Converts</th>
<th>Non-Catholic Father</th>
<th>Convert Father</th>
<th>Non-Catholic Mother</th>
<th>Convert Mother</th>
<th>Total One or Both Parents not Born Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two priests said their parents were lapsed Catholics. Allowing for this, we find that 83 of the priests had practising Catholic mothers, of whom seven were converts, and 74 practising Catholic fathers, of whom eight were converts. There is no marked difference between North and South. 'British' includes two priests born in Northern Ireland. The priests who were not British were all Irish born, with one exception. Of the 68 priests of British nationality born in England and Wales, over half (37) had at least one parent who was not born a Catholic. Of these 68, 76% had Catholic fathers, 88% Catholic mothers.

Table 4. Socio-economic class of Family of Origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>I (Manual)</th>
<th>II (Manual)</th>
<th>III (Non-Manual)</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to state their father's occupation; these have been matched with the Registrar General's division of the population into the five categories shown above. Excluding farmers' sons, 55% of the respondents were of middle-class origin. (Overseas 50%, North 48%, South 65%).
Farmers (practically all in Ireland) are put into a separate category. This table shows that only 2% come from Social Class I, while 46% come from Social Class III, manual and non-manual. Again the difference is barely perceptible between North and South (North I & II: 4, South I & II: 8; North IV & V: 7, South IV & V: 4).

Table 5. Educational background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Some All Pri-</th>
<th>Some All Pri-</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Higher Stud.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-</td>
<td>non-</td>
<td>vate</td>
<td>vate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cath-</td>
<td>Cath-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The priests from the Overseas colleges, among them most of the converts, are an exception to the general rule that the bulk of the priests went through the ordinary mill of Catholic primary and grammar school education (or its Irish equivalent) and did not attend a University or other form of Higher Education.

Table 6. Work Experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>Over three years</th>
<th>Three years or less</th>
<th>Holiday jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six of those who took holiday jobs had already been to work; which leaves 57% of the priests reporting no experience of working life, even minimal. One cannot establish a trend without comparative figures, but the fact that one in three of the priests was something of a 'late' vocation does fit in with the decline of the junior seminary and supports the idea of unwillingness among
young people to make a life commitment as young as they
did some years ago.

Table 7. Attitudes to Authoritarian Statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>Number per group who scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 10 5 0 -5 -10 -15 Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20 1 0 1 7 4 4 3 -1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22 0 0 5 5 7 4 1 -0.6 -0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27 0 0 7 11 4 0 -0.9 -0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13 0 0 1 0 6 3 3 -5.4 -1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15 0 3 3 3 1 4 1 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97 1 3 17 20 29 19 8 -1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were invited to express their attitudes to a battery of nine 'authoritarian' and one 'anti-authoritarian' statements, along a five-point scale, ranging from 'agree very much' to 'disagree very much'. The statements were chosen largely from remarks made by various priests among the twenty interviewed in the preliminary study, who were known to me personally, as tending towards 'an authoritarian personality' along the lines suggested by Adorno. The scores were arrived at by a process of awarding +2 for 'agree very much' (-2 in the last anti-authoritarian statement) and through the scale to -2 for 'disagree very much' (+2 for the last statement). Thus the highest possible score was +20, and the lowest possible -20.

As will be seen from the Table above, most of the scores came into the central range between +9 and -10, with an overall average of -1.3. The English seminaries produced an average of -1.0, and the Irish -2. The Irish college groups, however, showed a wide range between the comparatively 'conservative' score of +1.7 for the country diocesan colleges, and the 'progressive' average score of -5.4 for the two general colleges of All Hallows and Maynooth. It will be seen that North and South produce an average of -0.7, while the Overseas, notwithstanding a score of +18 from one priest who strongly agreed with nearly every statement, finish with an average of -1.2.

Before placing too much trust in these figures, which
are derived from my subjective idea of what is and what is not an authoritarian statement, I decided to examine each statement individually and then to determine what correlations if any exist between the sets of scores from each college group for the ten statements. To facilitate this calculation the scores have been converted to percentages. (±20 = 100%).

Statement 1: "The Church needs strong guidance".

47 respondents agreed very much; only three disagreed very much, and two only disagreed 'to a limited extent'. Examination of the overall scores and averages in Table 7 above suggests that those who agreed with this Statement may have done so for conflicting reasons.

Table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 2: "There is a great crisis of faith".

This was put in because it appeared in the preliminary interviews as an attitude of priests known to the interviewer to be 'tending to the right' in the controversies in the seminary; it may have been a catch-phrase in temporary favour with that particular set of students, at a certain time and in a certain place, which could equally be adopted elsewhere among men of quite an opposite tendency.

Table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 3. "The permissive society is a terrible menace".

Of the eight who agreed very much, three respondents were much older than most. Of the 19 who strongly disagreed only one reached an overall score of 50 for the whole battery of statements. It is instructive to compare the Irish scores with those given to the previous statement.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 4. "Celibacy must be upheld at all costs".

Ten agreed strongly, 19 to a limited extent. 31 disagreed strongly; 23 to a limited extent.

Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5. "The Church must not meddle in politics".

Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems to be here a widespread mild disagreement, with the South and the Irish Diocesan students tending to
agree with the statement a little more than the North and the Irish General students.

Statement 6. "The priest must avoid working as a social worker".

Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only sharp difference between this and the scoring on the previous statement comes in the Northern group, where the response may have been influenced by a course in pastoral theology provided in the seminary from which most of the respondents came.

Statement 7. "The Church must uphold law and order".

Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scoring from Irish General is noteworthy; in the response to this statement thirteen priests agreed very much, and 29 to a limited extent; only three from English seminaries strongly disagreed; five did so from Irish General, two from Diocesan.

Statement 8. "Ecumenism has gone far enough".

Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are the lowest scores so far. It is worth recalling that of the seven converts in the 100 respondents, five were educated in the Overseas seminaries, which score perceptibly higher on this statement than do the others.

Statement 9. "The Church's main concern must be for her own people, not for those outside."

Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though there is here an even greater rejection of this statement than there was of No. 8, it is interesting to observe that both Irish groups of colleges, from which the respondents have crossed the sea to work in England and Wales, give lower scores than the English colleges.


This statement expresses an attitude presumed to belong to the opposite end of the authoritarian continuum, and the scoring attached to it has been reversed, i.e. positive responses count low, negative high, in contrast with the previous nine statements.

Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52 respondents strongly disagreed, of whom 26 scored less than 50 overall (in their average score based on all ten statements). This statement was included to test for latent racist attitudes, but the high average scores registered might suggest that the bulk of respondents were not aware of this area of controversy, which had been engaging the World and British Councils of Churches for some time before the questionnaires were sent out.

Table 18. Average scores for each statement of the five groups of colleges. (Max. 100, Min. 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75 51 39 26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>83 56 52 39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64 48 43 42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67 64 21 33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90 12 57 40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By matching each of these ten columns with each of the other nine, one arrives at the following matrix of correlations.

Table 19. Correlations between lists of average scores of each college group for each of the ten statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.9</td>
<td>-.8</td>
<td>-.6</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of this matrix shows that clusters of the statements are linked together with a much higher level of correlation than the rest. Thus, if we take a c6-efficiency of 0.6 as a significant level of correlation, we find
that statements 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 form such a cluster, in
which each statement shows a significant correlation with
at least two others in the cluster. Statement No. 2 produc­
es a negative correlation with every other statement, and
it too links up with this cluster. Whatever the merits
of these statements as a key to the personalities of these
respondents, which might well be followed up in a psycho­
logical study, what interests us here is the trend these
correlations suggest in the response pattern of the five
groups of colleges.

If these response patterns are expressed in the form of
two contrasting graphs (See Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) it is possi­
able to see more clearly why it is that these five lists
cluster together, and why No. 2 has a negative correlation with the rest of the lists. The high positive correlations appear when the different groups of colleges keep to the usual pattern of response, (in which the Irish Diocesan tend to have the highest scores, followed by North, Overseas, South and Irish General). In their response to No. 2, (which was inserted into the Statements because it was associated with 'authoritarian' trends in one English seminar), we find the Irish Diocesan colleges offering a very low response to the suggestion that "There is a terrible crisis of faith", while the Irish General respondents do just the opposite. This accounts for the consistent negative correlation.

What the five Statements which cluster together have in common is the general shape of the curve falling from an Irish Diocesan high response down to an Irish General low response. Bearing in mind the way in which words and expressions stimulate different responses in different cultural and historical settings, we can focus our attention on these five Statements, and examine the response pattern of those priests who score high for these five, and those who score low. The best procedure is to establish the standard deviation for the five overall averages of these five lists, and then pick out those respondents who score above or below it, on either side of the mean of all these average scores.

Table 20: Average scores for each group of colleges, based on responses to Statements 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score for cluster</th>
<th>Group average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 1 3 4 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75 39 26 48 59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>83 52 39 28 60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64 43 41 45 48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67 21 33 28 31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90 57 57 53 60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 43 46 41 52</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation of the mean scores for all the Statements is 13.5. We should therefore examine the groups of respondents who score, in their response to this
cluster of questions, either 64 or over, or 36 and below. In the first group there are 32 respondents, and in the second 21. To make a more balanced comparison, however, we shall omit the ten respondents who achieved scores of 65; this leaves two groups at each end of the spectrum, one of 22, (scoring over 65) and one of 21, scoring under 36. In giving each group a convenient label, (and to anticipate subsequent findings) we shall name the first group K, and the second Q. (The letters refer to the two etymologies of the various words commonly used for 'Church': Kirk, Kirche, and Church itself, derive, as we have already noted, from the late Greek Kyriakon, meaning the Lord's House; while Qahal, Eglise, Ecclesia, derive from the classical Greek EKKLESIA, meaning the assembly of the people.)

The first point to investigate regarding these respondents is to find which college groups they come from.

Table 21: College groups: K and Q.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>(Respondents who scored 65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that in each case of the two extreme groups, the Irish are a third, with the Diocesan priests heavily represented in K, and the General priests equally so in Q. It will also be noticed that the bulk of the South priests come within the middle range, even when the men who scored 65 are included in the category K, whereas such an inclusion evens out the middle and extreme numbers in the North and Overseas.
Table 22: Background features of K and Q groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordained 1971</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained 1972</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained 1973</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year not stated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age at ordination</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic father</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic mother</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father convert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother convert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all education not R.C.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all education not State</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or higher study</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Seminary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Average years in Junior Seminary.)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years in Seminary training</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterley-type training. (Number involved.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience. (Number with two or more years)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Class: Non-Manual or Wealthy Farmer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual/Farmer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers involved in these groups of respondents do not warrant any generalisations to be made regarding the differences between them, apart from the slight evidence that socio-economic class, linked with education, plus years between ordination and completion of the questionnaire, may have played some part in determining the responses to the five Statements under examination. What part would be played by personality factors is not the province of this study. Age is not a decisive factor; if two 'rather late vocations' are removed from the K's, their average age at ordination also becomes 26. Nationality does not appear to play too important a part, despite the evidence to the contrary provided in the overall college-group average scores for the five Statements, which
cates that Irish priests from the diocesan colleges tend more towards K, while those from the general colleges tend more towards Q. The six Irish K's are all from the diocesan colleges; so are two of the Irish Q's; five of the Irish Q's come from the general colleges. The same reversal appears in the contrast between the Overseas colleges (3 K's, 6 Q's) and the northern colleges (8 K's, 3 Q's), with the South more evenly divided, (4 K's, 5 Q's).

Where had these two groups of newly-ordained priests been sent to carry on their work? Of the two 'rather late vocations' in K, one was already retired, and the other was in a specialised apostolate linked with his previous occupation. One K said he was a hospital chaplain, as well as an assistant priest; one had taught for two years after ordination, but had since joined the fourteen others who claimed to be simply assistant priests; three assistants were also school chaplains, and one cared for the elderly. Of the Q's, two were students; five mentioned a special chaplaincy undertaken along with their general work as assistants in parishes; of these one was a school chaplain, one a prison and hospital chaplain; three were hospital chaplains; one was a catechetical director. Fourteen were simply assistants.

Of the 57 in the middle category, 40 were also simply assistant priests in parishes. Of the rest, six were also school chaplains, one of these combining this with chaplaincy to a psychiatric hospital; one was a hospital chaplain as well as assistant, two were notaries in the diocesan courts, and one worked in his diocesan curia; one priest worked full time as chaplain to immigrants; four were full time students, and one was a teacher. One other did not say what he did. The proportion of 'specialists' to non-specialists is practically identical (3 to 7) with each of the three groups.

In question 4, the respondents were asked both to name their present appointment, and to describe briefly the people they were mostly concerned with, and the main problems in their lives they considered relevant to their priestly ministry. This question was included in order to
discover the basic attitudes of the respondents towards their priestly ministry.

**OVERSEAS: Seminary 1.** Here we have two K's, but no Q's. Neither priest was an assistant.

**Seminary 2.** One K, and five Q's, one of whom was a student. Of the Q's who were assistants, two gave a brief description of the local industries and economic situation of the people. One mentioned the loneliness and isolation of old people. The other spoke of apathy encountered in the task of trying to help them to find Christ "against a background of job, mortgage, kids and marriage problems". A third spoke of problems of prisoners and mental patients, and nurses, many of whom had rejected religion - "by getting to know them on a friendly level". The fourth commented that people need someone to talk to, and too often no one has time. The K, also an assistant, spoke of unhappy marriages and the 'meaning' of life.

**Seminary 3.** One Q, with specialised work.

**NORTH: Seminary 1.** Three K's (out of six respondents). No Q's. All three spoke about the area the people lived in, rather than the work they did. Two gave the population of the parish; of these one also gave the total town population. One commented on the people's problems resulting from life in a working class area, with housing 'medium to poor', overcrowding, poor general education, and 'so inevitably spiritual malaise'. Another spoke more laconically of "people living in a demolition area. The breakup of a well established urban community".

**Seminary 2.** Five K's and three Q's. The K's were concerned about problems of parishioners as such: family problems and apathy towards the faith; traditional Catholics faced with Vatican II, and non-Church-goers; loneliness and fear of dying among the elderly; meaninglessness of religion; broken marriages; irrelevance of practice of Catholicism. One said he was concerned with all the people of his area; all their problems were relevant. One of the Q's wrote out a list of the varied types of people he met - "all types of people from doctors, scientists and Bank managers to labourers, nurses, craftsmen etc". They belonged to
many different culture groups, with many problems relevant to his priestly ministry, such as "concern for a changing church, children thinking differently, confession and Mass as meaningful". For another Q, the main problem was "to get people involved on a meaningful level". The third Q was a full time student. The K group see 'their people' as church members with problems. The Q group see the Church 'as people'.

SOUTH: Seminary 1. Three K's, one Q. One K said he was concerned with "every sort of person, no pattern of problems". Another was concerned with adolescents, including members of an Army Cadet Force, to which he was Chaplain. The third said he was working amongst "working class people whose roots are deep in traditional English Catholicism. Problem - they are in need of redemption". The Q said he worked among "normal people with a leaning towards apathy in many areas as far as 'institutional religion' is concerned. Don't blame them, though!"

Seminary 2. Two Q's, no K's. Both Q's were hospital chaplains as well as assistants. One said he met a good number of well educated people in the parish and in the hospital and medical school; the problem was to come to an "adult and mature understanding of Christianity and the teachings of the Church. They seem often to have advanced in all areas of knowledge, but not in faith". For the sick people, sickness did not appear to be part of their 'religious experience' but a stumbling block - "something that upsets the applecart of their views of faith and God". The other priest said his main concern was with working class families which made up a large section of his parish. He taught R.E. in a local non-Catholic Grammar School, where he took all the school, and not just Catholics, as well as acting as chaplain to a girls' Secondary school and a small hospital for cancer cases.

Seminary 3. One K, two Q's. The K said he worked in a mostly middle class parish, with one large council estate at the other end of the parish, noticeably separate from the rest of the parish. (Here again is the 'K' pre-occupation with the local area, looking at the people as a
problem of the parish.) He said problems were mainly concerned with the social rat race, money playing a great part of the problem. Most of the people were "up to their necks in mortgages - but still trying to live a comfortable existence". One of the Q's was in a parish not far from this K. He described it as working class, with a large number of coloured immigrants, mainly West Indian and Asian. "The problems of the people are mainly relevant to their country of origin." He then went into some detail to describe the West Indians, the Asians and the Irish, and the way these different groups were able to adapt to the culture over here. The other Q was assistant in a seaside town, for which he gave the total population. "Within the parish we have all social classes - the very rich and the very poor. Large number of retired people, lonely and feeling at times unwanted. Younger families whose fathers commute to work". The Catholic primary school was a focal point of unity. The young people all felt the town was a dead place with nothing to do, so many of them left as soon as they were old enough.

**IRISH GENERAL. Seminary 1.** One K, four Q's (out of 11). The K divided his people into three groups - 1) young families; the problem was "making Gospel understandable in a real way, not just in concepts"; 2) infants and junior children; 3) patients in a Mental Hospital - their need of understanding, and relief from guilt; need to be seen as people of value. For one Q 'the immediate people' were elderly or at least middle-aged. Most of them seemed to be concerned with what they considered to be the 'old-time religion - Novenas, Rosary, pilgrimages, etc.' The main problem was the drudgery of ordinary living - "seems to be very little cultural background to work on". The people 'practise' but very little else; they had no sense of community. The priest also worked as part-time chaplain to a Grammar School, where religion was of 'minor importance'. Another school chaplain said the problems were too wide to list. A third said he worked in a large parish with a mixture of University professional people, car assembly workers and dockers. The problems of the non-professional
people seemed to be mainly moral. "The professionals apparently have sorted out such questions to their own satisfaction". The fourth was in "a depressed area, therefore poverty, high percentage on Social Security, vandalism, crime, poor living conditions".

**Seminary 2.** One Q, no K's. He said the parish was not a busy one, and there was nothing for him to do. It was a well-to-do middle class parish with no special problems. "I started a youth club but the young people here don't really need one". (This pessimistic note echoes a problem which occurs elsewhere in the responses to the questionnaire, especially among Irish priests working in this country - the apparent serious lack of care on the part of Bishops in the first appointment of young assistants.)

**Irish Diocesan Colleges.** Seminary 1. Two K's, one Q. The first K wrote: "I am in a parish in an industrial town - it is comprised for the greater part of council estates. The main problem is the materialistic outlook of the people - apathy towards spiritual matters." (This K combines the K territorial pre-occupation with a statement of the spirit/matter dualism.) The second K describes "problems relating mostly to family problems such as housing and the effect that has on their lives. A lot of high-rise flats going up in the area. Also high proportion of West Indians in the area: parishioners are mostly Irish and West Indians - declining area". (The last two words are very expressive of the K characteristics.) The Q wrote: "the people I am concerned with are working class people. Problems - making religion relevant to the working man".

Seminary 2. One K. "The people are mainly working class. Their problems; reception of the sacraments; the high rate of marital breakdown; housing; a lack of appreciation of what the Church means. Therefore to them the idea of the Church is irrelevant."

Seminary 3. Two K's (out of four). One was assistant in a London parish with "people of all ages and every nationality. 60% (approx.) are of Irish parentage; rest English, West Indian, Italian, Polish, etc.: problems -
marriage break-up, scruples; mental and physical illness; loneliness; lack of meaning in life; for youth - Mass going and confession pose problems; lapsing from faith".

The other was assistant in a Manchester parish, where he was chaplain to a hospital and spent much time in the parish primary school. "The people are poor and live in sky-scraper flats. We visit the houses a lot (especially the large number of old people we have). We keep in touch with the Social Services and give them information on who needs help etc. The people are very friendly but it's a difficult area to bring up a family in." The latter priest writes like many other K's; the former more like a Q, except that he tends to see problems in religious terms, and says nothing about working problems.

Seminary 4. One K. He said his chief concern was with the house-bound sick, the older members of the community, and youth. Problems were loneliness, for the sick, leading to a bitterness at the apparent lack of concern and sympathy by the healthy; making the elderly realise the contribution they had already given to society, and making them useful to each other in their age-group; with the youth, "reconciling all the 'changes' with permanent principles. Helping them to fit into society. Helping them to overcome the turmoil of adolescence." (Here is a constructive and thoughtful approach to the problems of various groups of marginalised people, on the part of a man who tends to see the work of the Church as "helping people to fit into society" - a good example of the NOMOS mentality at work.)

Seminary 5. One Q. "My main concern is with comprehensive school children, as I am a school chaplain and I spend most of my time there. The main problem of their lives as far as I am concerned is that 50% of them have no religious background, coming from non-practising homes, due to our policy of baptizing anything on two legs that moves". By way of contrast, this Q provided a good example of radical criticism of the work he is expected to do, and of the whole Church model which has produced those expectations.

To sum up: What distinguishes the K responses is the con-
cern so many show with housing, with problems of the area of the parish, and of families; they seem to have in their minds a point of reference based on an ideal of a well-established and harmonious community. The Q priests question established practices, and show a readiness to think about the problems facing their people, including work situations (though even with these Q responses very little is said about work apart from the occupations of people).

Before proceeding to examine the system of 'formation' which these priests received, one may note the length of time they actually spent in training. Eight K's and five Q's had been at work for at least two years before entering a seminary. Seven K's went to junior seminaries, five for periods of seven years; the average was 6.3 years. Nine Q's went to junior seminaries, two for seven years; the average was 3.4 years. Five K's and four Q's went to houses for preparing late vocations for entry into senior seminaries, such as Campion House, Osterley. The time spent in these places was usually two years. The average time spent in senior seminaries by K's was 5.6 years; for Q's it was 5.9; the difference is created by two older K's who did three and four years respectively; while one Q also did four years, four did seven; this does not indicate that they were less intelligent than the K's and so had to do a longer period of study, but rather the contrary; the English College course in Rome, which entails attendance at the Gregorian University, is normally seven years. What these figures do suggest (not very strongly) is the tendency for the K's to be slightly older, and for the Q's to be slightly brighter. This last point shows itself in the time spent in junior seminaries; boys who passed the eleven plus would have stayed on at school to get their O-levels, and then have gone to the junior seminary for a couple of years. Boys who failed the eleven plus would have proceeded to the junior seminary at once, to complete a seven-year course, if they persevered.
One interesting contrast is the fact that five parents of Q priests were converts, but none of the parents of K priests; ten of the K priests had non-Catholic parents, against four non-Catholic fathers and no non-Catholic mothers in Q. Bearing in mind that three of the K's were converts themselves, this suggests, on such slight evidence as these figures provide, that while conversion to Catholicism and non-Catholic parentage may tend to reinforce a 'traditional' approach to the Church and the ministry, convert parentage may tend to reinforce a more open and enquiring approach. What emerges more convincingly is the socio-economic class division, linked as it is with education, between the two groups; the K's tend to come from a 'higher' class than the Q's, and to have received more of private education; numbers are evenly divided regarding university or higher study of some form or other.

None of these background details goes very far in offering an explanation of why there is so marked a contrast between the responses, and the different models of the Church which these imply. Under consideration are two groups of priests asked to accept or reject five propositions. Here are their average scores expressed as percentages.

1) "The Church needs strong guidance". Average K: 91
   Average Q: 61

2) "The permissive society is a terrible menace". Average K: 80
   Average Q: 16

3) "Celibacy must be upheld at all costs". Average K: 75
   Average Q: 4

4) "The priest must avoid working as a social worker". Average K: 82
   Average Q: 18

5) "The Church must uphold law and order". Average K: 80
   Average Q: 20

The ambiguity of the first statement is revealed
by the comparative high score from the Q respondents; nevertheless the gap between their 61 and the 91 of the K's is still wide. "Strong guidance" for those who take an authoritarian and traditional approach has quite different connotations from its meaning for those who advocate a more 'liberal' and 'progressive' form of Church government. The issue of the permissive society, with its implications for Catholic moral teaching and practice creates a wider gap between the two groups; even wider is that over celibacy. It is noteworthy here that while practically every one of the Q group strongly disagrees with the statement in question, the K group give to this 'only' 75%; nevertheless eight of the K's gave this statement strong agreement.

The social worker issue, as already noted, is probably conditioned by the course in pastoral theology in one of the larger seminaries, where the idea of the priest's rôle being complementary to that of the social worker, though different from it, would probably have been stressed. In other seminaries (to my personal knowledge) the term 'social worker' can be applied almost as a term of abuse to a priest or a student who thinks of the ministry in terms of the material conditions of life of the people. (This was the reason for my inserting this item.) It was the Irish General respondents who most strongly rejected the statement.

The last item, about law and order, with its political implications, both for the Third World, for the Northern Ireland situation, and for the general attitude of the Church to 'established law and order', is possibly where the class differences of the respondents, and whether they are English or Irish, tend to show themselves most forcefully. As will be noticed, this gets the highest score from the Q group, apart from statement No. 1.

With all these factors in mind, we can now turn our attention to the principal object of this study, the seminaries in which the priests, with all their differing backgrounds (and personalities) were 'formed' - over periods of time varying from three years to thirteen - for the rôle of Church leaders.
CHAPTER VII

The Seminaries at Work

In the questionnaire the priests were asked to assess, in Q5, the seminary training they had received. They were offered a list of various interpretations of the principal function of a priest, and then asked to state for which of those functions on the list they had been best prepared in the seminary, and those for which they had been least prepared. Here is the list:

1. Saying Mass and administering the Sacraments.
2. Praying for all the people.
3. Preaching and instructing.
4. Counselling.
5. Forming lay apostles.
6. Helping people to relate to each other.
7. Evangelising the general population.
8. Some other functions (which they were invited to specify).

Table 19 shows the college group scores for the function for which the respondents felt they had been best prepared. (Some selected one function for praise and for blame as requested; others nominated more than one; in the event all the scores have been included.) Average scores are obtained by dividing the total number in each group who answered this question into the 'votes' for each function.

Table 19. The function for which we were best prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. The function for which we were least prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 1, "Saying Mass and administering the Sacraments" was given the highest percentage of votes for the function for which the seminary had best prepared the respondents. It was closely followed up by "Preaching and instruction". Then came "Praying for all the people", followed by "Counselling" - which received a varied approval, (having been taught in some colleges but not in others). In the negative voting, deciding which functions they had been the least prepared for, "Evangelising the general population" came first overall, and in the North, South and General groups. Other functions for which individuals considered they had been well prepared were:

To become an amateur theologian.
Being a human being.
Understanding the faith.
Good liturgy.
Personal prayer.
Trying to live the Gospel.
Preaching - but not instructing.
Christian care.
Relating to society through hobbies.
Working with other denominations.
Being a yes-man.

The following were thought to have been badly prepared for:

RE for children and adolescents.
Relating religion to people's lives.
Methodology in preaching and instruction.
Financial training.
Marriage instruction.
The Sacraments.
Instruction - not preaching.
Strict teaching technique.
Confession.

Notwithstanding three references in the last list to Sacraments, and the reservations about methodology in preaching and instruction, the picture that emerges is that for priests ordained in 1971, 1972 and 1973, the seminaries were still best at preparing students for the traditional tasks of cult and preaching, and least efficient at preparation for "evangelising the general population", with its implication of a radical movement away from the traditional Catholic community-centred ministry of the recent past. Even the comparatively old-fashioned (i.e. pre-Vatican II) task of 'forming lay apostles', seems to have been neglected, totally so, it would appear, in the Irish colleges. One would therefore expect the K group to have been more satisfied with the seminaries, the Q group to have been more critical. This is the way the two groups responded to this question.

Table 21: Response of K and Q groups to Q. 5 'Best Prepared'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Response of K and Q groups to Q. 5 'Least Prepared'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show that the average K was prepared to award good marks, to the average Q's, while the average Q awarded bad marks, to the average K's. In Table 21 the approval shown by the average K for functions 1 (cult), 2 (praying), and 3 (preaching), was .2 higher than those of the average Q. While none of the Q's thought evangelising the general population had been the function they had been prepared for the best, the average K awarded .2 approval. In Table 22, the average Q awarded .2 disappro-
val to preaching and instruction; the average K only .04. Evangelising the general population was given .5 disapproval by both the average K, and the average Q.

These differences are slight; perhaps their best use is in enabling us to see that even the average K gave .3 disapproval to the way the seminaries had prepared him for the functions of forming lay apostles, and counselling.

A more detailed look at the seminaries themselves, as distinct from the way they had been thought to have prepared the respondents for various priestly functions, was offered by Question 6. In this it was suggested that thought seminaries are all changing a great deal, there were some basic activities in them which needed to be evaluated by the subsequent experience of priests after their ordination. The respondents were invited, 'in the light of their experience' to cast back their minds to their major seminary days, and to evaluate 15 selected topics, on a four point scale. (Two marks were awarded if they thought the item was working extremely well, one if it was working fairly well; one minus mark if it needed some improvement, and two if it needed a great deal of improvement.) Respondents were also asked to note if the topic was non-existent, but needed, or non-existent and not needed. No points were given for these last two evaluations. Scores converted to a percentage basis are shown in Table 23.

The item which scored highest was the "physical care of the students", followed by "learning to make the liturgy live", "learning to preach effectively" and "learning to know Christ well". The overall average gave a negative score to all the other items. Last on the list came "learning to be an expert on prayer", preceded by "learning the real work of the priest", and "learning to talk to children". Preaching did not seem to have been catered for too well in the overseas colleges; on the other hand the Irish diocesan colleges gave a good mark to "learning to be an expert on prayer", and the North colleges gave a good mark to "pastoral formation". Not surprisingly the overseas colleges felt particularly badly done by for this last item.
### Table 23: Evaluation of seminary activities. (Q.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Group</th>
<th>No. 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score difference K/Q**

3 33 20 20 36 25 5 18 -2 8 10 30 14 -8 13 -2 12

Scores indicate average per group. Full approval 100%.

**Hr (Rank correlation):**

- South/Overseas: 0.6
- South/North: 0.3
- South/General: 0.6
- South/Diocesan: 0.7

(Activities evaluated:

1. Selection procedure for new students.
2. Pastoral formation of students.
3. The general course of studies.
4. Learning to know Christ well.
5. Learning the real work of a priest.
6. Learning to be an expert on prayer.
7. Learning to be a successful celibate.
8. Learning to make the Liturgy live.
9. Learning to preach effectively.
10. Learning to talk to workers.
11. Learning how to relate to women.
12. Learning a sense of social justice.
13. Learning to talk to children.
14. The emotional development of students.
15. The physical care of students.
16. Anything else you wish to specify.)
In one of the seminaries in the South, selection procedures were started a few years before the questionnaire was sent out. (The usual procedure is for a candidate to be interviewed by his Bishop, aided by one or two clerical advisers, and for the seminaries to accept anyone the Bishop sends. The new procedure mentioned in the seminary in the South, involves a selection week-end put on by the college itself, in which candidates are interviewed by a panel of experts, including lay-people and a psychiatrist; the reactions of other students are also taken into account in the final assessment.) Apart from the South, the college groups tended to criticize the selection arrangements. Five respondents indicated that such arrangements did not exist, but should do so; another four noted that they did not exist, but decided there was no need for them.

Individual features of various colleges were to be glimpsed throughout these replies. One of the North colleges was the first to introduce a full-time member of staff to deal with 'pastoral formation', and the success of his work is mirrored in the favourable score given to the appropriate item No. 2. In the item of studies, it is evident that some of the overseas students were pleased to have been given the chance to attend lectures at the Gregorian University in Rome. They produce a favourable verdict on this item, while no other college group does so, "Learning the real work of a priest" (No. 5) gets a negative verdict from every group except the North, who finish up with the favourable and unfavourable votes cancelling each other out. In fact most of the favourable ones came from one of the two colleges, which also tended to produce high scores in the question on authoritarian attitudes. (This suggests that the respondents from this college were content with the item, because what they learnt in the seminary fitted in with their model of the Church.)

The colleges from which the K and Q group respondents tended to come (K from North and Diocesan, Q from Overseas and General), may be detected in the Second Part of Table 23, in which the average scores of these contrasting respondents are matched together. It will be seen that
Pastoral formation (No. 2) gets a high K score, and a low Q one, whereas the difference on Item 3 on "The general course of studies" is much less. As will be seen the K respondents tend to give positive scores, approving the seminary, while the Q group tend to be negative. The largest difference of all emerges in the replies to Item 5 - "Learning the real work of the priest". A number of respondents asked what was the real work of the priest; on this item especially we can see different models of the Church revealing themselves. After Nos. 5 and 2, the next greatest difference comes under Item No. 12 - "Learning a sense of justice". Somewhat surprising were the scores for Item No. 14 - "The emotional development of students", in which the K's provided a less favourable response than the Q's. It will be seen that this Item is let off fairly lightly by the overseas colleges, where perhaps the proportion of older men may account for the comparatively favourable response. What emerges elsewhere in the open-ended sections of the questionnaire is a critical attitude among K type priests towards 'immaturity' among their fellow students; this is a different reaction to this Item from what one would expect of the Q group, who tend to be more concerned with a radical flaw in the seminary system itself.

Item 6 - "Learning to be an expert on prayer" came in for heavy criticism, despite the constant attention paid to this subject in many seminaries; this too is borne out by the open-ended questions. Here we may note that the criticism is expressed most strongly by England North and South, and by Irish General colleges; least of all by the Irish diocesan. On the other hand, these last took the lead in criticising the Item - "Learning to be a successful celibate". Seven respondents in the South (one in four) took this to be absent altogether, but needed. Five of the Overseas respondents (also one in four) thought it was absent, but four of them decided it was not needed. Five of the Irish General thought it was absent (out of thirteen), of whom three thought it was needed. Altogether 21 out of the 98 respondents decided this Item was missing from the seminary; fifteen of them thought it was needed, six not so.
Still more decided Item No. 11 - "Learning to relate to women" was missing; of these 20 saw it as needed. The Irish diocesan priests on the whole were content with the way their colleges treated this Item. Least satisfied were the North and Irish General.

Table 24. Seminary activities: "Missing and needed".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Q</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Seminary activities: "Missing and not needed".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Q</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Items specified under No. 16 were:

**Overseas:** Understanding the liturgy. (-2)
Involvement in the local community. (Needed)
Self-imposed timetable. (Needed)
Training for the Confessional. (Needed)
Learning to pray. (-1)

**North:** Learning to stand on your own two feet and to make responsible decisions. (plus 2)
Spiritual training. (Needed)
South: Learning to respect what was told in confidence. (-2)  
School chaplain work. (-2)  
Ability to organise and lead. (Needed)  
Lack of physical exercise. (-1)  

General: Being accepted man to man. (-2)  

Diocesan: Staff-student relationship. (Needed)  
Learning to organise life effectively. (-1)  
Lack of specialising in one subject. (-2)  

The Item No. 10 - "Learning to talk to workers", merits particular attention. It will be seen that both K and Q noted its absence. (9/22 and 8/21 respectively). Along with "The emotional development of students" it was given the highest score (24) among the Items listed as missing but needed, and the second highest rating (7) after "Learning to relate to women" (8) among the Items listed as missing but not needed. The college group who gave it the lowest average evaluation (-0.6) were the Irish General respondents, followed by the North (-0.4). The South, however, gave it only -0.04 disapproval; two South respondents gave it 2 plus, and four gave it 4 plus; this suggests not so much a middle class bias in the South, and less consciousness of this Item, but rather a tendency for these South colleges to provide opportunities for their students to make the necessary contacts.

The third of this series of questions, asked the priests to state what changes they would care to suggest for the future formation of students for the priesthood, bearing in mind their own experience. Their answers are set out in full in Appendix III. One way to 'quantify' open-ended questions such as this is to make a word count, and make note of the words that keep recurring.

Table 26. Words used most frequently in response to Q. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prayer/spirituality</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Priest/priesthood</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Course (of studies)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College group</td>
<td>Average use of each word per respondent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Word 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas:</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan:</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group K</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Q</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Groups K and Q have more to say than the 'average' respondent, and Q more to say than K, about every Item except No. 5, No. 6 and No. 9. The South group, who come mostly in the group in the middle, have less to say than the K or the Q groups, where most of these ten words are concerned. "Priest/priesthood" is the most important word for the Overseas group; "Seminary" and "Prayer/spirituality" come first for the North; "Seminary" and "Student" come first for the South. For the Irish General group, "Student" and "Pastoral" come first. For Irish Diocesan, "Seminary" comes first most significantly. K put "Seminary" first, Q "Student", which again seems to illustrate the territorial interest of K and the 'person-centred' approach of Q. After the words "Seminary" and "Student", "Prayer/spirituality" are mentioned most of all by the average respondent. On both the K and the Q lists these words come in fourth place; after "Student" and "Priest" for K, and after "Priest" for Q. We shall look once again at the ideas put forward by the K and Q students from each of the seminaries, to see what contrasts emerge.

**OVERSEAS: Seminary 1.** One of the two K's maintained that it is how a Rector 'shepherds his seminary' which will impress the student and fortify him for his future priesthood. The other wanted less bias towards philosophy; he did want the students to be taught how to express themselves with brevity and exactness. (No Q's)
Seminary 2. One Q wanted more opportunity for personal initiative. "Personal responsibility should be greatly allowed and emphasised". Another wanted both greater stress on personal responsibility and deeper understanding of priesthood, to be seen as service, not as a possession. Training has to be carried out by a Rector and staff who are familiar with modern theology and the changed understanding of the priesthood, authority, and community. He commented that there is often a clash between the 'world-pictures' of the staff and of the students, "which makes for lack of real communication". The one K saw a need to create flexibility in the courses of studies between the seminary and other educational institutions. He wanted the student to have an opportunity "to make mistakes and carry the can for them" - and to learn to live on his own. A third Q wanted "a system as totally free as possible, which would enable students to develop their talents, and be mature". He wanted some kind of novitiate to enable the students to grow in self-knowledge and in knowledge of Christ - experienced as a "real living person active and present in their lives". He wanted a system that would not be too systematic, "but rather more open to diversity and the promptings of the Spirit".

The fourth in this college suggested that changes would have to be very basic. Students must be more ready to go out, to relate sensibly, but also have a chance of some "quiet togetherness", to be able to get to know each other, and to know God in prayer. He wanted more time taken over selection, and during the time of study; he was worried about the "staff-student set-up". He wanted generally smaller communities giving wider freedom in choice of courses. He too stressed that "essentially people should be allowed to develop their capabilities".

Seminary 3. One Q, who wanted smaller groupings of students, asked for far more contact "with other people" and a more flexible academic course.

To sum up: The first obvious contrast is that the Q's have more to say than the K's. The second is the way the Q's (and one K) stress self-development, while one of the K's lays stress on the character of the Rector, the
'shepherd'. The course of studies seemed to be causing some anxiety in all these colleges - it seemed to lack flexibility in each case.

NORTH. Seminary 1. No Q's. Two K's talked about staff and one about the need for more practical help in the day-to-day duties of priests in the parish.

Seminary 2. One man made three points: 1) More emphasis should be laid on the spiritual formation of a student's life. More experienced and trained spiritual directors should be introduced. 2) Studies should be shown to be relevant to the pastoral needs of the People of God. Teachers in seminaries should first be made to spend quite some time working in a 'parish' situation before returning to seminaries to teach future priests. Professors who have spent all their time within a college situation tend to teach in a vacuum, thus offering no practical aids to the student. 3) The way of life in the seminary should make it clear to the student that he is being trained to serve in a missionary field. At present they are being encouraged to get into a comfortable middle class style of living."

It is interesting to note this demand for properly trained spiritual directors, from a priest ordained in 1973. One ordained in 1971 took a more optimistic view of the actual state of affairs in this college, when he wrote: "In the latter part of my time at the seminary a completely new system had been introduced, and I would say that it was extremely beneficial; particularly in its insistence upon regular contact with a personal Director."

This man stressed counselling and group-work. Another priest wanted to see students learning and living in small (9 - 12) communities; he wanted much higher standards; "quality not quantity in prayer, discipline, manners, etc". He wanted selection to encourage later vocations, after a year or two at work; and he thought junior seminaries should be closed; "their only justification is for children of bad family background". (He had done seven years in one himself.)
Yet another K thought much more was needed in the seminary "re practical and 'successful' running of a parish; there should be more active and positive approach re real parish problems", which he specified as "a) formation of community, and b) adaptation of parish to changes and vice versa". (Underlined twice and two exclamation marks.) Finally, he put down as VERY IMPORTANT: "Whole approach to non-Christian and lapsed needs to be thought out; parishes doing very little at this level in an active way. Yet I think that this is one if not THE primary task of the Parish, to worship AND BEAR WITNESS ACTIVELY." The last K again called for a more intensive course in spirituality, for greater contact with parish life and problems, to avoid what he called seminary "insularity" and "storm in a tea-cup" situations. Theology, he thought, still seems to have a naive idealistic effect on students.

The three Q's, not unexpectedly, strike a more radical note. For one, "my first thought is abolish seminaries altogether, but perhaps that is not a practical solution to a perennial problem". He suggests, therefore, "1) more integration into life - 2) A move away from a stoical emotional emptiness, to a situation which 3) involves the important stress on relationships. 4) A deep spirituality which does not rely upon outmoded halls of residence, which is what seminaries are".

The next one goes further with his three suggestions: 
1) That if the basic principle of training is that the student should be given the opportunity as far as possible to live the sort of responsible life expected of a priest while that student is still training in the seminary, that principle should be properly adhered to: which means that his socializing with women, any drinking habits he may manifest, etc., should not be subject to seminary disciplinary regulations. It follows, a fortiori, that prayer, attendance at Mass etc. must not be subject to rules either.
2) As regards selection of those students 'fit' to proceed to ordination, the students themselves ought to be consulted on the suitability of their fellows.
3) Courses in prayer, ascetic theology must be substantially introduced. The third Q respondent felt the need for developing along the lines of small groups. "The foundation year (or years ?) is excellent as a basic idea, but then I feel that the study following that would be better accomplished in a small group setting, e.g. sharing with a Presbytery or in 'digs' with a first rate Catholic family, sharing the apostolate of the area." For him education after the foundation year would be more beneficial in a secular environment.

These two sets of replies from the one seminary illustrate very clearly the difference between those who want to reform the system and those who want to change it drastically. We can begin to see here manifesting itself the difference between the NOMOS ANOMIE polarity, and the ALIENATION PLEROMA one, outlined in Chapter IV.

SOUTH: Seminary 1. The three K respondents did not have a great deal to say. One wanted students to be prepared to meet "pre-Vatican II conditions" and to be taught that change does not take place overnight. Another wanted greater emphasis on personal and community prayer - "e.g. obligatory meditation, recitation of office, etc". He wanted more work done on the Canon Law of marriage preparation, and more of a traditional Eucharistic devotion. He asked: "Would you like me to write a book?" The third said there is a need for a greater maturity on the part of the staff. "Many of them are far too young to bring a sense of stability to the college." He also wanted to see a degree system established "so that all qualifications don't emanate from Rome". The solitary Q from his college, wanted priests to be drawn from within small communities of lay people. He said there is no one type of ministry, and so no one type of training. "It would depend on each community that was served as to how a priest should be trained. Naturally Christian formation of some kind would be necessary, but not six years full-time study". He added that before training there would be a need to change a lot of ideas outside the seminary.

Seminary 2. No K's, two Q's, of whom one remained
silent on this question; the other said students should pursue their secular education before entering the seminary; they needed much greater depth of spiritual formation, far more ecumenical contacts, and a much greater study of the 'social' teaching of the Church, and of political awareness generally.

Seminary 3. One K, two Q's. The K wanted greater emphasis on prayer, both for priests themselves, and as leaders of prayer groups; he also wanted more help for students in dealing with marriage instruction, converts, talks, etc; and greater stress on the importance of "correct and relevant liturgy. The real principles of liturgy, and not reliance on our own fads and fancies, which have a harmful effect".

Of the Q's, one said formation must be on a more individual basis. "Everyone was expected to do the same courses of study where some needed greater help, others greater freedom to do more". He stressed the importance of prayer. "It must be part of the student's life, otherwise he is wasting his time". He added that there are many things for which the seminary cannot prepare a student; dealing with children, for instance, can come only from experience.

The other turned first to celibacy. He thought it was essential that students should have made up their minds about their ability to undertake it before entering the seminary - so they should be accepted before 20 years old. The seminary process, he thought, was only partly a process of formation; the main process is one of elimination. The 'formation', as he experienced it, was really an 'information' process, that is, acquiring relevant knowledge and skills. "Unless students are accepted at the age of 3 years, I do not think 'personality' formation is possible."

(This remark is most pertinent to the whole Tridentine theory of seminary training, and a key perhaps to the malaise of today's attempts to reform that system, instead of radically changing it.) The changes this priest wanted were: 1) smaller groups doing practical work together, out in parishes, and undertaking parish work over a period of months. (More staff.) 2) Breakdown of staff/student
barriers. 3) Wider distribution of 'job opportunities' in
the seminary - "and as priests increasingly have to care
for themselves in presbyteries, use of opportunities in
the seminary for learning how to cook, etc."

**IRISH GENERAL.** Seminary 1. One K, four Q's. The K
had nothing to say. Of the Q's, not surprisingly, one
begins: "Seminary to be phased out and replaced by living
in the community, working in some sort of lay apostolate,
and attendance daily at lectures. Concept of ministry to
be re-examined." He wanted to see development of indivi­
dual talents. The same note struck by another respondent
who wrote: "Try to educate men - who are capable of honest
and independent decisions; men who will make a stand when
some genuine and real grievance arises." He continues in
a similar rhetorical vein for some time, and concludes:
"this will happen only in a seminary where there is real
freedom, real honesty and truth, where there is real re­
sponsibility, not molly-coddling". The other two wrote
more soberly. One wanted more emphasis on real religion
and prayer, solid training in prayer (again harping on
a need for reality). He also wanted more information on
social conditions especially for those going to foreign
countries, accurate information in life-style of the
clergy, especially for "over-idealistic types" - and also
a course in dog-handling.

The other wanted part of every academic year spent
in a parish of the diocese in which the student is to
work as a priest, with at least one year spent "on deacon
work" in at least two totally different parishes, with
time back at the seminary before ordination, to "chew" over
the experience; less emphasis on the academic passing of
exams "which are taken as the necessary qualifications of
a good priest, and indeed for ordination". (It is notice­
able how little the Q's mention the course of studies.)

Seminary 2. One Q, who, simply wanted "less emphasis
on rules and regulations and the outward observable behav­
ior; more consultation with students, who tend to know
their own needs best".
Seminary 1. Two K's, one Q. One K said the seminary had changed too much since his ordination for him to comment. The other suggested that every prospective student should have spent a few years working in the area in which he was to minister; more time should be spent on the training of the student in practical rather than theoretical aspects of the priesthood. "I would suggest a year of study about three years after ordination." Some of the student's holiday time ought to be spent in parochial work with "a good pastoral parish priest". All the Q recommended was that students should be like "any ordinary student and attend University".

Seminary 2. One K, who, wanted "a deep appreciation of the need of spirituality in the priesthood". The seminary course should be "more pastorally orientated. In particular the Diaconate should be extended to two years approximately."

Seminary 3. Two K's, one of whom wanted to see seminaries built in close proximity to cities, "where there is an abundance of pastoral work, that the student should be introduced to very early in his studies". This man added that the student should also be almost "brain-washed into an appreciation of the value of prayer in his life as a priest". In addition to these remarks, this priest added, at the back of the questionnaire form, these interesting comments: "I want to add something about seminary Rectors and staff. You must be very special people because you are shaping the lives of the leaders of the Church of the future. A lot of what professors said in class when I was in the seminary I have long since forgotten, but, what still stays with me and has obviously become part of me is their own attitude to the priesthood. I still recall vividly the great enthusiasm for work, for prayer, that oozed out of some of the staff, and sadly also the damage that a cynical or half-hearted seminary professor does. To me your own personalities are as important as the system you work within." (These words echo those of the late vocation from Overseas Seminary 1, about the importance of the Rector.)
The other K in this Irish seminary said he liked the present mixture in the seminary between pastoral activity and learning. He did not want to see pastoral activity become the more important. He wanted students to be paid a salary by the Diocese, to avoid the present inequality where "some who ask get all, and those who don't, get nothing". (This was an exceptional reference to a student's financial problems, and the question of grants, either from local authorities (some of whom paid them for the whole of a student's course, some for part of it, and some for none), or, from the student's Bishop. This respondent wanted more training for preaching, using modern TV techniques (again a rare mention of an important area of education). He wanted all "Sem Profs" to have "a few years pastoral experience first", and he wanted all students to be made aware of what is happening in their Diocese, as they train for the Priesthood. (This need was registered, as we have seen, by a number of Irish priests, both K's and Q's.)

Seminary 4. One K, who wanted students to be helped to relate their "professional knowledge to unprofessional people; to be realistic in their learning and how to use that learning; to be taught that they are leaders in their communities - not bosses or tyrants but leaders who "roll up their sleeves"; to live moderately both socially and domestically; and to be able to communicate as a professional and as a human being. (This Irish K writes like an English Q. Later he talks about a "lust for authority" causing tensions in the seminary, but he also sees tension arising from a desire for revolutionary instead of evolutionary change.)

Seminary 5. One Q who makes it plain that he is a Q and not a K, by writing: "After surviving the trauma of being treated like a very junior schoolboy, one at last expects to be treated as a responsible adult at an age when most of one's contemporaries have children attending junior school. But this is not the case. One is still a schoolboy after ordination. Seminaries would do well to prepare students for this shock especially as I believe some semi-
naries treat students as men nowadays. So the trauma will be even greater for them, reverting from men to schoolboys on ordination". (This expresses rather bitterly a feeling which is present in the replies of a number of the 'middle group' responses, that the seminary student was treated as a schoolboy; the extension of this to the priesthood itself reminds us of Greeley's findings in his study of American priests, whose main complaint was the way they were treated by those in authority over them, or by the 'system'.)

To sum up these two strands of comment and criticism on the various seminaries by these forty odd priests: From the K group comes a wish for stability in the seminary which is not helped by immature staff or students; junior seminaries should be abolished. Students should learn how to make mistakes; the selection process should ensure later vocations. Student finances need looking into. Prayer needs to be appreciated more deeply, even if this means 'brainwashing' the students into it. There should be well-trained spiritual directors for each student. Students should be trained to be leaders of prayer groups, and to celebrate liturgy correctly, without introducing their own fads and fancies.

Students should learn about the day-to-day activities of a priest; they should also be prepared to meet pre-Vatican II conditions in the parish, and be prepared for living on their own.

In their pastoral formation, they should learn to be missionary, and not settle down into middle class comfort. They should be prepared more for counselling and for group work, for marriage instruction, etc.

Students should spend a few years in the area in which they will be working as priests; they should spend some time working with a good pastoral, parish priest. Seminaries should be sited near cities. In the Seminary, the staff should have spent some time in a parish before they begin teaching; their own personalities count as much as the system. The Rector especially has a shepherd rela-
tionship with the students. The COURSE of studies should be more flexible, and more relevant; the Philosophy course needs improvement, to help the students to express themselves with greater brevity and exactness; the Canon Law of Marriage needs to be taught better. There should be a degree system set up in the seminaries. Preaching could be taught better with the aid of TV techniques. The course should be a mixture of pastoral training and learning. The Diaconate, at the end of the course, should be extended to two years. Students should be able to communicate professional knowledge to unprofessional PEOPLE.

From the Q's comes a demand to get rid of senior SEMINARIES as well. The seminary system, which really exists for purposes, not of formation, but of information and elimination, should be replaced by some kind of noviciate or foundation year, after which the students should live in small groups situated in presbyteries, or with lay-people, from where they could attend lectures; in any case a great deal is learnt after ordination. STUDENTS should be selected from small groups of lay-people; before they begin to study for the priesthood they should have finished their secular education, and they should have their minds made up about celibacy - so that they should be at least twenty years old. In their education for the priesthood they should be treated as men, not as schoolboys - though it is also important to prepare them for possible treatment as schoolboys after ordination. Great stress should be put on their personal initiative and responsibility; the seminary should be marked by real freedom, real honesty, real truth. There should be more ecumenical contacts.

Students should receive a real knowledge of Christ, and a deeper SPIRITUALITY; they will be wasting their time unless they appreciate prayer; in the seminary they need periods of quiet togetherness. They need a deeper understanding of the PRIESTHOOD, seeing it as a service, not as a possession; the whole concept of the ministry needs to be re-examined; there is no one type of ministry. Students need to learn more about the life-style of the clergy.
(They also need to learn how to cook.) They need to find out more about the social conditions of the diocese where they will be working. STAFF need to be men who understand modern theology; there should be a breakdown of staff/student barriers, and much better communication. In the COURSE of studies the social teaching of the Church and political awareness need more attention; there should be less emphasis on the academic passing of exams; students should be able to go to a University.

Perhaps the main dividing line between these two groups emerges in the frame of mind in which the respondents appear to have been writing when they completed the questionnaires; the main emphasis on the K side would seem to be the dissatisfaction a young priest feels as an assistant priest in a parish, concerning some of the duties he is called upon to perform; he accepts the parish as he accepted the seminary; he wants to see improvements in both; just as he wants to be a good shepherd to his own flock, so he would like to see the seminary staff well equipped for the task of shepherding the students along towards their ordination. On the Q side there is a re-thinking of the ministry, of theology, of society, and therefore of the seminary, if there is to be such an institution. (The ideas of these respondents sound very like those of the French writers in Vocation, while the K respondents correspond more with Seminarium.)

---

CHAPTER VIII

Influences at Work upon the Seminary as a Process of Communication

Before this study is taken any further, a model of role-taking factors, derived from Katz and Kahn, in their Social Psychology of Organisation may be found to be useful. One of the Q respondents complained of poor communications between staff and students, and asserted that these two groups tended to have different world-pictures.

* references begin p. 184
If one is to accept the contention that a seminary would be better looked upon as a time, rather than as a place, one may also see this time as a period in students' lives in which they are put through a communication process, in which the organisational leadership of the seminary propose to communicate the rôle of priest. Following Katz and Kahn, we may examine this process through the various factors involved: organisational factors, personal factors, inter-personal factors, all of which affect the communication of the rôle by the rôle senders to the focal person, and feedback of the communication from the focal person to the rôle-sendee. This process is best illustrated by this diagram, borrowed from that on p.186 of the book just mentioned.
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Fig. 3 Model of rôle-taking factors.

Katz and Kahn employed this model to illustrate some of the areas of conflict which may accompany a rôle-sending process. A variety of conflicts can enter the system from the organisational factors. What Marx had to say about the economic sub-structure comes to mind when seminaries are shut down or merged or moved from financial necessity, overruling as it does all too often arguments of a more theological or pastoral nature. The seminary institution will evidently be much affected by the organisational changes in the entire Church structure attendant on Vatican II; equally important will be the factors deriving from ongoing changes in the societies in which the Church and its seminaries exist — and this is where our discussion of alienation is relevant. Industrialisation and urbanisa-
tion, in so many different phases, even within these islands, will have done a great deal to influence the family and educational atmosphere in which these students grew up: above all the impact of secularisation on the religious life of their families, and of themselves, will have played a vital part in the way in which they received the rôle communicated to them. After organisational factors, conditioning and modifying the entire system in which the communication takes place, one needs to consider the rôle senders, as Katz and Kahn call them; in the case of the seminary system these will not be exclusively the seminary Rector and staff, though clearly these play a very large part in the process; also to be included will be the laity, the members of the Church community from which the students come, and among whom they intend to work. Foremost among them will usually be their own parents and families, their peer-group, their teachers and anyone else who helps to shape their understanding of priesthood. One needs to consider the influences at work on the rôle-senders, notably Bishops, the Pope, the Vatican Council, authors of books (and writers of theses), and the so-called 'new priesthood' of our age, the men and women who control the mass media. In the Katz and Kahn model, separate consideration is given, first of all, to the rôle expectations of the rôle senders — the theory about the message they entertain collectively (and quite possibly without agreement among themselves); and, secondly, to the rôle as it is actually sent, whatever code or medium the message takes. In the case of the seminary, seen as a process of communication the very shape of the building may make a great difference to the sending of the message. A vast Victorian block of a building is saying a great deal to a student, before anyone actually speaks to him; the same would be true if he were sent instead to a back-to-back terraced house in Leeds, to join a small group of three or four students or others already engaged in a specialised form of apostolic work (as is the case, for instance, with the religious order founded on the ideas of the French missionary, Charles de Foucauld, whose 'Little Brothers' already share the kind of small group contem-
plative life among ordinary working people envisaged by some of the Q respondents). (2)

The rôle of the priest is communicated to the focal person, the student for the priesthood. Again there is a distinction to be made between the rôle as he personally receives it, over the years in which he plays this part, and his subsequent rôle behaviour. He does not begin to behave in the priestly rôle as such until after his ordination; yet in fact the student is expected to take on and live, long before ordination, many of the features both of the priesthood itself, and of the clerical status and life-style, a style which accompanies the priesthood in Western European Catholicism, and more especially in British Catholicism. Once again in a wide variety of ways, the student feeds back his rôle understanding and behaviour to the rôle-senders; but in doing so, as the model makes clear, both he and they will both influence and be influenced by two other sets of factors, the personal and the interpersonal ones. The focal person's personal factors include not only his own personality and education, his age and his experience, family background and intelligence, but also his financial position (and that of his family), his emotional development, and attitudes towards celibacy, his spirituality, and above all his sense of 'vocation', the mysterious element in every decision to apply for admission to the priesthood. (3) An important element in this 'vocation' will be the student's changing understanding of the priesthood, and also the ideas and example of his fellow-students. This brings us on to the interpersonal factors, in which the whole body of staff and student members of the seminary with all the different friendships and antipathies, small group relationships and overall sense of community or lack of it, have their part to play. Overcrowding, reputed to have played its part in the troubles of the L. S. E., may also enter into a seminary's interpersonal factors; the same is true of undercrowding; the sight of empty benches in the chapel, for instance, when numbers of candidates for the priesthood have decreased, or when students are away on 'pastoral
work can play its part in creating the mood of a group of students. The same applies to students sent overseas to Rome or Lisbon to live the life of expatriates.

Katz and Kahn note possible causes of conflict in this process; the rôle senders may themselves suffer from interpersonal, and intrapersonal conflict; the focal person, or his peers, may suffer from rôle ambiguity, especially in times of rapid change in the rôle senders' messages; he may suffer from rôle conflict, as between his rôle as a student, and his rôle as a future priest, which may make him uncertain whether to keep at his books or to engage in some apostolic task. Again there may well be a conflict between the rôle and the person.

Before one looks into some of these factors, so far as the questionnaire was able to elicit information from the respondents, a remark by Smelser, in his Theory of Collective Behavior, (in which he is talking about structural strain underlying collective behaviour) is worth noting. He says: "Value strain poses the issue of commitment; normative strain concerns the integration of human interaction; strain on mobilization concerns the balance between motivated activity and its rewards; strain on facilities concerns the adequacy of knowledge and skills." (4) This list of strains may be put to good use in our examination of the stresses and strains of the seminary system, seen as a communication process over a period of time.

Each respondent was asked to comment, as before, on a series of statements designed to investigate some of these issues.

Twelve statements were arranged in pairs. In each pair the first statement is concerned with the supposed Nomos-Anomie polarity; the second with the Alienation-Plenoma polarity. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree on a five-point scale.

Table 27. "The kind of family I grew up in prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life".
Table 28. "The kind of family I grew up in helped me to develop as a human being while I was in the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+95</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noticed that the K score is higher than the Q for the first statement, and lower for the second, though there is not a marked difference between them. (This pattern is maintained through all the pairs of statements, with the exception of the last.) The difference between the two lists of college group average scores is interesting. The respondents were, on average, inclined to think that their family background had helped them to develop as human beings, rather than fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life, by the following percentage differences: Overseas: 12; North: 15; South: 32; General: 21; Diocesan: 25; K Group: 4; Q group: 26; Total: 22.
Table 29. "The education I received as a boy prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life!"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30. "The education I received as a boy prepared me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it will be seen that practically all the average scores are near 50; there were no strong views, either way, in the overall picture; the Irish General group seemed to be of the opinion that their education had indeed prepared them to fit in to the seminary pattern; but the Q group were inclined, overall, that theirs had not done so; on the other hand the Q group were the only ones who moved very far away from the 50 mark in agreeing that their education had prepared them to develop as human beings while at the seminary; (it will be remembered that while the Q group tended to be rather more working class in origin than the K group, they also tended to spend less time in the junior seminary). Again, looking at the
percentage differences between these two Tables, we find the following: Overseas: 5; North: 4; South: -1; General: -12; Diocesan: 5; K: -1; Q: 15; Total: 3.

These differences are much less than in the two statements on family background, but there is an overall tendency to reinforce the family statement differences.

Table 31. "The way my age group thought and behaved when I was a young man prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No. A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. "The way my age group thought and behaved when I was a young man prepared me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No. A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it will be seen that the first statement receives an overall negative response; the lowest scores come from the South, and from the Q group. On the other hand the second statement is generally accepted. The % differences are: Overseas: 23; North: 24; South: 25; General: 13; Diocesan: 7; K: 23; Q: 41. The two Irish groups stand out
for the smallness of these differences. The Irish priests tend to think back to the norms and values of their peer-group as being less contradictory to the seminary NOMOS than do their English counterparts, and especially the members of the Q group. The overall difference is 23%.

Table 33. "The predominant values of modern affluent industrial society helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. "The predominant values of modern affluent industrial society helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the first statement receives a negative response, but so does the second one, with only slight percentage difference: Overseas: 1; North: 4; South 5; General: 6; Diocesan: 5; K: -6; Q: 4; Total: 4. The K group were the only ones to think that the values of modern affluent industrial society helped them even less to develop as human beings than to fit in with seminary pattern. It will be
seen that the South gave the lowest response to both Statements, whereas the North provided three who agreed with the second Statement, and two who agreed very much. Perhaps the words 'modern' and 'industrial' are connected in some of their minds with grit and drive and self-determination, or possibly with union militancy, while 'affluence' may stand out for the students in the South as something far removed from the rigours of seminary life, and from the notion of human development.

Table 35. "The way I understood the Church, and my place in her, helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. "The way I understood the Church, and my place in her, helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a marked contrast here between the responses of Overseas, North, and Diocesan to that of South and General, towards the first Statement. This suggests perhaps a dif-
ferent model of the Church; this is brought out by the difference between the positive K response and the slightly negative Q response. On the other hand all groups respond positively to the second Statement, and the difference between K and Q is slight. This suggests something common to both Church models. The group with the lowest response to the second Statement is Overseas, which suggests that "the way they understood the Church" may not correspond with the life of an expatriate community, and this they may have found personally frustrating.

The differences between the two lists of percentages are: Overseas: -3; North: 13; South: 26; General: 27; Diocesan: 12; K: 24; Q: 26; Total: 23.

Table 37. "My own personal temperament helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. "My own personal temperament helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly everyone seems to have confidence in his personal temperament, and the way it got him through the seminary. The Irish Diocesan and the K group are distinguished by the way they think their temperaments fitted them into the seminary; the K group keep the same high score in the response to the second Statement. Though the Q group also give a high response to both Statements, they manage to lag behind the K's. The responses in Table 38 are notable for the high number (49 out of 93) who thought their temperament did help to grow as human beings while they were at the seminary, but considered this merited only a moderate response.

The differences in percentages between these last two lists are: Overseas: -3; North: 5; South: 9; General: 15; Diocesan: -5; K: 0; Q: -8; Total: 5. These differences are here put into tabular form:

Table 39. Percentage differences between "NOMOS" and "ALIENATION" responses. (Normally the latter and greater than the former.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Difference between Statements</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pairs which elicited the consistently higher margins are 1/2, dealing with family, 5/6 dealing with peer-group, and 9/10, dealing with the Church. Where education, modern society, and personal temperament are concerned there is again a consistently low margin between the pairs of Statements. The two sets of averages, "A" denoting those for pairs 1/2, 5/6 and 9/10, and "B" the others, are set out at the end of the Table. This shows that the differences for the "A" scores from the Q group are three times as big as they are for the K group. It will be seen that the
college groups range between the 30 differences of the Q's and the 11 of the K's; nearest to the Q's are the South, with 28, followed by General with 20, North with 17, and Diocesan with 15, while Overseas have 11, the same as K.

From these figures we may draw only the most tentative of conclusions, given the difficulty of expressing in a questionnaire of this nature the full implications of these questions, based themselves on highly speculative alienation theory. We can say that there is evidently some link between the 'personality' or 'different Church model' polarities expressed by the K and Q groups, and the responses to six out of the twelve Statements here offered for consideration. We cannot hope to establish with any great conviction, by a study confined to a postal questionnaire, the hypothesis put forward in the article on seminary polarities. What we can deduce from the Table above is that the colleges of the South show a greater resemblance to the 'polarities' exhibited by the Q group than those of the North, or of Overseas, which come nearer to those of the K group; the Irish General are somewhere in the middle between K and Q, with Diocesan nearer K.

Another tabulation may be of interest, ranging from highest to lowest the overall average responses for each of the twelve statements.

Table 40. Range of overall average responses to twelve Statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &quot;The kind of family I grew up in helped me to develop as a human being while I was in the seminary.&quot;</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;My own personal temperament helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary.&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (&quot;The way I understood the Church, and my place in her, helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary.&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;My own personal temperament helped me to fit in easily with a semi-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family, temperament, and Church understanding evidently fit together in the bulk of respondents' minds, as factors which enabled them to develop as human beings in the seminary, even if they were not too sure as to whether or not these factors helped them "to fit in" to the seminary pattern. Both Statements on education come into the "not sure" area, but both on "predominant values" come at the bottom of the list, helping respondents neither to fit in nor to develop. The peer-group were thought to help the respondents to develop but not to fit in. One cannot but speculate as to
This helps us to see that Dominant Values of the affluent society were not thought to have helped any group, on average, to "fit in" or to "develop". Otherwise K and Average show the same pattern, but Q will admit that only their own Temperament enabled them to "fit in" to the seminary pattern. This suggests some confirmation of the Polarities hypothesis, by which one body of students will be polarised along a continuum between NOMOS and a consciousness of ANOMIE, while others will be polarised along a continuum between PLENOMA and a consciousness, dwindling to "false consciousness", of ALIENATION.)
why "predominant values come last. Perhaps these are not thought to be too relevant to the seminary career of a Church student by the bulk of respondents. It would be interesting, though difficult, to investigate further just how much these students were in actual fact shaped and made aware by such norms and values, and to what extent their responses reflect a Marxist "false consciousness".

The attitudes expressed on peer-group influence would also merit closer investigation. One may contrast with the negative responses concerning peer-group and ability to develop, the conclusions drawn by Kusgrove in his study of young people, made at the very time when most of the respondents in this study would have been teen-agers. Adolescents he tells us, are on the whole "kindly disposed to their seniors, value their approval, and aim to be co-operative with them" (5) Yet the responses here suggest that "my age-group" would have been non-conformist. The other statement on age-group, as linked with development, which scores an overall average of 59, carries the suggestion that the peer-group did help the respondents to develop as human beings, almost in spite of the seminary system, into which it did not help them to fit. (See Fig. 4, p. 159a)

Q. 9 One aspect of "socialization" in the seminary which I wanted to investigate concerned the growth of priestly authoritarianism. Many factors extraneous to the seminary, clearly could contribute to an individual's personality in this regard; it might, nevertheless, be possible to examine some trends originating within the seminary system itself. One possible approach would be a series of statements reflecting the way in which respondents felt they had been treated by various elements within the system - and by "the System" as a whole. Here are the results for five statements, each prefaced by the sentence "In my seminary days, students were treated with great respect for their human dignity..."
Table 41. "By other students".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The closeness of K and Q here suggests that these responses are not governed by "personality" or "Church model" differences. There is a consistency throughout all the college groups, with the Irish diocesan showing the greatest approval of treatment by other students, and General the lowest. Only one response, from the North, disagrees very much. We cannot look here for evidence of authoritarianism among the student body. What we find is quite the contrary, though evidently with a little reservation.

Table 42. "By the staff as a whole".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again K and Q are close together; the overall average is lower than the response concerning students, and General express an overall negative response, though not very much. North were most loyal to the staff, with 10 respondents out of 23 saying they agreed with the Statement very much;
South had 13 who agreed moderately, though only four agreed very much. K turn out to be the group with the greatest number disagreeing strongly—four out of 20. (These four came from Overseas, South, and two from Diocesan.)

Table 43. "By some staff members".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |         |      |
| K   | 17  | 11  | 3   | 2   | 1   | 0   | 24    | 1.4     | 85   |
| Q   | 17  | 8   | 6   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 19    | 1.1     | 78   |

Though all scores are high, K does get a little away from Q on this occasion, though the K score still lags behind the very high 93 from the North. It is of interest here to observe the differences in percentages from the previous question, which are: Overseas: 18%; North: 18%; South: 18%; General: 24%; Diocesan: 23%; K: 24%; Q: 18%; Total: 22.

This gives us some measure of reservations on the part of the respondents concerning the staff who do not come in for the approval expressed in Table 43. It is interesting to see how consistent this gap is in the three groups of English colleges (18% for each) and also the two Irish groups, (23 and 24%).

Table 44. "By the Seminary Rector".

Though the scores are favourable overall, it would be invidious to present the college group responses, so we offer here simply the overall scores, and the K and Q averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All college groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is surprising here is the reversal of the K and Q scores; with 5 of the K's disagreeing very strongly with the statement, as opposed to 3 of the Q's, and 3 of the K's simply disagreeing, as opposed to one of the Q's. (3 of the 5 K's who disagree strongly prove to have done the same in Table 42; in this case the other two come from the North and from Overseas, so the criticism is well spread around the groups, and never concentrated.) It will be observed that feelings about the Rector's treatment of students come half way between the overall 61, regarding the staff as a whole, and 83, regarding some staff. There is no evidence here to suggest that any of the Rectors appeared to the respondents to have acted in a particularly authoritarian way, so far as the responses to this Statement are any guide to follow.

Table 45. "By the seminary system".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K          | 20 | 5  | 4  | 3  | 3  | 5  | +1    | +0.05   | 51           |

Q          | 20 | 1  | 5  | 1  | 4  | 8  | -13   | -0.7    | 31           |

After the reluctance of the Q's in the previous four Statements to come out very strongly against other students, staff or Rectors, they suddenly turn against "the system" (reminding us of Marx on alienation). It will be observed that the Overseas group have the same low score on this as do the Q group, with General quite close, and South not far behind. North are the only group to give a positive response, though it is still a very low one for them, and includes six "agree very much" scores. By averaging out the scores presented for "the staff as a whole", and "some staff", we may obtain an overall representation of the respondents' attitudes to staff members, and observe the differences between those scores and these ones.
regarding "the system". They are: Overseas: 37; North: 15; South: 29; General: 19; Diocesan: 17; K: 13; Q: 31; Total: 22.

This points to a conclusion, so far as this evidence will justify it, that the bulk of respondents do not think the "seminary system" treated them with great respect for their human dignity, although they did not necessarily associate the staff or the Rectors with this treatment; there is the inference, noted previously, that certain members of staff would have been associated with this lack of respect. We shall find more evidence of this conclusion when we come to the open-ended questions on tensions in the seminary, and tensions among priests attributable to the seminary. Students who spend up to 14 years in a "system" which (according to some of them) does not treat them with the dignity they deserve as human beings, are at the very least liable to be infected with the virus of which they complain. A more explicit approach to attitude-learning was contained in a final series of Statements, loosely linked with See-man's list of "categories" of alienation. Again these Statements come in pairs. Each was prefaced with the words: "We learned in the seminary...."

Table 46. "To treat everyone with great respect".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+0.9 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+1.04 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+0.8 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+0.2 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+0.9 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+0.8 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+1.1 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+0.1 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47.  "To behave in an authoritarian way".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bulk of the respondents, it is clear, were reluctant to admit the second statement, and preferred the first. Differences between the two are: Overseas: 48; North: 53; South: 37; General: 17; Diocesan: 50; K: 58; Q: 4; Total: 44. The contrast between K and Q is instructive; all those who agreed very much with the second statement, and half those who agreed with it moderately, come from Q. General, it will be noticed, come at the bottom of the first Table and top of the second, though in both cases they follow the overall swing. We have no evidence for supposing that these reported attitudes are wide of the objective truth; (presumably authoritarian personalities did learn to treat everyone with respect, more than tolerant personalities; presumably tolerant personalities did learn - in the seminary - to behave in an authoritarian way - more than authoritarian personalities did). If we take the overall averages (70% in Table 46 and 26% in Table 47) as some rough guide to the "real situation" we may conclude, tentatively, that on this evidence students did learn in the seminary to treat everyone with respect, with certain qualifications; and likewise they did not learn to behave in an authoritarian way - though again, this is said with qualifications.
### Table 48. "To help people form a community".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 49. "To thrust community upon people".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnote:
The Statement in Table 49 needs a word of explanation, as it has come in for some criticism as a "leading question". The reason I put it in this form goes back to a seminar with students on the subject of non-directive community development, which seemed a harmless but useful exercise at the time. During the course of the proceedings I noticed a distinct drop in the temperature of the group. When I questioned them about it afterwards I was told "You (meaning not me but the staff) are always going on at us about community; it's the same in the parish. People don't want community thrust upon them". (Harvey Cox makes the same point in *Secular City*). In
subsequent years I would tell this as an anecdote to other students, and, unfortunately, invariably with the same emotional effect, which is not unlike the effect upon a sociology class of talking about social class. Taken out of its context, one cannot expect a remark like this to produce the same result, but I put it in hopefully.

There is not much separating K from Q in either Table, though in the first one can see that General and Q both score 50, a somewhat lower score than the overall average of 63, while Diocesan score 72. Not many (22) disagreed with the first Statement or agreed (18) with the second. Indeed, if it is true that the seminaries do, by and large, "thrust community" upon their inmates, such an attempt may conceivably be counter-productive, and lead the respondents to emphasise their rejection of such a policy.

Table 50. "To help people find a meaning in life".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51. "To find a meaning in our lives".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bulk of respondents agree with both Statements, and rather more with the second than with the first. K, North and Diocesan, are especially eager to agree with the second Statement, with which none strongly disagreed. Here was a pair of Statements in which the medium of postal questionnaire has probably blurred the message more than elsewhere and failed to express and elicit what was intended. Yet even if there is a certain complacency here on the part of these respondents, in an allegedly meaningless world, a quarter of them could not agree positively that they had been helped in the seminary to help people find a meaning in their lives.

Table 52. "To help people develop a mature conscience".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K 20 7 7 5 0 1 19 1.0 74
Q 21 2 8 3 6 2 2 0.1 52

Table 53. "To act maturely and responsibly ourselves".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K 20 9 7 3 0 1 23 1.2 79
Q 20 6 7 0 4 3 9 0.5 61

There is little difference between the two sets of scores. K's lead over Q goes up in the second Table from 12 to 18.
General have comparatively low scores in each Table, Diocesan have come top in the first Table, and are second in the other. It is a matter for reflection that the priests who have most confidence that they have learned how to help people to develop a mature conscience, and who are most satisfied with their own maturity and responsibility, are those we have come to associate most of all with a NOMOS mentality, in which a good conscience consists of conformity to rules. On the other hand the men we have come to associate with the other seminary polarity, who would see NOMOS in terms of false consciousness and alienation, and who gravitate towards PLEOMA, are the ones who show the most doubts regarding the effectiveness of the seminary course in this regard. Yet even they, it must be acknowledged, keep their overall response above the half-way line. 32 altogether fail to agree positively with the first Statement, and 27 with the second.

Table 54. "To live as part of a big community".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K 20 8 8 2 1 1 21 1.05 76
Q 21 5 5 3 5 3 4 0.1 52

Table 55. "To live in a presbytery".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K 20 4 6 3 2 5 +2 +0.1 53
Q 19 0 2 5 3 9 -19 -1.0 29.
These two Statements, taken together, are very revealing, and help to support the theory that the role which students in fact receive in the seminary communication process is not that of the priest at all, but that of the seminary student. It is interesting to see what happens to K and Q in these responses; in reply to the first Statement, K, somewhat surprisingly, agree (76%) far more than Q (52%). In the response to the second Statement the K score comes down to 53, though it is still much higher than the overall average (35) and far away from General (21) and South (23). Q comes down to 25. Evidently the Q respondents did not learn to be part of a big community, or at least only half of them did; but neither did they learn to live in a presbytery, which implies far more than an ability to get used to a smaller house. In the decrees of Vatican II there is reference to priests as a presbyterium - a word which means a collectivity of "elders" of the Church community, which we have come to attach to the building priests live in, in much the same way as we have applied the word "Church" to the "sacred building". In the open-ended question concerning tensions among priests, we shall hear more of the serious difficulties some of these respondents had already encountered on their entry into the presbyterium. The failure of the seminary system to prepare priests adequately for this is one of the most serious criticisms discerned in this study.

It is noteworthy to examine the Irish diocesan response in Table 55. This may simply follow the same "personality" trend as the K respondents, but it may also reflect something of credit to these seminaries. In Ireland the presbytery custom is different from that in this country, where priests and assistants normally share the same house. In the open-ended responses several references are made by priests from the Irish diocesan seminaries to the care with which they had been prepared for the English way of presbytery life. On the other hand some of the Irish General priests speak strongly about
the problems of adjustment to house-sharing with an older priest of "incompatible" ways.

To sum up the impression received from the answers to this question, the priests appear to be satisfied, on the whole, that they are not authoritarian; that they are ready to provide people with a meaning to life; and to help them form a community, without thrusting it on them; they are able to act responsibly and able to help others to develop a mature conscience. But when they turn to their own situation, they see themselves formed to live in a big community, rather than in the more restricted life of the presbytery. All this is a reminder of the impression derived from the preliminary study of 20 priests, who had little to say about the way their ministry affected the various ways in which the mass of people around them were alienated, but had plenty to say about their own tensions. In the next open-ended question we return to tensions. (See Appendix IV for full text of replies.)

q. 12. Were you aware of any sources of strain or tension among the students when you were in the seminary?

OVERSEAS. These respondents made one or two references to the problems encountered by men unused to foreign ways and climates, or to the continental approach to study. One or two also had financial worries, and like all the other college groups, they reported tensions originating with the implementation of Vatican II, and the need for a "mature attitude to change". Men living abroad in a seminary community are perhaps thrown more on top of one another than those who stay at home, and this appears in these responses. For some it shows itself as an irritation with younger or less mature students, some straight from school, and still growing up. There is mention of "natural human relationships" and emotional pressures. The communities could be split along various lines: "dogmatic versus experimentalism"; "trads v. mods" in the liturgy; theological fragmentation. One man complained that he had no vocation for the monastic life the seminary offered him. Staff were criticised for lack of direction,
and for the "Them and Us" mentality. Authority was occasion­ally authoritarian, and this led to some rebelliousness. The main problem was a lack of real communication between students and staff. Two mentioned a certain frustration regard­ing the local community, with which they were unable to make contact, or to which there was no commitment on the part of the seminary.

One Overseas K complained that fully mature men, ex­perienced in the world, were treated like teenagers. One Q said that strain arises because of the refusal to allow students to work with the staff in developing new community structures. "This leads to a counter-productive 'them/us' attitude and is a real refusal to face the underlying prob­lems of authority, community, and ministry." Another Q wrote: "A division - not to be over-simplified - between what for want of a better term can be called 'traditionalists' and 'modernists', but what my bias urges me to call those who wished to be out-going and have an 'incarnation­al' approach to Christianity in the world (me!) and those who preferred a strongly self-contained seminary and spiri­tuality and a clerical Church". This expresses the basic "K" and "Q" division, which was not of course confined to 5% at either end of the spectrum, but which involved to some degree all the student body.

Another Q spoke of efforts to make and train everyone to be the same, which led to efforts to suppress personal­ity. He also said that "exams led to terrific tension". Yet another Q wrote: "Apart from the 'shall I leave' or 'shall I stay' type of tension, the seminary did create other tensions. The tensions that come from a large group living in the same building - personality differences etc. Tensions created by living through a period of drastic change in the Seminary; the authorities not moving fast enough for the students. Sometimes, among individuals, the feeling of being inexperienced, especially those having come directly from school."
NORTH. No special climatic conditions were mentioned, or local cultural problems, apart from one reference to tensions breaking out between supporters of rival football teams. Nor was much said about authority, or staff/student relationships; one K said the trouble with the staff was that they were all so busy lecturing outside the college as well as within it. Another man spoke of Big Brother and an atmosphere of fear leading to deception, but this did not emerge as a widespread feeling. Again not much was said about work, apart from reference to academic boredom; a problem of dividing time between academic and pastoral work; and one reference to the work load, "after the changes". Some students apparently could not cope with it and broke down as a result. Other odd mentions were made of loneliness, (comparing the seminary to a block of flats), low grants, and unfulfilled talents. Sudden changes from "monasticism to freedom" also brought tension, but what really stands out in these two northern colleges is the division among the students themselves. It was described in various ways, right against left, cliques leading to bitterness, conservatives against progressives, pressure groups; arguments about liturgy; people who welcomed freedom against those who preferred a more structured community. One K priest described how hard it was for "dedicated students to put up with those who seemed either through idleness or a crisis of identity to disrupt and destroy what should have been a reasonably good and mature system of education". The word maturity seems to have been a key to much of the trouble. One man complained that adults had been treated as VIth formers. Another spoke of immaturity showing itself in a "false bonhomie". Others spoke of emotional immaturity, as students tried to come to terms with their sexuality, and developed a fear of homosexuality. This led to "a great fear of emotional feelings". A Q priest said that though in theory after the changes the students were given the same freedom as they would have as priests, in practice the rules and regulations continued to prevent this from
happening, in such areas as friendships with women, drink, and compulsory attendance at Mass. He linked this last point with "genuine problems of Faith" experienced by some students. Other emotional problems in the all-male community came from "heart-aches" following pastoral expeditions. One K said there was bound to be a certain immaturity in seminary life; maturity only begins, he thought, with permanent attachment to a parish or to pastoral life. One K wrote of the lack of true responsibility given to the students. "More often as not the students tended to be treated like a schoolboy, which tended to make life somewhat difficult for the adult vocation." Two of the eight K's in this group did not think there were tensions, apart from trivial ones. It was one of the three Q's who said that as in sky-scaper flats people can live closely together and yet be completely isolated – so also in the seminary. Another Q blamed "the tendency to be encouraged to seek Perfection, when we had not yet become fully human".

SOUTH. In contrast with the North, the colleges in the South did not dwell on tensions caused by other students. One man spoke of "normal healthy tensions of personal relationships? a K said that petty crises boiled up "because the lads have nothing better to think about". One did say that "polarisation was evident", though its causes were complicated; it took the form of "Conservatives and Liberals". Another K said tensions came from "an all-male post-adolescent community preparing for a life so fundamentally different from others". Several made reference to the personal decision involved in such a preparation. There was for one "the strain of becoming aware of my own imperfections and having to change". Another K spoke of crises which hit everyone trying to discern God's call. There was just one reference to financial strain for older students; hardly anyone referred to work. One man said the "new teaching" was difficult for converts, while the more militant could not adapt to compromises in the Church. He added: "We were more concerned with the
Church than with those outside. Others also mentioned the effects of living in an inward-looking community, with its internal politics. For some it was more of an artificial, or make-belief community. One Q put all the trouble down to lack of fresh air and too much sitting around drinking coffee. He said the seminary was an artificial society, which made people introspective. The students turned to each other in an introspective way. There was a lack of reality, a refusal to face up to reality.

What marks out this group of colleges is the way they criticise the staff. In one college they were alleged to lack maturity and were younger than older students, with whom they did not know how to cope. Staff were afraid to give firm guidance. Leadership was either too weak or too strong. (This reminds us of the article referred to previously by Barakat, in which he speaks of alienation coming from overcontrol or undercontrol.) Some students found one to one relationships with the staff very hard to make. He wanted the student/staff "gulf" replaced by a relationship of Christian to Christian. One K priest had felt "scrutinized and spied upon", which bred insecurity. He deplored ignorance of students by staff, even after three or five years. Staff were blamed for insensitivity, and for unstable attitudes. One respondent maintained that when the changes took place, many students were quite lost, and the staff in the middle did not know which way to turn. "For many it was hopeless", he added. But another man thought that the staff/student barrier had created solidarity among the students, and removed serious tension; later on, however, he had seen tensions between "more reactionary students and the majority".

Another comment on the changes was that the whole system was turned upside down without sufficient regard for the effects this would have. This did not prevent another from complaining that students had to fit in with a type of system, or get out. The seminary catered for only one type of ministry. Another Q complained of having to live a semi-monastic life "without monastic spirituality to support us".
"Absurd views of spirituality" and "a terrible lack of formation in real prayer" were also mentioned, and a lack of direction, or lack of a declared sense of purpose. One man complained of a lack of dialogue between staff and students together, and the Bishops. One Q suggested that the seminary is suitable for a limited range of personality types, and some people suffer in trying to adapt to this. "I personally did not think that a 'monastic' type community was a good preparation for the secular priesthood. As it is an "elimination" type of process, it may be eliminating people who cannot stand monastic life, without 'selecting' people who can be successful as secular priests. In some sense the old "Isolate" seminary system was a better preparation for the lack of community support in a secular priest's life - but it was not Christian."

GENERAL. These respondents scarcely mention any tension between students. In discussing the lack of adequate consultation between staff and students over changes, one Q priest comments that the changes the students saw as necessary were a source of tension among the students. Though another man noted that the gradual nature of the changes avoided tension, the lack of consultation rankled. Another Q spoke of "twentieth century young men brought up in an open-minded freedom-centred society having to cope with an outdated authority system". The Freedom-fighter spirit shows itself in the unexpected remark that "apart from two attempts at student strikes the staff always listened and implemented changes if they saw them as necessary". But this does not prevent another man (the solitary K) from saying that decisions concerning students and their future were taken by the seminary staff on the basis of students' behaviour and exams; the students did not feel they were known to the staff as persons. Staff were said to be aloof, and to lack an inspiring vision of the priesthood. "In many fields students took much of the initiative in community life, which left the staff more isolated."

Another man said: "We never knew for sure if we were going to be called to orders". And another wrote that the staff
often acted in a way which removed all responsibility from the students. Students did not have the power or the responsibility to act as adults. For another, students always had the impression that they could not be trusted; they were always treated as boys, very seldom as young men. For another Q the authorities and the system generally showed an inability to accept them as adults. Some of these criticisms cancel out; one is left with the impression that this staff/student relationship was not the main problem in these colleges.

What does emerge from the replies is the suggestion that the real source of tension came from the individual students themselves. One man spoke of strain, usually personal, based on indecision or unhappiness in one's vocation. Another spoke of a drink problem; through social work there was a clash between celibacy and normal contact with women. He also spoke of a lack of real education, because teaching and outlook were inward looking. Another Q spoke of basic uncertainty about the future, and the unsettling effect of priests and students leaving the ministry. Another raised a whole list of unsettling personal factors: "Financial. Overcrowding. Question of celibacy. Fear of responsibility. Unhappy about their prayer life. Unsure of their own sexuality. Theory not shown to be pragmatic. Inability to express themselves."

dioecesan. These respondents did not have too much to say about tensions. Some repeated what we have heard from the other groups - such as "adult men being treated like children", "staff too old" (for a change), a lack of openness on the part of the staff; the fact that those in authority "could throw you out at any time for any whim, with no appeal to Caesar or the Lords". One man spoke eloquently of a "lust for authority, engendered by the system". Another complained of a lack of "decent lectures". A novel complaint was over-crowding, which prevents students from having single rooms. Hours of work were too long; subject matter was thought to be irrelevant to life in the parish (though not so once the priest was
ordained and sent to a parish). There was little freedom to do pastoral work, and what opportunity existed was not used sufficiently. There was a lack of "explanation and meaning of traditions which appeared anachronistic". There did not seem to have been much tension among students; two priests reported a tendency for some students to want to dominate others. A scrupulous student created problems. Showers of temper were witnessed on the sports field. All these complaints have a timeless quality. Of the K's one left his questionnaire blank, and one said NO. Neither of the two Q's nor the rest of the K's had very much to say. There would appear to be an amiable lack of tension in these Irish country seminaries, unlike their Dublin cousins.

To sum up these reports we can call in the assistance of Smelser, and what he had to say about structural strain underlying collective behaviour, as quoted earlier in this chapter. Where possible we shall group the strains and stresses mentioned in these open-ended responses under the four headings Smelser provides, of value strain, to do with commitment, (or vocation); normative strain, to do with human interaction (staff, students, outsiders); strain on mobilization, to do with motivated activity and its rewards; strain on facilities, to do with adequacy of knowledge and skills. By counting the references to each of these forms of strain, we may construct a Table to compare the responses from each college.

Table 56. Tensions in seminaries: underlying structural strain. (Total references and average per respondent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College group</th>
<th>Value strain (N)</th>
<th>Normative strain (staff)</th>
<th>Normative strain (students)</th>
<th>Mobilization strain</th>
<th>Facilities strain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One thing to remember about this Table is that it is constructed from the memories of ordained priests; it does not tell us directly of the feelings of students who did not persevere through the seminary course. The section on value strain might be bigger if it did so. Normative strain is divided between staff and students, as sources of strain. This shows us that at least on the measurement of numbers of references, staff played a bigger part in causing such strain in all college groups except North, and Diocesan; in North students are nearly twice as important as staff; in Diocesan they are equal to staff. In Overseas, South, and General, (51 out of 87 respondents, or 59%) problems with staff are greater than those with students. Under mobilization strain have been included items concerning students' ability to get on with their work; under facility strain come such items as finance, overcrowding, and the extent to which students were given responsibility. It will be seen that these do not amount to much, except for facility strain for Overseas and General.

It will be seen that K and Q, at either extreme of student opinion, had rather more to say than the average respondent. Like North, K were more concerned with normative strain derived from students rather than staff. Q, like Overseas, South, and General are concerned more with tensions coming from staff/student rather than student/student relationships. It will be seen that Q refer twice as much as K to value, mobilization, and facility strain.
This illustrates the differences between K and Q over 27 items, arranged in ascending order (reading from left to right) according to the overall mean scores of all 100 respondents (or as many as answered each particular question). It will be seen that apart from the lowest mean score (item 47 at the foot of the list) and five other items (34, 29, 30, 44, and 28) the K scores are greater than the mean, or much the same (49, 31, 32, 42, 48, 41, 50). Q scores are usually below the mean (with the exception of 47, 49, 30, 32, 37, 36, 44, and 28). It will be observed that Q have a higher coefficient of correlation with Overall Mean than K have. The widest gap between K and Q is item 47 (We learned to behave in an authoritarian way) while the least is item 42 (We were treated with respect by the staff as a whole).
As Figure 5 illustrates, in the various Tables presented in this Chapter, K and Q have sometimes come close in their scoring. In 17 out of 27 Tables there was 15% or less difference between them. It will be of interest to examine the ten Tables in which the difference was greater than this. In all but two, K scored more than Q.

Table 57. Widest K/Q divergences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>K-Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Table 47.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual word "authoritarian" seems to bring out the biggest difference, with Q exceeding Overall average by 23%, and K by 29%. The next issue, whether the respondents had learned to live in a presbytery, while in the seminary, has the low Q score of 25, nearer to the Overall 35 than the K score of 53. This response may tell us more about presbytery conditions, when the questionnaires were completed, than about seminaries; at any rate, this Statement appeals to something in the K mentality more than it repels the Q's. On the other hand, No. 3 does the opposite, with the K 78 far nearer the Overall 70 than the Q 53. This Statement is virtually the reverse of the first one, and the scoring reveals this, (if one subtracts the scores in No. 1 from 100, leaving us with 74,
Similarly No. 4 should be the reverse of No. 2. It is, for the Overall scores 100 less 35, becoming 65, compared with 66; but the K 76 for No. 4 is a long way from 47, and the Q 52 a long way from 75, obtainable by taking their No. 2 scores from 100. Perhaps here we have the emotive effect of "community", which is a good word for K and a bad word for Q.

A Statement on Family, it will be recalled from Table 40, headed the overall average scores for the twelve Statements testing out Nomos and Alienation polarities; that Statement dealt with "development as a human being" in the seminary. Here we find the other family Statement, dealing with "fitting in to the seminary pattern. K are not very committed to the Statement, and Q far less so. K show more agreement with No. 6, that the seminary prepared them to help people to develop a mature conscience, and more again with No. 7 asserting that their temperament helped them to develop as human beings while they were in the seminary. An interesting reversal comes with the next two Statements. The same distance of 20% separates K from Q when they are asked to agree that they were treated with respect by the "system" and by the Rector. While K appear to be undecided for both Statements, Q reject the first but accept the second. The explanation of this apparent paradox may be found in looking to see who provided high and low votes, and observing which seminary they came from. A tolerant Rector intent on renewing the seminary on the model of Vatican II would very likely have upset some of the K respondents, and encouraged the Q men; and the word "system" is another emotive stimulus for radicals. To this one should add one impression which comes through these responses, that these priests are for the most part kindly characters, who dislike expressing an opinion which could be construed as an attack on an individual, but who gladly go to war on institutions. The last statement in this list of ten, asserting that the seminary
the students learned to act maturely, contains what we have come to see is another emotive word, this time of importance to the K group, who in their open-ended contributions referred a number of times to the immaturity of other students.

To draw this lengthy Chapter to a conclusion, we can, in Figure 5, return to the Katz and Kahn model, to enable us to see how all these stresses and strains of the seminaries affect the process of communication of the rôle of the priest. We must bear in mind an elementary principle of communication theory, that stress or tension of any kind is liable to interfere with and distort if not block both the communication itself, and the feedback. As we have seen, there are plenty of tensions, as reported by the respondents; to what extent they are interfering with the communication process it is beyond the resources of this study to determine. All we can do here is to make a list of them, grouped under the various headings supplied by Katz and Kahn. Every point made by the respondents could be examined in greater depth. All we can state at this stage is the fact that they have been reported by recently-ordained priests.
REPORTED CAUSES OF STRESS IN ELEVEN SEMINARIES, 1966-73

A. Organisational factors
   Artificiality
   Introspection
   Narrowness
   Transitional stress
   Post-transitional
   Freedom v. Rules.

D. Rôle Senders
   Bishops/Rector/Staff
   Old-Young
   Out of date life style
   Aloof; indecisive; drift;
   unstable; whims
   Ignored suggestions
   Treated students as
   children
   Communications
   Lack of vision
   Authority
   Them/Us
   Big Brother
   Theological divide

B. Personal factors
   Finance
   Age
   Loneliness
   Celibacy
   IQ & F-scale rating

E. Rôle Reception
   a) Spirituality
      Monasticism
      "Men of God or Social Workers"
   b) Studies
      Too much work
      Exams
      Too inward looking
      Boredom
      Pastoral/Academic
      Divorced from parish
      Methods of tuition
   c) Vocation
      Whole life
      Desire to be normal
      Imperfections
      Faith problems

C. Interpersonal factors
   "Left/Right"
   Immaturity - sheltered
   Age, social, IQ etc.
   Unisex
   Overcrowding/undercrowding
   Being abroad.
What the present study has not sufficiently explored is the whole economic and socio-cultural/political background of this communication process. The study of alienation was intended to pave the way for such a study, but one has to acknowledge the limits of one's resources in assembling the data on which valid judgements may be based. However, the closer look we have been able to give to the KYRIAKON and QAHAL groups has at least enabled us to offer the beginning of such an exploration of the suggested existence of the Nomos and Alienation polarities.

3. cf. Rulla, op. cit., p. 51
6. Another wide field of study which lies beyond our present scope is of a more psychological and socio-psychological nature; it is hinted at in Figure 4, under the headings: Rôle senders' conflicts, and Focal Person's conflicts. Apart from this, the whole communication and feed-back process at work, examining such areas as lectures and seminars, Rectorial addresses to students, and days of recollection, holidays and holiday jobs, "stages" (in the French understanding of the word) in the seminary context, and informal day-by-day conversations and activities, would all provide more work than one research student could undertake, successfully. At the outset of this study, indeed, all this was intended, along with a comparative study over time of the socialization of other students, such as Anglican divines, social workers, engineers, and teachers, but as ever, the best is the enemy of the good.
Earlier in this study some attention has been paid to the twenty interviews with priests, in which they spoke of tensions they knew about among priests. In the postal questionnaire two questions were included dealing with strains and tensions among priests, and "the good qualities" among priests, which the respondents thought could be attributed to seminary formation. The actual replies are to be found in Appendices V and VI. Here, once again, is a summary of the College Group replies.

q. 13. Are you aware of any sources of strain or tension among priests which can be attributed in any way to the seminary formation which they were given?

OVERSEAS Most of what they said seems to have been directed at an older generation, rather than at themselves. The main point made was the emotional immaturity of men who never learned to make proper relationships, but who were trained to be "men apart". After the seminary they found there was "no instant comradeship", so they had tended to withdraw into a defensive eccentricity, marked by refusal to change, or to open their minds. They thought the people were there for them, not the other way round; they had been trained to provide THE answers, which were no longer acceptable. This had undermined their self-understanding. Many older men who could not understand recent changes in the Church and in liturgy were the products of closed seminaries and a narrow theology. They showed a dogmatic adherence to inessentials, yet were indifferent to essentials. One result of this was their inability to take even the simplest of decisions on their own initiative. They had been given insufficient preparation for the "intangibility" of priestly work, with its highly variable "job-satisfaction". They tended to see the priesthood as a secular job, with a materialistic outlook. Some felt
inadequate in face of younger priests prepared in the "new" seminaries. One man felt that some priests, who had been right through junior seminaries, "had not really been given a chance".

Looking more at themselves, the respondents spoke of the clash of mentality between themselves and older men. One suggested priests recently ordained might have a better understanding and breadth of thought about contemporary needs, but they felt they lacked compassion and resilience of the older generation; they felt they were more unstable; they might have better facts, but their faith was less certain. They took a more difficult approach to spirituality, a freer approach. They felt frustrated because the vision of Vatican II had not been implemented. They felt they had missed out on something, due to their seminary training, until very recently, having cut them off from the people. Priests were trained to be Jack of all Trades, Master of none. They lacked preparation for clericalism, and for presbytery life.

NORTH One priest misread the question as referring to seminary staff. He thought they had so many commitments they were unable to spend as much time together with the students as they would have liked; they were disappointed at their students' failure to appreciate their problems, and to see that staff had to take a long-term view, with a more cautious approach.

Judging simply on length of answers, these priests had less to say than the Overseas men. Two simply said "Yes" and two "No". Like the Overseas respondents those who did reply at greater length commented on the division of priests between young and old. "In some cases there is conflict" one priest believed. Sometimes he thought there was lack of Tolerance and Understanding of each other's background. "In some cases very very touchy." Another spoke of priests formed before Vatican II. He thought there was sometimes a strain in their understanding of recent developments correctly—especially among middle-aged priests. "They think they have to prove they are with it,
while misunderstanding much of recent theology." Those since Vatican II, he thought, had what was sometimes an unreal idealism, "which fails to accept people and situations for what they are". Another respondent said many priests have fixed ideas about parish life, and have become very parochial in outlook. They were bothered about small unimportant details. Another spoke of "their lack of vision and missionary zeal which results in a crisis of identity"; and another of their "narrow vision of so many subjects — and no incentive given during training to develop interests".

Relationships and celibacy called for several comments. One mentioned "their inability to be fully human and form relationships". The seminary, he said, inculcated a "bastardized monastic approach diametrically opposed to sharing one's life". Another saw among older priests "the unwillingness, perhaps inability, to show their feelings or allow their feelings to be seen". And another explained priests' inability to relate to people by "the fear of becoming involved — with women emotionally involved". He saw in priests an inability to come to terms with the 'alone' life of the priesthood, or to adapt their rôle to the needs of the Church today. Another believed that sexual hang-ups were "predominant among older priests — often showing a total lack of understanding of society's inverts — e.g. homosexuals". Three others suggested celibacy was a source of strain, though one added "I'm not sure that there wouldn't be strain anyway". One thought celibacy had not been made "part of you" at the seminary.

Commenting on the priests' relationships with their parishioners, one man believed there was a tension between "being taught and trained as though religion were the prerogative of the middle class, then finding the bulk of the parishioners do not respond to this approach"; and another said many priests still have the attitude "This is my parish. I'm the priest". He thought the seminary should stress that the parish is his to serve, not to rule, because "an authoritarian manner causes tension in the parish".
Echoing an important point touched on by one of the Overseas priests, one man said there seems to be a tenden­cy among some clergy to complain that in some way they were deprived of real choice and of real development, while at the seminary. "Under the older system this would be understandable, but not the new".

SOUTH This time eight said "No" or "None", though even these tended to amplify this, and the respondents were generally wordier than those from the North. Another one spoke about seminary staff. He felt there was tension among them "knowing that no one was in the pipe-line to replace them in their particular field of study". (This from a seminary which had seen a number of its staff leave the ministry, reflects a serious problem facing the colleges in the immediate future, after so many theologians have given up the priesthood.)

Only one or two repeated the strictures of the Overseas men on the older generation, and spoke in similar vein of closed minds and generation gaps, power complexes and obsession with seniority. Two mentioned the way priests wait for directives from above before they take any initia­tive, and blamed this on the seminary. One of these com­mented that "inspiration, leadership on the part of the 'young' priests are dangerous, often seen as a threat, up­setting the status quo". Another man related this equally to all priests, irrespective of age. He explains that "a sense of order was predominant in the seminary way of life, and so it has become a way of life totally unreal to the way of life a secular priest has to live in a busy inner city parish. As another one put it, "the new 'system' (re­ally the different more open approach of Vatican II) has now caused a tension between the old times when everyone knew their station and place in life (same in industry, commerce, etc) and today when things that once were taken for granted without question are now examined more closely and questioned with a view to positive growth". 
For some the seminary was unreal. "It has no lasting effect to my mind on life hereafter" wrote one. For one FEAR (his capitals) still abounds. Another said that after ordination he met a great number of very intelligent non-Christians, and "only now" was he "just beginning to realise how sheltered we were intellectually. Not having any real knowledge of Judaism, Islam, etc. Being a Catholic in the most narrow and dangerous sense of the word. The total security of the seminary system cushions us from many material realities, and so we preach a spirituality that is useless for ordinary married non-clerics, etc."

However, some missed the good things in the seminary. "What I miss most after leaving the seminary is not the social contact of a like age group and like outlook so much as the deep realisation of God's mission found in prayer together. Priests just do not pray together nor talk in anything but shallow terms about the spiritual life." Another found among priests a lack of community life, and lack of community support in evaluation of life and its problems. Another, however, thought the failure to accept the priesthood as team work was a result of the kind of training and attitudes still at large among a sector of students today.

GENERAL Only one "No" here. Authority seemed to be the main bugbear. One said tension came from "the question of authority in church on the one hand and human responsibility of the priest on the other". Another thought that many priests felt that the structure of the Church before Vatican II "tended to be a crutch, which when removed unsettled them. The barbarity of injustice of a system which they had to undergo left some with chips on their shoulders". One traced this problem to "the concept of authority and superiority of one year of students over the younger classes in the seminary". This, for him "tends to support the Parish Priest cult". Priests, he writes, are now being asked to work as a team in their ministry but were trained by a process of Authority and Obedience.
If one was obedient enough one was given authority; to have to share this hard won authority causes great strain to some priests. One respondent spoke of a monastic emphasis on authority, leading to conflicts between P.P.s and curates. In the seminary, another man thinks, undue and unnecessary importance was given to the status quo and to the 'yes men'. Later, with responsibility and maturity comes the realisation "that you were conned (tricked or misled as to what priesthood in practice was like)". And he adds: "N.B. Didn't give you experience of living with one priest - older than you with totally different value system and outlook". This last remark sums up what is perhaps one of the most serious lines of criticism running through all this study so far, namely, that the seminary formation is no real preparation for the reality of presbyterial life, of the presbyterium or of the actual day to day activity of a busy parish; above all that by its failure to cope with emotional immaturity, it leaves the priest unable to make normal human relationships, including those with other priests. So great was this failure, as several respondents suggested, that, in the words of this last respondent, they were "conned" into the priesthood.

DIOCESAN Most of the twelve comments were brief, such as "Difficulty in relating to people" or "tension between older and younger priests". One said that though some priests may be mature in years they lack a mature attitude to life, due to their background, and more especially their seminary training. Among the older clergy another respondent found "a lot of distrust and competitiveness, among themselves even". For another, many priests today behave like children. They have little sense of the "real work of a priest; i.e. say Mass, give Sacraments, and keep to yourself. This is the motto instilled in the seminary - and is carried on. Priests I know don't think for themselves. They look for guidance from authority - but nothing comes. The seminary didn't help us think for ourselves".

One man said difficulties in praying and spiritual life must be connected with seminary formation, and he added that
in recent times some seminaries seem to breed intransigent characters. One man had his own explanation for it all. "Too much emphasis on Canon Law has made priests inhuman and insensitive to the needs of people".

A word count of these comments (from all colleges) is revealing. Authority heads the list with 8, followed by relationships (5) relations, and relate (4). Development (4), mature (3) and immature (4) come next, followed by real (3), unreal (3), and reality; then come spirituality (4), theology (4), Vatican II (4), old (6), young or younger (4), human , inhuman (5) ; rôle (4), rôle play, life (3), life style, living, responsibility (3), women (3), curates (3), narrow (3), closed (3), emotional (3), and formation (4).

Favourite Q words: Relationships, narrow, old/young. K: No.

Clergy problems, as distinct from people problems, are mentioned 23 times. Authority in the abstract, as inculcated for years in the seminary, appears to be the problem, rather than complaints of priests being troubled too much by the authorities. This abstraction has left the priesthood indecisive; eight respondents made this point.

q. 14. What are the good qualities of priests you know which can be attributed to their seminary formation?

OVERSEAS Only one denied he knew of any. One said there were "probably a good many - tenacity, putting up with things, devotion to prayer, willingness to be available at all times. Hard work, patience, long suffering". Another spoke of a sense of brotherhood among the clergy. He said he could not think of any other qualities that could be attributed to seminary formation that priests would not have had without it; some qualities, he suggested, priests had in spite of their seminary formation. Another man thought the many good qualities priests show are part of their individual characters, and are fostered by a good seminary rather than to be attributed to it. "However the experience of living in a community surely plays a decisive rôle, although the seminary ought not to be the only place for this."
Against what was said before about priests being unable to relate easily to people, several respondents attributed to seminaries the opposite trait; one said priests were always ready to listen to people, with kindness. Another that some have a greater easiness, because of the seminary, for being with people, and show affability, sociability, and warmth. Others pointed to tolerance, dedication, concern, relationships among priests themselves, friendships, (essential, one man said, if celibates are to retain their humanity), imaginativeness, the capacity to try things and risk and accept failure; readiness to become really involved with people, and to give up any vestiges of authoritarianism or paternalism; readiness to work equally with lay people; seeing the value of people as human beings. The man who made the last point added that this was often "very deeply theologically rooted, without being explicated". He went on to say that priests have a "presence" and ability to relate to people, for good or ill. Another used almost the same words: "many priests have a decisiveness and 'presence' which seems to have its source in seminary training. Several mentioned faith, and prayer.

There was no clear reference to post Vatican II seminary life, though one said "I am speaking of seminary formation as I experienced it. An openness with people. Avoiding 'prejudging' or forming instant opinions about events or people (a trait which I find disconcerting among older clergy). Willingness to be open and to accept change. A broader spirituality which seems to make a person more whole. A sense of "mission" rather than of "maintenance".

NORTH This college group responded most to this invitation to point out the good things in the existing system. Most of them praise old-fashioned virtues, such as discipline, prayerfulness, a spirit of charity and fraternity among the clergy, selfless dedication to the work of the Church, adherence to regular hours of prayer, an ordered life, perseverance, a "true humility", generosity, a sense of humour, love for Mass and Church, trust, loyalty,
understanding, patience, obedience to conscience, willingness to work hard, and so on. On the other hand, one man said it was a difficult question for him to answer, "for what I consider good qualities can only be attributed to the fact of the struggle of these priests to retain their individuality in a 'seminary formation' which at all times tried to stereotype them. Probably the finest quality one could attribute to their seminary formation is that of tolerance".

One respondent who criticised younger priests for their lack of discipline also said that these younger priests have without any doubt a strong academic and pastoral base, especially with their ability to adapt to change and development within and outside the Church. Another spoke of the sense of personal responsibility encouraged by the newer seminary systems, but previously perhaps, he suggests, more to be attributed to the given individual rather than to the priestly training system. Another puts down to the "New System" the advantage of counselling techniques, and individual freedom to find one's own limitations and capacities.

SOUTH Only one, again, said he could not honestly think of any good qualities that could be attributed to seminary formation, though he could list a number of bad ones. Nearly all the responses were on the brief side, however, Two mentioned a sense of humour, born, said one, "from some of the crazy things we had to do in the sem."

This quality showed itself in some of the responses. One priest spoke of the surprising ability his fellows showed in adapting to the strangest of circumstances, and their tenacity in "hanging on to their own identity". Another said the fact that some could survive a system that provided them with an ability to withstand the pressures encountered in parish life. One simply wrote down: Endurance. One said "where there is a will, there is a way, seminary system or no seminary system". One said: Perseverance! He added that the course was by now certainly
broader and more comprehensive than in his early days in the seminary. One said "priests are good and holy men. They are like sausages, fat and juicy but in skins. You have to cut the skins to see and share their goodness". And another said, reassuringly, "in spite of any criticisms, there are some damned good blokes who are priests". He qualified this by wondering how much this could be attributed to their training, but he did concede: "Perhaps the group set-up, where it has been encouraged to work in the seminaries, has helped students more than anything else to come to a common realisation of the presence of Jesus in their lives and their world".

GENERAL One said "None", and one said he was not a cynic, (and then showed that he was by the remark that "If saying 'yes' to everything without question is good, then the seminary did this"). Apart from these, the respondents managed to find a few good words to say for the seminaries, such as "Faith, concern, dedication to work, use of imagination, willingness to try new ideas, and Perseverance." One said the gradual breakdown of the old system seems to have produced priests who are much more approachable and relaxed, with a spirit of service; several mentioned availability, friendliness, and openness. One man said availability is the one positive and good quality that younger priests have (and indeed, he adds, the good older ones too). This, he said, comes from their seminary. One respondent said priests took from their seminary formation, kindness, a generous outlook, "showing people that you love them as individuals, not as a group".

DIOCESAN As usual, one man said "Nil", and added that "most priests are self-educated". These respondents put in some qualities not met before, such as "ability to speak before a crowd", and "a constant application to work". One said communication and mixing well with people came from seminary formation, but he added "these qualities are possessed by far too few priests". One mentioned a quality of Brotherhood among priests.
Another said priests tend to care about people. Another
said he found the prayer formation "pretty sound", and
he went on to praise the custom of reciting the Breviary
at different parts of the day, as something he attributed
most to the seminary.

Here again is the Word Count for this question.
Prayer (19); spirituality (3); prayerfulness (6); people
(18); individual (8); personal (4); listen (7); understand
(5); availability (3); approachability (2); tolerance
(5); humour (5); openness (3); open, open-minded, concern
(8); dedication (8); work (11); patience (6); ability
(10); perseverance (5); development (4); Church (8);
faith (5); discipline (4); Brotherhood (8); fraternity
(2); fellowship (2); corporateness, presbyterate, friend­
ship (6); no, none, nil (6).
(K favourites: discipline, brotherhood, concern;
Q: dedication, open, perseverance.)

It is interesting to put this alongside the previous
Word Count list, from the question on tensions among
priests. There is very little over-lap - only in "develop­
ment", "spirituality" and "narrow/closed" and "openness/
open-minded". This leaves us with a list, above, from the
question of good qualities, of very old-fashioned virtues;
there is scarcely any mention of the studies of the stu­
dents and the theology they spent so long acquiring.

Putting together these two questions and the different
responses, nuanced as they are by the different moods and
characteristics we have come to associate with the five
different college-groups, and the K men and the Q men they
all contained, we do not receive an overall impression that
these priests are crushed down with tension and stress.
Most of the stress they report is by way of comment on their
elders; but lest we conclude that the clergy are riven asun­
der, we have the recurring theme of brotherliness and friend­
ship in the answers to the second question. It also rebuts
the impression that no priest is capable of relating with
anybody else. What is noteworthy is the spirituality theme
(which we encountered before when examining what the respon­
dents thought was lacking in the seminaries).
CONCLUSIONS

At the end of the questionnaire the priests were invited to add any other remarks they might consider apposite. The bulk of these are to be found in Appendix VII. A few are mentioned here because they help to draw together the conclusions reached in this study.

A priest from an Irish diocesan college made the remark that when all is said and done, the best "seminary" is the home you come from. It will be recollected that in the series of questions about whether certain items helped the priests to fit in to the seminary pattern, or to develop as human beings while they were in the seminary, the three Statements which were given the highest overall support were the ones which asserted that the student's family, the way the student understood the Church and his place in it, and his own personal temperament, had all helped him "to develop as a human being". In the answers to such Statements one does not look for any great depth of psychological insight, but one does take note of the effect of certain key words on overall trends of response. The fact that the bulk of the priests put family first, as the chief agency of their human development - as against their "fitting in" to the seminary pattern, serves to corroborate this remark about the home being the best seminary. This is particularly true if we accept the point, frequently suggested by respondents, that it is necessary for the priest to be a very human person, well able to relate easily with others, and not the man set apart of another epoch. In this study of socialization of future priests, in which we have already noted Breeley's remark that seminaries do not make a great deal of difference to the future priest, since he is the product of his family more than of any other institution, we might well have given more attention to the pre-seminary development of students. This would, however, entail a
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far more complex and arduous study than this one, though it might be possible to achieve such an undertaking with the help of interviews. Such data as was collected in the postal questionnaire regarding socio-economic class and the religious background of parents did not lead very far, though it may help to explain some of the differences between the K and the Q groups.

A priest from the North commented in his concluding remarks, that the seminary as he had experienced it was not a monolithic system. The same system, at the same time, he believed, affected different people in different ways. This remark suggests what has been a fundamental theme running throughout this study. We began by trying to take a look at the "world today"; what in fact we did was rather like setting a globe on a table, round which Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and a few lesser immortals, such as Frankl, Heidegger, Fromm and Berger were sitting. Each saw the same world, but from a different angle; each looked at the same - or much the same - complex of industrialism, capitalism, urbanisation, war and peace, boom and slump; each wrote a book or a series of books on the way he saw the world. Not only do these writers create schools of thought, and "world-pictures", which have greatly influenced the way men and women today "see" reality; they themselves inherited and represented widely differing approaches to the phenomena before them. We meet a summary of their insights, all perhaps somewhat distorted, in the efforts of a man like Seeman to put all their ideas into one article, in the hope of making the whole thing measurable.

The Church in the world today is in a similar situation, capable of being seen and understood from many different points of view. To help our analysis we have tried to reduce these to three, which we christened K, Q, and the ones in the middle. We called the first viewpoint K, from **KYRIAKON**, the late Greek word for Church, understood as the Lord's House. This use of a word denoting an actual physical building, and also introducing the word Lord, involving
Divine Domination, (with its echoes of Marx's dictum that all alienation begins with the idea of a dominating God who reduces man to a nobody) turns out to have been more apt than was at first intended. When we isolated the K group, the 22 respondents were selected because each had scored an average of more than 65% in five putative "F-scale" Statements which had been found to cluster together with high inter-correlations. A contribution of this study to work on the Authoritarian Personality may come from the way a number of these priests demonstrated an interest in buildings, in people's housing problems, in the home situation of their parishioners, and in the problems of the Catholic parish. Durkheim, not so much a conservative as a man absorbed with collectivity, saw anomie as one stage of a process by which those who live under conditions involving the division of labour move from mechanical towards organic solidarity. In the K respondents, too, we find priests who view the Church from the collective point of view, and who tend to identify collectivities with territorial divisions and physical buildings. These NOMOS men, who believe in law and order, criticise immaturity, when it leads to eccentric or irresponsible or anarchic behaviour. The North colleges, where they were strongest, displayed a greater awareness of division among students, rather than resentment towards authority. If authority was criticised, it was for weakness, or for the immaturity of the staff. As priests these respondents tend to accept the parish system in which they find themselves.

The Q priests, on the other hand, associated with QAHAL, the Hebrew word derived from the classical Greek EKKLESIA, meaning the assembly of the people, also possess an apt enough label. We find them laying emphasis on individuals rather than on community; for them the assembly is to be open, not exclusive; it is like that of the People of God in the desert, a People on the march, accustomed to change; not tying itself - nor God - down in buildings or places. Theirs is a model or vision of the Church, put forward by the theologians of Vatican II, though not as
yet, one suspects, accepted by the majority of Catholics. Marx, too, was an individualist, in his early writings, though we may tend to think of him as the prophet of collectivism. There is no reason to think that any of the Q priests are Marxists; but they do tend to be analytical of the Church, and of society's problems; they talk of the importance of a new theological understanding of the ministry; they are prepared for radical change, including the abolition of seminaries.

It was one of the men in the middle who said "I'm sure some of the answers given are illogical. However, I happen to be illogical. I am sure as a human being I developed in spite of seminary, home, work and school life. None of us are static. Neither did I think much about my humanity. God gave me a job to do, and with the limited brain power and intelligence to use it as best as I can. Surely the job of all thinking beings?" His contribution helps us bear in mind how few of the respondents see the seminary system as either perfect or completely useless. As one of them said, "I honestly feel that taken as a whole my fellow students (particularly those who reached ordination) were a well-balanced crowd of people....I would like to say that my attitude to answering the questionnaire has been greatly influenced by the fact that I consider the system which was implemented in September 1967 to be forward looking, expertly guided and spiritually and humanly formative." Not everyone was as satisfied as that, yet this priest speaks for the majority. There may be many models of the world, of the Church, or of the priesthood going the rounds not only of students but also of "rôle senders", yet it is a Catholic Church we are considering, one that in theory at least is meant to be all-embracing. It needs to cater for K and for Q and all in between, (and all those, too, whose journeys took them beyond K or Q out of the seminary, or even out of the priesthood, before they had their chance to complete the questionnaire).

Another man worth quoting is from Irish General, who said that one thing in favour of his particular seminary
was that it gave him an international view of life - and the Church. A lack of this, he thought, has long cursed the Church in England. "In students", he said "the ghetto mentality must be got rid of if the Church is to make any headway". As the logic of the series of questions posed on the first page of this study suggests, the seminary is for the priest, who is for the Church, which is for the World. The Church does not exist just for its own members. The priest, or whatever we are to call the Church leader, must be "formed" or educated, or in some way prepared for his task, in terms of this evangelical relationship of the whole Church with the whole of society around it. This is why we looked at that society, in terms of alienation and anomie. In the early chapters we pursued the implications of what was said about an alienated and/or anomic mass of people, into a series of a priori requirements for an ideal Church, an ideal priesthood, and an ideal preparation of that priesthood. Notwithstanding all the qualifications that have been made about Seeman's list, we still return to it at this late stage of the study, to outline some of the conclusions thrown up by these twenty interviews and 100 completed postal questionnaires.

1. POWERLESSNESS As Marx saw industrial capitalist society in 1844, it made man unmensch, by forcing him to surrender himself to the "system". The Synod of Bishops of 1971 spoke of a network of oppression encircling the earth. (1) As already suggested such a world "needs" a Church that will itself be neither an opium of the people, nor dominating, and dehumanising, but which will be both powerless, yet able to offer them the power which its founder, for all his own kenosis specifically claimed when he sent out his apostles. Such power is concerned with man's total development. It embraces the whole of human life, in every aspect, not excluding politics and economics. Ever since Christianity began there has been a two-fold danger, both of the Church itself becoming a Power, and of its members retreating from the profane into a "sacred" spirituality, which in effect denies the "wholeness" implicit in the New Testament. The Church today needs to
find a way to equip itself with a leadership able to em‐
body these qualities, and capable of transforming the
Church into the Body it was meant originally to be.

Do seminaries create powerlessness? A "lust for au­
thority" may have existed in some colleges but the res­
pondents' main complaint was of the indecisiveness of the
clergy, who wait for someone to tell them what to do,
though generally in vain. There was also the problem of
"defensive eccentricity" among older clergy, passed on to
younger ones; but it is not a problem for which today's
seminaries were generally held responsible. The criticism
levelled at them was rather their failure to prepare the
students for the realities of presbytery life, in which
they would have to live cheek by jowl with products of an
older and more hierarchical age. The colleges themselves
can hardly hope to deal with this, unless we concede the
proposition that a seminary is not a place but a process.
If that is so, then the "rôle-senders" in this process
include not only the seminary staff, but also family,
school, peer-group, and so on, encountered by the student
long before he begins to study theology and pastoral prac­
tice, plus the men and women he encounters after ordina­
tion, when the most important part of his development
really begins; these will include Popes, Bishops, Parish
Priests, other clergy, and all the people. It is their
rôle-expectations for him, as we tried to explore in the
twenty interviews, which are of crucial importance in his
leadership development. (2)

This idea of seeing the seminary as a process in time
is already accepted, in practice. For many of the respon­
dents in this study it began - apart from home and school
- in a junior seminary, or at Campion Hall, Osterley, or
some similar institution for preparing "late vocations"
for their study of theology. After this many went to the
major seminary, but some attended a University or went to
work for a while. Others either left the major seminary
for a period to do one or both of these things, or to
spend some time in the Services, or else they attended
University as part of their day-to-day seminary existence,
as happened with some of the students at Ushaw, (or as is now happening at the new Allen Hall seminary in Chelsea, recently transferred from Ware). In many seminaries varying periods of time are spent out on "pastoral work". It may be an hour or so a week; it may be a week or a fortnight, or a couple of months in the course of the year; or it may be several years, in which the student is not simply reconsidering his vocation while earning a living, but is deliberately including in his studies for the priesthood a better knowledge of the people among whom he will be working. Time, again, may be spent away from the seminary, by a student or a group, out from the seminary in a monastery, on retreat. A number of respondents reported that they had begun their studies at the English College, Lisbon, which was then closed down. This meant they had to finish somewhere else. The same has recently happened to senior students at Upholland. Before their ordination to the priesthood many of the respondents spent a year or more working in parishes as ordained deacons. Some returned to their seminaries before they became priests; at Wonersh the deacons come together for a few weeks not in the seminary but at Douai Abbey, to reflect together on their diaconal experience, and to prepare for ordination to the priesthood.

The mention of Upholland reminds us that the priest's "formation" does not finish with his ordination. This college in Lancashire now contains the last of the junior seminaries left in this country, and also the Upholland Northern Institute, in which a team of theologians work together to provide adult education for priests and laypeople. This could be a most significant new development in the concept of "seminary" as an on-going process, for in future candidates for the priesthood may well find themselves attending Upholland not only as junior seminarians, but also as laymen (or laywomen, who knows ?), and later on as priests, or even as Bishops. (The first "course" offered by the Institute was for a group of Bishops.)
Given this existing development, and de facto acceptance of the process notion, it is possible to envisage further stages of the evolution already at work. A great deal clearly depends on changes in society at large, not least in the economic and political spheres. Not only seminaries but also recently-built colleges of education have been shut down from financial necessity, (itself involving the fall in the Catholic birth-rate since the mid-1960's). In such an atmosphere of rapid change and abandonment of large institutions, the climate of opinion may well be moving towards acceptance of the end of seminaries as such, thought of as large imposing buildings, housing a hundred or so priests, students and domestic staff, more or less isolated from the outside world. Looking at the recommendations of respondents, we find no widespread call for such a move, though several do look for it in the future. A number of them urged the adoption of a system rather like that tried out experimentally in Barcelona, and later in Turin, by which students are housed in small groups away from the seminary itself, which they attend for lectures. A more restricted version of the "group system" has been tried out in a number of colleges. Ten or so students meet weekly or monthly with one of the priests on the seminary staff to discuss pastoral or spiritual topics, or to attempt a more general "review of life". This system does not emerge in this study as a notable success, though it is not written off. It is perhaps part of the "artificiality" of seminary life, criticised by numerous respondents, which accounts for the comparative failure of this system; it did not anywhere evolve spontaneously, but was introduced rather self-consciously as part of the "renewal programme".

What may have a direct bearing on the group system, and on the desirability of taking it further by having the group living together outside the main seminary, may well be a combination of further economic necessity and a development of existing selection procedures. At present these last would nowhere seem to be very elaborate except at Wonersh, where a team of priests and laity meet each
year to interview prospective new students; the seminary staff and students also have an opportunity to get to know the newcomers, and to express an opinion about their suitability. The selection team includes women as well as men, and a psychiatrist is present, unobtrusively.

Some of these candidates will be known already to some of the staff and students, through paying a series of previous visits to the college. All this is evolving, perhaps, along the same lines as those adopted by many religious orders, who have introduced what they call the pre-novitiate. Boys or girls who are thinking of joining an order are encouraged to spend some time staying in its houses, and sharing in its work; they may be brought together for talks and discussions, or for a spiritual retreat; they are given reading matter, and a chance of having lengthy discussions about themselves and whether they are likely to fit in with the order's spirit and activities. By such means there is far less likelihood of someone joining up for transient emotional reasons; character problems can be foreseen, and dealt with, if possible, in good time - before the order spends time and money in putting an unsuitable and unprepared candidate through the training process. Candidates well prepared beforehand will be more likely to stay the course. All this could very easily be done with candidates for the priesthood, and to some extent it is already happening through the work of "vocation directors" in different dioceses. These, however, are often very busy men dividing their time between this work and other tasks; they cannot do as much as a religious order can for its would-be novices.

What the Wonersh selection panel suggests is the possibility of a Bishop assembling a small team of people, men and women, clerical, religious, or lay, combining theological expertise and pastoral realism, who can do more than "select" the candidates who present themselves once a year. Perhaps the nearest professional equivalent that comes to mind is the probation officer, despite the unfortunate associations. Vocations counsellor is perhaps a better name
for someone whose task it would be not only to enable a candidate for the priesthood to work out for himself whether he thinks he does have a "vocation" to the priesthood, but also to help him discover the priesthood in all its dimensions, before he commits himself to it. One dimension which used to be taken for granted, but can no longer be so, is that of a basic knowledge of the New Testament, not to mention the Old, with some idea of the main tenets of the religion for which the candidate is offering himself as a minister. Another dimension closely bound up with this will be that of prayer and "religious experience", including not only knowledge of God but also knowledge of the work of the Church in many of its aspects; the counsellor will need assurance that such knowledge goes beyond theory. Another dimension, to which, as we have seen, the French Church have paid a great deal of attention, is awareness of the "real situation" of the mass of people, not only members of the Church, but members of society at large, of every socio-economic class, ethnic grouping, cultural level, and so on. Obviously no one can know it all, yet we need to get away from the situation, mentioned by several respondents, in which the future priest feels cut off from one segment or other of the population, whether this be the workers, intellectuals, non-Christians, the English (or the Irish) because of the narrow reach of his own family and educational background, and the subsequent sheltering effect of his seminary career. The vocations counsellor, in fact, would be expected to ensure that the candidate carries out, before he ever gets to the seminary, a great deal of his training for the priesthood. This will include a good knowledge of presbytery life. No priest should ever again be able to say: "I was conned into it".

If this is done successfully, money, time, and hopes can all be saved by the diocesan authorities. A more mature man who has given a great deal of thought to the real situation, not only of priests themselves but also of the people among whom they either are or should be working is much less likely to abandon his studies once he has actually begun them.
He is more likely to have thought through the whole issue of celibacy, and to have sorted out his own "sexual hang-ups" (as respondents called them) and he is likely to work harder before ordination. For all these reasons his course could be made considerably shorter than the present six years (in major seminaries) and there would be far less need for make-believe pastoral outings, cutting across academic study.

What this line of thinking points to is not the complete abandonment of the large institutional seminaries in favour of small groups in parish houses, but rather their occupation for shorter periods of time; this in turn, unless the large buildings can be put to some such use as the Upholland Northern Institute, may suggest concentration of existing resources in fewer centres than the Church now possesses. Given the problem of a shortage of theologians to staff the seminaries, and the criticisms made by overseas respondents of their pastoral "formation", this may in its turn point to alternative uses for the Venerable English College in Rome, and the college in Valladolid. It may also point to a further rationalisation of existing resources in England itself, (where the major seminaries have already been reduced to four while this study has been in process) and in Ireland.

One important corollary of this possibility of candidates deferring the commencement of their academic studies until something like their mid-twenties, or later, is the need to eradicate any grounds for the recurring complaint, expressed by several respondents, that in the seminaries they were treated as schoolboys, even when the staff professed to treat them as adults, and to give them the same responsibility they would enjoy as university students, or as priests, (not forgetting the complaint concerning similar schoolboy treatment of priests). What this requires, perhaps, is the careful training of staff which several respondents call for, and which was envisaged by the Vatican II decree on priestly formation. The skill staff particularly need to acquire is again that of the counsellor,
who understands non-directive methods. More important than this, perhaps, will be what Lochet called for in the article quoted in an earlier chapter, in which he urges a sharing of the same priestly mission by staff and students alike. Here, above all, "student power" can effect a genuinely radical change within the seminary system.

2. MEANINGLESSNESS Earlier in this study space was devoted to Weber's views on priesthood and prophet-hood. When we examined the respondents' reactions to two questions on meaning, in their own lives and those of their people, the comment was expressed that here the questionnaire had apparently failed to convey what was meant by meaning, and by the implications of meaninglessness. Meaninglessness can be the lot even of a seminary student, if a critical approach to theology extends from his Biblical studies right through the gamut of everything he has ever been taught to believe without demur. In this study not very much has been said about the content of theological studies, or the quality of theology, whatever its vintage; this in itself may be an eloquent omission.

The problem of meaninglessness in priests was expressed by some of the twenty interviewed. One of the twenty spoke of his relief at escaping from the world of seminary speculation into the work of the ministry, when he became a deacon. Another admitted that at his ordination he scarcely believed in God. Perhaps more along these lines might have been forthcoming if the hundred had been interviewed, instead of being asked to complete a postal questionnaire. It is also possible that in the three years between the interviews in 1971 and the questionnaires in 1974 a great deal of heat went out of the post-Vatican II theological ferment, which had excited the seminaries around 1968 and 1969. (It is at this stage of the study particularly one regrets not having interviewed ex-students.)

It is possible that today's seminaries are attracting more "K" men than ten years ago, when the bright hopes of Vatican II brought in the "Q's". Yet, what has just been
said concerning a "pre-seminary training" period applies particularly to the problem of meaninglessness, and the need of a Prophetic Church, able to offer a coherent and acceptable meaning to modern man, and not simply concerned to succour the faithful. What this asks of the priest, who is called to lead this Prophetic Church in its evangelising task, is more than a sound knowledge of up-to-date Scriptural exegesis and theology. It demands also an ability to communicate the message, not just to the members of the Church, but with them, and through them, to the masses of people in society at large. Here we meet two problems: tension, and credibility. Tension, as already suggested, blocks and distorts communication. If there are strains and stresses in the seminary, as respondents have reported, it will operate there; if these exist in the parish, it will do so there. One important contribution to the Church's Prophetic work consists in the removal, wherever possible, of such tensions as now exist, in both seminary and parish, viewed as communication processes, (not forgetting feedback).

Credibility is not just a problem of loss of faith on the part of the masses. It is a question of disbelief because the priest-prophets do not appear to practise what they preach. In the 1971 Synod statement on Justice, already referred to, this point was strongly emphasised; for the sake of prophetic witness all members of the Church, bishops, priests, religious and laity were called upon to adopt life-styles consonant with the message of the Gospel, in a world divided between affluence and widespread poverty. Little mention was made of this question of life-style in the postal questionnaires or in the interviews; which is not to say that the problem may not worry many recently ordained priests. Efforts are made from time to time in the seminaries to inform the students of the facts regarding world poverty, and to teach them what Popes and synods and the Council have had to say about these areas of grave concern. There is a danger, within the closed community of
the seminary, that such efforts may become counter-productive, associated with one or two students or staff members known to possess eccentric views on the social order. The problem is that seminaries consist of staffs and students who import with them, from their homes and schools, the current prejudices and political feelings of their background. Abstract development education, however well contrived, cannot hope to go far in uprooting such basic preconceptions; what we come back to once again is the need for a gradual change of values in the Church at large, and the importance of pre-seminary training, by which a prospective candidate may acquire far more of an all-round vision before he shuts himself away for a period of years to study his theology.

Seminaries especially need careful scrutiny, to see whether the life-style they impart is genuinely prophetic, or not.

3. ANOMIE As this study has shown, seminary students are liable to have different visions of the Church, and of the seminary, according to whether they tend to be K or Q. K's identify themselves with the Church collectivity as they know it; they opt for NOMOS, but they are liable to suffer from anomie themselves, or else to diagnose their changing situation in terms of anomie. The Q's are individualists, more radical, awakening from what they have come to see as a false consciousness, as they opt for a state of PLEROMA, of human completeness. This may make them critical of what they have come to regard as a dehumanising "system". Given the limited nature of this study, it may not have been possible to confirm such a hypothesis of seminary polarities with any great degree of conviction; nevertheless the study of different K and Q responses over a variety of issues did establish that in some areas at least they were consistently divergent in their attitudes. It is possible to conclude that the Church should get rid of all the K students (or all the Q students depending on which end of the spectrum one happens to be). A more balanced and possibly more realistic solution is to recog-
nise that this divergence is characteristic of our society, and that it is right for an open and all-embracing Church to welcome both types into its ministry.

Quite apart from the special problems of "K" men, it is useful to include a consideration of anomie in this study even if one agrees that it has no place in any list of aspects of alienation. What Durkheim described, especially in *Suicide*, was an anomie in terms of norms of human behaviour, which no longer seem to possess validity for members of society. For the Protestant, it will be recalled, Durkheim saw this as a greater problem than for the Catholic, given the latter's dependence on the priest, and on the priest-led community, for guidance in day-to-day behaviour, in contrast with the former's dependence on his own individual conscience. Since Pope Paul VI issued *Humanae Vitae*, his decree on birth control, in 1968, Catholics have heard a great deal more about individual conscience. In most of the seminaries students will have been taught to instruct penitents in confession that they are bound to obey their own conscience in this matter, while pointing out to them the necessity of trying to ensure that their conscience is correctly informed. More recently the seminaries have turned to a study of the revised rite of Penance, the latest modification of Church practice since Vatican II, in which the priest, acting as confessor, is asked to play a rôle more akin to that of a counsellor than was formerly the case. One feature of this new rite, already put into practice in the seminaries themselves, is the restoration of the ancient practice of a service of Penance, in which a whole congregation think together, with the help of the priest, about some aspect or other of conscience. In this way the priest can help his people to develop what has been called a mature conscience, as opposed to a childish one. (4) Questions such as social justice, discussed above, can be introduced to congregations who have heard little of such matters in their traditional upbringing. We are likely to see a development of specialisation, in which men become known as skilful and thoughtful confessors,
and others excel at the art of conducting services of penance, or at the still more important work of keeping in touch with the people. The "Jack-of-All-Trades, Master-Of-None" era is nearing its end.

One way in which the priest can lead his people to carry out their own Prophetic task is that known as review of life. This method of group discussion lies at the basis of many movements in the Church, such as the Young Christian Workers, or Family and Social Action. If they do put into practice what they are resolving, and help each other to carry it through, such Family or YCW groups can become an important element of Christian and human influence in a street or a block of flats, or a factory. The priest's role in this can be of great importance, as he learns from the laymen what their lives are really like, and helps them to acquire a wider and deeper value-system by which to achieve positive and constructive results, sometimes extending to the whole political and economic life of a country. One useful feature of the more open seminaries has been the opportunity it gives students to participate more easily in such house groups and YCW meetings, and similar events.

4. SELF-ESTRANGEMENT One feature of the responses to the questionnaire was the call for more and better spirituality, involving such features as a year of spiritual formation, and better trained spiritual directors, able to give each student personal guidance. Earlier in the study the suggestion was made that "spirituality" can smack of a dualistic approach to human life, unless "wholeness" - or PLEROMA - be introduced to complement "holiness". Another plea by respondents was for greater emotional maturity among future priests; the immaturity of priests was thought to be the principal cause of much of their inability to make relationships. This is linked in its turn with the whole thorny question of celibacy. Given that the celibacy rule is not to be modified in the near future one may consider the connection between "wholeness" and celibacy. In the past celibacy was often presented in
a negative way. It was thought to consist of not getting married or having children, or of having close friendships with women. Preparation for it took the form principally of cutting the student off from contact with girls or women in his adolescence and early manhood. Added to this was the subsequent fear, not surprising in an all-male celibate community, of homosexuality. This led to the seminary authorities frowning on close friendships between students. One result of this negative approach has been the attitude of many students towards celibacy. They have not seen it as essential to their vocation to the priesthood, but rather as a condition of life imposed on them by the Church. They accept it not because they experience any special charisma for this way of life, but because it is a condition sine qua non of the Catholic priesthood, to which they do feel strongly attracted.

What has just been said may not have been established in the study apart from the one statement in the "F-scale" test that "celibacy must be maintained at all costs", with which only a minority of respondents positively agreed; but nothing in the questionnaires leads one to alter it. Any good "vocation counsellor" will realise that a question of the utmost importance to be put to a candidate is to ask why he has not got married, or does not intend to do so. Celibacy cannot rest on homosexuality, or on a fear of women.

A positive celibacy, which encourages prospective priests to get to know women well, and to look on marriage as a vocation in its own right is asking for two things: fewer priests, and more spirituality. Such spirituality cannot be passed on in a year's novitiate, however valuable such a time might be for quiet reading and prayer; nor can it depend on the student's good fortune in finding a spiritual director who happens to be "on the right wave-length". Its only genuine source will be the shared experience of a whole growing community, in which the potential candidate's priesthood has emerged as a new way for him to express what he has already acquired as an authentic layman, member of the assembled People of God, which needs him whole and complete.
5. ISOLATION in one of the most chilling observations made by any of the respondents, compared his seminary to a block of skyscraper flats. Students may tend to be wary of the enforced community of the seminary; they rightly suspect its "instant bonhomie", yet a sense of loneliness among priests came strongly through the twenty interviews, if less so in the questionnaires. The student's immaturity and negative celibacy may prevent him from achieving successfully the normal human growth point of young manhood, with its acquired ability to make relationships. Some respondents spoke of the ease with which some priests do make relationships, so this must not be exaggerated.

One danger of the group system, taken to its limit, is that students could become so dependent on their small group that they would be lost without it. The priest has to achieve an ability to be at home in many groups, and still be free. Where the priest of today is more at ease, and feels both welcome and needed, is in the celebration of the liturgy, over which he is asked to preside in a far less formalistic way than in the recent past. Here is a problem for the seminary, which still tends to present the students with an exaggeratedly formal liturgy, solemnly celebrating a community from which they may feel estranged. It is the K men, who like to see everything done correctly, who come into their own, naturally enough, in the House of the Lord; it is the Q men who prefer a liturgy of house-Masses and folk-Masses, marked by spontaneity. Once again a balance needs to be achieved, and a growth in understanding of what the seminary liturgy really means, and is meant to signify and symbolise. For many young Catholics, including seminary students, the liturgy is the occasion that proves Marx right, when all alienation begins with God. What it could be, transforming seminary, priesthood, Church, mankind, is an encounter with the Maker of man, and the end of alienation.
1. See *Our World and You*, a synopsis of this statement made by R.V. Bogan on behalf of the English Commission for International Justice and Peace, 1972. For further development of the themes in this statement, and for a better understanding of many of the values of the present author implicit in this study, see *This is Progress*, synopsis translation of Pope Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio*, Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1968; *This is Action*, synopsis translation by R.V. Bogan of *Octogesima Adveniens*, English Commission for Justice and Peace, 1971; *This is Right*, synopsis translation by R.V. Bogan of *The Church and Human Rights*, English Commission for Justice and Peace, 1976, and a summary of much of this teaching, *The Mankind Manifesto* by R.V. Bogan, Catholic Information Office, 1976.

2. For the data collected in the interviews, see Appendix VII.

3. See *Seminarium*, 1974

A VISIT TO ST EDWARD'S, TOTTERIDGE.

This college of the White Fathers is one of the constituent parts of the North London Missionary Institute, formed a few years ago. The college is not far from St Joseph's College, Mill Hill. It occupies several pleasant acres, and a cluster of grey institutional buildings, on the northern edge of London, in Hertfordshire, where the Morden line meets the cows. The students have come down from 80 a few years ago to the present number of 25 White Father students, and a dozen or so Verona students and Society of the Divine Word students. The latter live with one of their own priests in a separate building in the grounds. The College has a staff of ten or so White Fathers, most of whom are lecturers in the Missionary Institute; some of the lectures and seminar work of the Institute take place in the College, and some at Mill Hill. There are also a number of missionaries living in the college who have come there to learn English.

On my arrival at the college (June 7th 1972) I was met by Father A. the Rector for the past eight years, who took me into the staff common room for a drink. Sitting there was one of the students, B., a deacon who was about to be ordained a priest. He took me to my room in Oak Lodge, which is used as a conference centre, and which is the headquarters of the Voluntary lay helpers, who go to work in the missions. B. told me that Frs. A., and C. (a Canadian priest who teaches moral theology) were both leaving at the end of the term, and that the numbers were declining fairly rapidly. The College had brought together students from a number of countries, and vocations from the Continent were also disappearing, so there was now a greater proportion of English-speakers in the community. There had been 36 WF. students at the start of the
year. Next year there would be only 20 students, after
the ordinations. Nine or ten were being ordained this
summer, and some of the students were already ordained
priest, but were still at the College sitting for exter-
nal London B.D. examinations. Mill Hill was apparently
the only institute with a province in Holland which had
not suffered too much of a decrease in vocations.

I asked B. if there was any particular part of Eng-
land where missionary vocations came from. He said there
had once been a junior seminary in Portsmouth for the
White Fathers, and a number of vocations, including Fr.A,
had come from there. The so-called parish groups among
the present students had now been in existence for five
years but there did not as yet seem to be much in the way
of vocations from the parishes which the students worked
in at week-ends. In B's own parish two lads of 12 had
expressed an interest.

B. told me that when he came to the College in 1968
there were 60 or so students; there were 9 parish groups,
with six or seven students in each. The groups were split
up by years and by nationalities. At first the students
allocated newcomers to the groups they thought they would
fit into best. There had been some friction last year
when one group of students came in from the Washington
noviciate, and said they found the Totteridge set-up im-
posing and conforming; there was a fair amount of discon-
tent about the system of formation. They thought the
group system was artificial, and the big house uneconomi-
cal.

The groups have weekly meetings; they are based on
the corridor system of the college, because the geography
of the building lends to it. The rooms in a corridor tend
to be hidden away, and the students work together in de-
corating and cleaning. They have common manual and pasto-
ralwork, and have their prayer life in common. Theysay
Morning and Evening Prayer together and have Mass once a
week in the group common room. This was originally with any priest they could lay their hands on; to begin with, priests were not members of the groups. There was in fact a big division between staff and students, but no tension about it. Before the refectory was altered the staff had their own table in it, where they would eat lunch and supper along with the rest of the community, though they always took breakfast in a separate room. When the system was changed the Fathers had to queue up to get their meals, along with everyone else, and this integrated everybody. The refectory now contains small tables to seat four people, and people sit down anywhere. There is still one Father who always sits at the same table but he is 'exceptional'.

The student is not a White Father until the ever of his subdiaconate. The fact that he is not considered a member until he has spent six years with the White Fathers is upsetting for some. The deacons meet once a week with the Rector, and this upsets some of the younger people, who look on it as something of a prefect system, though the deacons do not think of it in this way. The groups have evolved over the years, and the group now plays a certain part in recommending whether or not a student should join the society. The group would meet to discuss a person, generally in his absence, for a critical appraisal. The deacons were also asked to give a simple Yes or No. They were considering a person for the society, not for the priesthood, and they had to consider whether his character, the way he gets on with people, the part he plays in the community, fits him for the society.

I suggested to B. that individuals might become too dependent on the group, in a way that would be unhelpful to them in the mission field. He said it was part of the group system to train an individual to become independent, but to do so in reliance on others. But he agreed that one could become overdependent on the group. Prayer was a good
example. It was usual for the students to get up at 6.20 and to have Morning Prayer in groups at 6.45, finishing at 7, leaving half an hour before Community Mass at 7.30, leaving each person an opportunity to meditate for half an hour. But on holidays or at weekends, when there was no Morning Prayer in groups, a person was thrown on his own capabilities, and people admitted they did not get up, because they had come to rely too much on the structure.

At lunch I met Father C., behind the cafeteria counter dishing up the food with his group. In the queue was the new Rector, D., whom I had last met in Uganda. I was struck by the informal dress of staff as well as students. Students' hair was not particularly long, though quite a number wore beards. They looked neat enough.

I had lunch with B. plus a young lad from Tourcoing, with a Flemish look, and Jesus, from Navarre, about to be sent off on a 'stage' in Africa. It was a friendly atmosphere, though some of the older priests looked somewhat apart. After lunch we went to B's group common room for coffee. The room was quite small, which squashed everyone together; a slightly contrived atmosphere (a little uneasy with me?) C. was there, an African student from Malawi, bearded S. from Cardiff, a Spaniard who said little, and one or two others; there were frequent visitors to the door looking for someone or other in the room. We discussed the studies, especially the communications course at Hatch End, which has now been moved from the syllabus. S. was a students' representative in the task of drawing up courses for the Institute, and he told me about a new course still at the planning stage. The B.D. had been a failure owing to ignorance of Greek. Those who sat for the exam had to work very hard. The students left fairly soon to revise for their exams, or so they said; the exams are mostly vocals, though Canon Law is written. (It had been made interesting by the lecturer.) They wondered who would replace M. as Moral lecturer. They complained of the bittiness of much of the study, in such things as Missionary Theology.
They seemed to have the same friendliness as the students at Wonersh; it helped that I knew Father Beckworth, and had been to Africa.

At 2.30 I met A. again; he seemed eager to talk. He is very keen on the non-directive community development idea put over by Batten; he has worked with George Lovell, who is now working full time on this in conjunction with the Grail.

When I remarked that there seemed to be a relaxed atmosphere, he told me there had been a great deal of criticism by Spanish lads, who had been anti-Rector. Then the staff suggested talking to them, it seemed these students had no wish for dialogue; they were very tenacious and were keeping together. In Lyons they were living together near the White Fathers' house. The French went along with this for a time. One man was now living among the pygmies in the Congo.

Between 1968 and 1970 the policy had been for students to do advanced studies before they went to Africa. Now they went to Africa first, and then came back for higher studies. The feeling in Africa was that we could not be priests on our own terms. White Fathers were "bushmen, not sophisticated". Surveys had been made to find the opinions of the men in Africa - "what do you want from students?"

F. talked to the students twice a week - it used to be every day - discussing 'the documents'. He was invited to visit different groups, before the groups had priests in them. He did not think the students were mature enough to use their freedom properly. But the priest must not be a Father Figure.

I asked if the students were too dependent. He said there would be two teams of staff next year, one lecturing, one for formation. Was there any community here? He thought his own conferences were big factors in creating one. They meant everybody was in the same place at the
same time listening to the same man. The Rector's personality was bound to influence the students; it played a part - either positively or negatively. He had been attached to one of the groups, which he had now handed over to D. The group discussed their relations with him and among themselves, but they preferred him not to be there when they did so. Up to 1969 he felt he was on the wavelength of the good chaps, with a partnership relationship. The turning point was the beginning of last year.

As we walked up and down in the garden we wandered off the college to the problems of the clergy - why they don't come to meetings. Cardinal Heenan's attitude was "For God's sake get on with the work" - without wanting to spend time asking "what work?" The staff were going to meet that evening for evaluation and assessment of the year. They used to meet every Monday evening; now it was Saturday morning, once a month; the meeting was well-prepared. The Rector's job was to do the sort of thinking the others haven't time for.

He commented that the students always strongly asserted the White Father identity. When exchanges were suggested between the colleges of the Institute the W.F. students welcomed others coming to them, but did not want to go off to other colleges. The 'Mission' colours their understanding of the priesthood, and 'mission' means old humdrum routine catechizing. They felt remote here from uneasiness about people not going to confession, and so on. There was no sense of identity crisis about the priesthood. The only question they were asking was: should we pull out of Africa and hand over to the Africans? But there was no African Church to hand over to; phasing out looks after itself, however. Pastoral work was in a rut in Uganda.

Did the students question celibacy? Were they properly prepared for it? He said they talked about it rather vaguely, as being propter regnum. Their idea of it was ill-defined and needed earthing.
At tea, in the staff dining room, I met a number of priests, including one S.V.D. priest and André, a recently ordained Belgian White Father who was sitting for his B.D. F. told me that only the Continentals had persevered with the degree. I had a long chat with these two (both "outsiders" in the group) on the students' idea of Africa, and of the Gospel. What precisely is the Gospel they are going to proclaim? Is it just turning to God? André said the training should take account of the work people do, and its effects on them - on the need men have for liberation. The S.V.D. man said that all that was needed was to turn one's mind to God.

Then I had another long talk with A. mostly about Cardinal Heenan, and priests who go off. We got on to the idea of the priesthood, and the fact that in this country priests are not missionary, but see their work as directed only to R.C's. We began to discuss how much the groups derived from the parishes they worked in at weekends. Some of the parish clergy were very keen to help, most not.

Some students went to Michael Hollings' parish but did not see much of him. A. said he doesn't know much about parish work. I gave him my paper on Celibates and my interview notes (I can't decide whether he likes talking to me or wants to keep me occupied!)

After supper I had a long session with André, while the staff were meeting. His first comment was on the staff community life; he thought it was mechanical, and confined to social occasions, when it was dead, as when the Fathers had coffee in the morning together. But when one priest was sick three or four had their meals with him. He asked how creative are we going to be in any particular situation? Two or three of the staff, aged about 35, were creative in this way.

He said the students really live outside the place, the only place they met inside was the dining room, which
was very impersonal, like a supermarket. It was the only social place they had. There was a lack of social occasions. In the past there used to be a monthly get together but it had slowly disintegrated. It was always easier to be a guest of somebody outside than to be in one's own community. The group should be the place where a student is accepted for what he is, and has something to give as a warm human being. The group was in fact very humanizing. He said he had left his own group to let a deacon be its animator No. 1.

Sincere warm friendships among the students kept them going. There were too many activities. One had to decide which were more important, to stay in college on a Sunday evening, or go to the pictures, or visit a family. There was lack of any serious training to be a proper group member. He had had a week at the Grail on community living but a more systematic backbone was needed, the basic dynamics of any group life.

I asked him if the students were still opposed to the idea of Révision de Vie because it was French, but he said those who had been, had now left.

Fathers came back from the mission to learn a new language; the community had to be on the alert to make them feel part of the community. The Sisters and au pair girls were part of the community, insofar as they watched the same TV, and went to the film club or any social that was on. But André asked himself: "How much do we take the Sisters for granted?" They had invited one Sister to a group meeting; and they came to the community Mass on Monday evenings - which was when the college had its "Sunday" liturgy. It was an opportunity for the students to invite people along from outside and to entertain the visitors afterwards. The Union of Catholic Mothers had been along from the parish where André worked had worked. Two or three guests were taken up to the small group common rooms. The staff used to have their weekly meeting just at this time, but not any longer.
Dear Father,

May I invite your kind co-operation in a task I have undertaken? I am a priest on the staff here, and I teach the sociology of religion. As part of my work I have set out on a study of seminaries, and the best way to train priests for their work in the modern world.

If you would be kind enough to fill in the enclosed questionnaire, I should be more than grateful. A good response will help me to build up a balanced picture, and lend weight to any conclusions that may be reached.

Let me assure you of the complete confidence with which anything you tell me will be treated. Please let me have the questionnaire back, if possible, by March 25th.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL
THE SURREY UNIT FOR SOCIO-RELIGIOUS STUDIES

1. Please write down the names of any seminaries, minor or major, which you have attended, along with the dates of entering and leaving them, and ordination.

2. Please write down details of your education, apart from the seminary, and indicate if any schools you attended were not Catholic.

3. If you have been employed in any capacity, (apart from priesthood itself, and holiday jobs) please give some details of what you did and for how long.

4. What is your present appointment? Please describe briefly the people you are mostly concerned with as a priest, and the main problems in their lives relevant to your priestly ministry.

5. Priests have described their function as a priest in various ways. Please read these ones through, and then ring X for the function which you think your seminary training has best prepared you to carry out, and Y for the function which you think your seminary training has least prepared you to carry out.

(1) Saying Mass, and administering the sacraments X Y
(2) Praying for all the people X Y
(3) Preaching and instructing X Y
(4) Counselling X Y
(5) Forming lay apostles X Y
(6) Helping people to relate to each other X Y
(7) Evangelising the general population X Y
(8) Some other function (please specify) X Y

6. Though the seminaries are all changing a great deal, there are some basic activities in them which need to be evaluated by the subsequent experience of priests after their ordination. In the light of your own experience, please cast your mind back to your major seminary days, and evaluate these activities by circling:

A if you think an item was working extremely well
B if you think it was working fairly well
C if you think it needed some improvement
D if you think it needed a great deal of improvement
X if it was non-existent, but was needed
Y if it was non-existent, but not needed

(If you attended more than one major seminary, confine your evaluation to the last one you were at)

(1) Selection procedures for new students A B C D X Y
(2) Pastoral formation of students A B C D X Y
(3) The general course of studies A B C D X Y
(4) Learning to know Christ well A B C D X Y
(5) Learning the real work of a priest A B C D X Y
(6) Learning to be an expert on prayer A B C D X Y
(7) Learning to be a successful celibate A B C D X Y
(8) Learning to make the Liturgy live A B C D X Y
(9) Learning to preach effectively A B C D X Y
(10) Learning to talk to workers A B C D X Y
(11) Learning how to relate to women A B C D X Y
(12) Learning a sense of social justice A B C D X Y
(13) Learning to talk to children A B C D X Y
(14) The emotional development of students A B C D X Y
(15) The physical care of the students A B C D X Y
(16) Anything else you wish to specify A B C D X Y
7. With your experience of the priesthood in mind, what changes would you care to suggest for the future formation of students for the priesthood?

In the next four questions there will be a series of statements. Please read them and indicate what you think of each of them by ringing:

A if you agree very much
B if you agree to a limited extent
C if you are undecided either way
D if you disagree to a limited extent
E if you strongly disagree

8. (1) The kind of family I grew up in prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life A B C D E
(2) The kind of family I grew up in helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary A B C D E
(3) The education I received as a boy prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life A B C D E
(4) The education I received as a boy prepared me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary A B C D E
(5) The way my age group thought and behaved when I was a young man prepared me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life A B C D E
(6) The way my age group thought and behaved when I was a young man prepared me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary A B C D E
(7) The predominant values of modern affluent industrial society helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life A B C D E
(8) The predominant values of modern affluent industrial society helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary

(9) The way I understood the Church, and my place in her, helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life

(10) The way I understood the Church, and my place in her, helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary

(11) My own personal temperament helped me to fit in easily with a seminary pattern of life

(12) My own personal temperament helped me to develop as a human being while I was at the seminary

9. In my seminary days, students were treated with great respect for their human dignity

(1) By the other students

(2) By the staff as a whole

(3) By some staff members

(4) By the seminary Rector

(5) By the seminary system

10. We learned in the seminary

(1) To treat everyone with great respect

(2) To behave in an authoritarian way

(3) To help people form a community

(4) To thrust community upon people

(5) To help people to find a meaning in life

(6) To find a meaning in our own lives

(7) To help people to develop a mature conscience

(8) To act maturely and responsibly ourselves
(9) To live as part of a big community
(10) To live in a presbytery

11. (1) The Church needs strong guidance
(2) There is a great crisis of faith
(3) The permissive society is a terrible menace
(4) Celibacy must be upheld at all costs
(5) The Church must not meddle in politics
(6) The priest must avoid working as a social worker
(7) The Church must uphold law and order
(8) Ecumenism has gone far enough
(9) The Church's main concern must be for her own people, not for those outside
(10) The Church should support African 'Freedom Fighters' with cash

12. Were you aware of any sources of strain or tension among the students when you were in the seminary?
If so, please specify.

13. Are you aware of any sources of strain or tension among priests which can be attributed in any way to the seminary formation which they were given?

14. What are the good qualities of priests you know which can be attributed to their seminary formation?

15. Please write down your father's occupation, or his last one, if he is now deceased or retired. (Please avoid using vague terms such as 'civil servant', 'engineer', 'clerk' etc., but describe the nature of his work and the grade of post he held: e.g. 'chief cashier in bank', 'partner in firm of engineering consultants', 'motor mechanic', etc.)
16. Please indicate any other religions involved if you or your parents were not 'cradle Catholics'.

17. Please give your date of birth — and nationality — if not British.

VERY MANY THANKS FOR YOUR KIND CO-OPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS FORM AND LETTING ME HAVE THIS INFORMATION.

IF THERE IS ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD, PLEASE DO SO.

-----

APPENDIX III

q. 7 With your experience of the priesthood in mind, what changes would you care to suggest for the future formation of students for the priesthood?

(1) OVERSEAS:

1...1. Improved selection procedures, especially with regard to the student's personality as a whole, and his emotional development and motivation.
2. Curriculum to be more spread out and to contain periods of pastoral work.
3. More of following subjects: history, comparative religion, psychology, literature, e.g. novels.
4. To balance No. 3, more emphasis on prayer life — so periods of solitude or retreats to be retained, or even increased.
5. Everything is to be gained by presenting the life of the priest as challenging, and not a 'soft option' in any sense. Then there will be more vocations.

2...1. No start in seminary until 21.
2. A strong formation in prayer and spirituality, but in a spirituality geared to realities of present day industrial society, not to monasticism (curiously the monks have made the move!)
3. Theology to be more pastorally orientated.
4. Spell in carefully chosen parish (as a "lector/acolyte").
5. Continuous intermingling with peer group who will keep asking "So what?"

3... My experiences at the college were very happy ones - made so, more I think, by the presence of a Rector who was such an excellent example of the Catholic Priesthood. It is on that score - how a Rector "shepherds his seminary" that will impress the student and fortify him in his future priesthood.

4... There should be less bias towards philosophy, as it is not understood by the laity in these days. Students should be taught to express themselves with brevity and exactness. The old catechism was a superb example of how this can be done.

5...1. Greater stress on personal responsibility.
2. Deeper understanding of priesthood - to be seen as service, not possession.
3. Training to be carried out by Rector and staff who are familiar with modern theology and the changed understanding of priesthood, authority and community. There is often a clash between the staff world-picture and the student world-picture: this makes for lack of real communicating.

6...1. No one admitted until 21.
2. All to be psycho-analysed.

7...1. Greater flexibility in the courses of studies between seminary and other educational institutions.
2. Teaching practice.
3. School chaplain course.
4. The workings of local government and Social Services, National Assistance, Sick Pay, Rent Rebates.
5. Opportunity to make mistakes and carry the can for them.
6. Learn to live on your own.

8... The majority of our congregations are women.
Students need considerably more knowledge of female psychology and how to relate effectively (as
priests) with the opposite sex.

9... Much more training for pastoral activities (this was happening towards the end of my time in Rome); less academic theology and philosophy with more a bias towards more practical work in theology. More use of the modern sciences (psychology, social studies, etc). Greater reliance on personal initiative.

10... Older age for beginning studies. More variety in place and nature of training. E.g. I did seven years in one place all of one type. Perhaps three or four years study, a year intense spirituality, a year "vocational" or working or teaching. More emphasis on prayer and spirituality on one side, and reality, people's actual lives, on the other. But the real question is not changing the training but changing the priesthood - what you are being trained for. My experience of priesthood wants me to adapt the way we exercise ministry more than the way we train for it.

11... A system as totally free as possible which would enable students to develop their talents and be more mature, and also great emphasis (possibly in the form of novitiate or by periodic long periods) on spiritual training - to enable growth in self-knowledge and in knowledge of Christ. A system which would put students in many different kinds of situations, but most basic of all, I think, a real spiritual development to enable the students to experience Christ as a living person active and present in their lives. A system not too "systematic" if that is not too contradictory - but rather more open to diversity and the promptings of the Spirit.

12...1. Formation geared much more to the specific priestly rôle to be assumed after ordination and therefore 'specialised'.
2. For a 'parish' priest: Much more contact with Catholicism as she is lived, to serve as a help to acquire the practical skills of being a priest at the
levels of a great variety of people at various stages of religious, intellectual, social, emotional etc., development.

13... The changes will have to be very basic and essential. Students must be more ready to go out, to relate sensibly– but also need certain "quiet togetherness" to learn to know each other, and know God in prayer.

(a) More care taken in selection and during the time of study. Staff-student set-up.
(b) Generally smaller communities. More freedom in choice of courses.
(c) More care in choosing staff for these communities, especially spiritual directors.
(d) Pastoral work.
(e) But essentially people should be allowed to develop their capabilities.

14... More opportunity for personal initiative. While not wanting to see a loss of sense of community, individuals should be allowed to get involved outside the seminary as individuals. The seminary should not give the idea of being cut off. Meeting with many people of different sexes, backgrounds, outlook, etc. is most necessary. Personal responsibility should be greatly allowed and emphasized.

15... Limit the academic course to basic necessities. Close down seminaries as residential establishments and have students living "on the job" in presbyteries, hospitals, old folks homes, prisons, etc. Allow much more specialisation (morals, sociology, spirituality, liturgy, etc.) for those who want it and would benefit. In general, realising that our present ecclesiastical system cannot last much longer, train our priests to cope now with the inevitable future system. Train priests not for 1974 but 1994.

16... Most of the changes seem to be happening already - more contact with schools, hospitals, etc. More vaguely: there should have been more examination of
how much an individual priest can spend just on getting to know people. Some priests, not just young ones, spend very little time actually with people - in their homes, the various different gatherings, dances, etc. The whole rationale of 'visiting' should be talked about - perhaps it is now, but it wasn't when I was in the seminary.

17... A shorter more streamlined course is required to my mind, starting if at all possible after candidates have taken up a secular job or at least had some sort of break from school life and experienced what life means to ordinary people. More stress on selection during the seminary. Small seminaries if possible - large nebulous establishments do not prepare one well for life in a presbytery.

18... Smaller groupings of students. Far more contact with other people. More flexible academic course.

A word count reveals that the item which concerns the respondents most is spirituality (6), with spiritual training (2), spiritual Directors, and prayer life (2). Next come People (4), and Pastoral (4), followed by Philosophy (less) (3), Psychology (more) (3), age of entry to seminary (older or over 21) (3), course of studies (more streamlined, more freedom in) (3), community (loss of sense of, smaller) (3), development (of talents, of emotions) (3), freedom (in courses, in system) (3), staff-student (world-picture, relationship) (3).

(2) NORTH:

1... More responsibility and not treated as a child. Took three or four months to find my feet in parish life.

2...(a) I would suggest that there should be far more involvement of the seminary staff with the student. Students should be given first priority above outside commitments.

(b) More instruction should be given on prayer.

(c) The college - both staff and students should be involved in one large outside project. This
would bring about good not only in society but also in the college by its cohesive effect on the community.

3. . . 1. Much more needed re practical and 'successful' running of a parish.

2. More active and positive approach re real parish problems.
   (a) Formation of community.
   (b) Adaptation of parish to changes and vice-versa!
   (c) VERY IMPORTANT — Whole approach to non-Christian and lapsed needs to be thought out; parishes doing very little at this level in an active way. Yet I think that this is one if not THE primary task of the Parish to worship AND BEAR WITNESS ACTIVELY!

4. . . 1. A more intensive course in spirituality. Today in seminaries — generally speaking — the formation provided in all the forms and aspects of priestly ministry is quite comprehensive and good. But in practice it is all too easy simply "to go through the motions" in a "professional" capacity, if one is not drawing fire from a personal relationship with Christ. Somehow when prayer and meditation "slip", the life and vitality seem to drain from these activities.

2. Greater contact with parish life and problems there etc — to avoid seminary "insularity" and the "storm in a teacup" situations which still seem to plague seminaries.

3. A more down-to-earth realisation and acceptance of parish life and its problems. Theology still seems to have a naive/idealistic effect on students.

5... A staff in the colleges with more commonsense about life in general.

6... As a man of prayer, with a working knowledge of what is needed as a modern spirituality, for all peoples, especially the young; as an effective worker with young people, in and out of school, for this is where the future of the Church is.
7... (a) That, if the basic principle of training is that the student should be given the opportunity as far as possible to live the sort of responsible life expected of a priest while that student is still training in the seminary, that principle should be properly adhered to; which means that his socializing with women, any drinking habits he may manifest etc should not be subject to seminary disciplinary regulations. It follows, a fortiori, that prayer, attendance at Mass etc., must not be subject to rules either.

(b) As regards selection of those students "fit" to proceed to ordination, the students themselves ought to be consulted as regards the suitability of their fellows.

(c) Courses on prayer, ascetic theology, must be substantially introduced.

8... (a) Learning and living in small (9-12) communities.

(b) Much higher standards should be demanded i.e. of prayer, discipline, manners, etc. Quality not quantity.

(c) Selection should encourage later vocations, i.e. after a year or two at work.

(d) Junior seminaries should be closed (their only justification is for children of bad family background).

9... My first thought is abolish seminaries altogether but perhaps that is not a practical solution to a perennial problem.

(1) More integration into life.

(2) A move away from a stoical emotional emptiness - to a situation;

(3) which involves the important stress on relationships.

(4) A deep spirituality which does not rely upon outward halls of residence which is what seminaries are.
10... More down to earth in Morals and Dogma.

11... Far be it from me to profer suggestions. Perhaps detail in hospital procedure/counselling required.

12... In the latter part of my time at the seminary a completely new system had been introduced and I would say it was extremely beneficial; particularly in its insistence upon regular contact with a personal Director. Perhaps I have felt least able to deal with those who are Catholics only in name. Also, the idea of counselling and group-work cannot be overstressed.

13... What a question! I feel the emphasis was still very much on the academic life rather than the subsequent involvement with people and their problems. I feel more emphasis needs to be placed on the place of counselling and to improve the priest's (my) ability to lead people in all spheres - Liturgical etc, as a leader of the Eucharistic Community.

14... Some more practical help might be given on the day to day duties of a priest, and this would be helpful I feel, although you do learn your own approach by experience and talking to others once you are in a parish.

15...(1) A six month diaconate in a parish - if the man is English it is imperative that he spends it with Irish clergy.

(2) Abolish large seminaries - e.g. Ushaw, Upholland. Train in small groups of a dozen, with a personal character, nun doing the cooking, etc. This and a great deal of work with a parish and the social services.

16... More done in three fields of student's training.

(a) Individual's spiritual life. More emphasis should be laid on the spiritual formation of a student's life. Secular establishments tend to
show more concern for the student's academic life than his spiritual life. More experienced and trained spiritual directors should be introduced.

(b) Studies should be shown to be relevant to the pastoral needs of the People of God. Teachers in seminaries should first be made to spend quite some time working in a 'parish' situation before returning to seminaries to teach future priests. Professors who have spent all their time within a college situation tend to teach in a vacuum thus offering no practical aids to the student.

(c) The way of life in the seminary should make it clear to the student that he is being trained to serve in a missionary field. At present they are being encouraged far too much to get into a comfortable middle-class style of living. More community service should be introduced e.g. some religious orders.

17...(1) Longer periods doing pastoral work, completely away from Seminary.

(2) As far as is possible developing sense of having to live "almost alone" once away from Seminary community.

(3) More extensive spiritual guidance, both personally and for later counselling and directing in spiritual matters.

18... Not all seminaries are as free as ours was, while it was not ideal, because its constitution was based on Optatam totius ecclesiae it is better than some in the country. It should be a free society where men can develop as persons in a community of love. It should have high moral and educational standards. Its staff should be aware of the needs of the Church.

19... I must qualify any comment here with the fact that I have been a priest for only one year with a limited experience. But in this light I
would suggest that there is perhaps too much of a stress on subjects which are not practical ones but of which a general knowledge is needed for a general priesthood that a young curate is asked to pursue. Subjects - especially Dogma/Scripture and Canon Law - could be more practical with less emphasis on little points which are of no consequence. I would also suggest that students, and often more especially staff, should be given a time in a working class parish to get themselves brought back to ground level.

20... So far I haven't had enough experience really to suggest any concrete proposals. But I would say that the way the course is moving at Ushaw certainly does prepare anyone for the priesthood as I have experienced it so far. The course itself must be flexible enough to suit changing needs.

21... (1) Course on Book-keeping/Shorthand-typing.
(2) Course on car-driving.
(3) More stress on the unity of the subjects studied. Perhaps using the Liturgy as a focus and showing how morals, doctrine etc. relate. The students need some vision, some aim in mind.

22... (1) Greater insistence on trying to develop a PERSONAL prayer life - more help in matters of private prayer, meditation etc.
(2) Still more integrated pastoral/"academic" programmes. BUT in so doing NOT to dismiss academics as irrelevant.
(3) Ordination should be later; (24) too young.
Greater co-ordination between Seminary and Diocese.
(4) Recognition that Priesthood HAS and WILL change and therefore a grounding in essentials rather than preparation for the system as we have it now.

23... Personally I feel the need for development along the lines of small groups. The foundation year (or years) is excellent as a basic idea but then I feel that the study following that, would be better accomplished in a small group setting e.g. sharing
with a presbytery or in 'digs' with a first-rate Catholic family sharing the apostolate of the area. I fear to have the seminary education become a training or apprenticeship but I feel that education in a more secular environment after the foundation years would indeed be beneficial.

Word-count: Prayer (8) and spirituality (4). Community (7), Counselling (4). Pastoral (4), Seminary staff (5). Small groups (3), Practical (more) (3).

(3) SOUTH:

1... That students should be prepared to meet pre-Vatican II conditions and to be taught that change does not take place overnight.

2... Greater emphasis on personal and community prayer - e.g. "obligatory" meditation, recitation of office, etc. Marriage preparation (especially Canon Law). Greater respect and love for Blessed Sacrament (Holy Hours etc). Would you like me to write a book?

3... There is need for a great maturity on the part of the staff. Many of them are far too young to bring a sense of stability to the college. There is a need for a degree system to be set up by the college themselves so that all qualifications don't emanate from Rome.

4... Much more attention paid to sermons; not enough subjects were sermon minded or pastoral-minded. For example, when faced with a first convert Instruction you suddenly become really aware of a lot of wasted time. The same applies with marriage instructions. There should be more room for "individual character growth".

5... Education of lay people (adults) to realise their true apostolate. Work with smaller communities. Priests could be drawn from within them. No one type ministry and no one type training. It would depend
on each community that was served as to how priests would be trained. Naturally Christian formation of some kind would be necessary but not six years full time study. (Before changing training, need to change a lot of ideas outside the seminary.)

6... Cut out Junior or Minor seminaries. Too many of their products were seriously immature, and suffered a lack of family influence - essential for balanced personality.

7... More time spent living for a month or so in the parish milieu, preferably in a presbytery.

8... During my own time at Oscott I think conditions were about right. Today, in view of recent changes in Seminaries, I would recommend a return to a stricter discipline and time-table. A return to the cassock and a good hair-cut too.

9... More flexibility in the seminary courses and in the length of time of training, to dovetail more with the candidate, taking special note of the individual. A man of 40 with his experience of life will require a completely different approach in his studies from the man of 20. Much more pastoral application and experience of work "out in the field" much earlier in the present six year course, starting with second year.

10... In a seminary there was little sense of "mission" - why not link up more with missionary orders e.g. White Fathers, etc., and have diocesan priests more taken into missionary theology, etc. Need of better methods for human formation, e.g. need for better group approach. Present group training rather amateurish.

11... Teaching staff of seminaries should be equipped by pastoral experience not just an academic piece of paper.
12... A much more objective assessment of the student, his personality, spirituality, academic ability, effectiveness of pastoral work, preaching, relationships etc. This would demand courage, insight, and decision-making on the part of both staff and student but the whole church would benefit if we broke away from the amateurism which typifies our selection (?) process.

13... that they should pursue their secular education further before entering the sem.
- a much greater depth of spiritual formation.
- far more ecumenical student contacts.
- a much greater study of the social teaching of the church, and of political awareness generally.

14... I can only speak with a very short experience of the priesthood but I think the future formation of students must be on a more individual basis. Everyone was expected to do the same courses of study where some needed greater help, others greater freedom to do more. I would stress the importance of prayer - it must be part of the student's life otherwise he is wasting his time. There are many things which the Seminary cannot prepare you for, it has to come with experience - e.g. dealing with children.

15... I think there should be a greater concentration on formation in prayer; that the theological, scriptural, and philosophical studies should be less 'rarified' and give a broader knowledge. I think our studies were too detailed and we wasted time on inessential details to the detriment of a good grounding in principles.

16... that the studies be worked out much more and perhaps concentrated into 3 or 4 years (this surely is adequate) and the pastoral activities carried out over a longer period of time. We were always swapping from one thing to another. "Southampton Course" is a good move!
17... More self-reliance and more chance to use one's initiative. Obviously at the seminary one is expected to attend certain functions, lectures, Mass etc. But what about time apart from this? Why ask for permission to go out to the pictures, theatre, etc? If a man is adult enough to be at a seminary, then he is adult enough to make such decisions for himself. I objected at 30 years of age being told what time to go to bed!

18... First two years: Introduction and first formation. 3rd year: Job chosen by staff with needs of student in mind. 4th - 5th years: Theology (intensive). 6th year: Diaconate. Practical: Moral and Canon Law - more needed. Interviewing; Chairing meetings; Impromptu speaking; Employer; Essential Domestics and Housekeepers; Health in self and colleagues.

19... At risk of seeming negative I do not believe that seminary life has a future on the long term. For the time being, however, there seems no substitute for being "Men of God", men who have experienced God in some way. One is a "Go-Between" and people sense if you are not. Also one must know the people you are dealing with and about parish life. This aspect demands more work of a practical nature, with perhaps centres of study?

20...(1) Since one's experience also includes what happens to one's classmates, I think it is essential that students should have made up their minds about their ability to undertake celibacy before coming to the seminary, so they should not be accepted before 20 years old.

(2) The seminary process is only partly a formation process. The main process is one of elimination. The "formation" is as I experienced it an "information" process, that is acquiring relevant knowledge and skills. Unless students are accepted
at the age of three years I do not think "personality" formation is possible.

Changes

(1) Smaller groups doing practical work together, out in parishes and undertaking parish work over a period of months. (More staff.)

(2) Breakdown of Staff/Student barriers.

(3) Wider distribution of "job opportunities" in seminary - and as priests increasingly have to fend for themselves in presbyteries, use of opportunities in seminary for learning how to cook etc.

21... That more attention be paid to the situation the priest is to be working in, i.e. in a parish with one or two other priests - as the end to which the whole of the course is orientated.

22... I believe the main difficulty in training is that college life is rather far removed from the circumstances we actually find ourselves in once actually working in a parish. One of the least effective elements of training seems to be in encouraging people to become active Christians. The atmosphere of training presupposes one is dealing with active Christians. I would suggest the set up is now outmoded and still too sheltered. I should like to see training developed along the lines of an active participation in parochial life - training in small groups and going perhaps a couple of days a week to a centre for the "academic" learning. Development perhaps of Walworth idea.*

23...Greater emphasis on:

(1) Prayer for the priests, and also the priest leading prayer groups.

* A reference to St. Augustine's House, at Walworth in South London where a small number of students were able to study Latin and English in the evenings, while going out to work during the day.
(2) Dealing with various approaches to the practical dealings with marriage instruction, converts, talks, etc.
(3) Greater stress on the importance of correct and relevant liturgy. The real principles of liturgy and not reliance on own fads and fancies which have harmful effect.

24... Students must have a lively personal commitment to Christ. A thesis on the Trinity prepares a theologian. A sermon, instruction, or talk on the Trinity prepares a priest. Two weeks on the parish is a holiday. Six months on the parish gives the opportunity to do and learn something.

25...(1) Making sure that students are conversant with areas which ordinarily they would not be familiar with.
(2) A better understanding of marriage I think; looking back I don't think I was aware of half the problems that can occur.
(3) An ability to be creative as a priest - to seize initiative and make something of it.

Word count: Formation (7); prayer (6) and spirituality (2); Parish (6); age (4); staff (4); personality (4); academic (3); courses (3); experience (3); groups (3); individual (3); marriage (4).

(4) IRELAND GENERAL:

1... More emphasis on real religion and prayer; solid training in prayer. More information on social conditions of areas for those going to foreign countries. Accurate in life-style of clergy, especially for our idealistic types. Also course in dog-handling.

2... Try to educate men - who are capable of honest and independent decisions, men who will make a stand when some genuine and real grievance arises. Men who are compassionate and have care and concern
for their people. Men who can work to build up community and not just presbytery boys. Men who can communicate with all sections of the population including females. This will happen only in a seminary where there is real freedom - real honesty and truth, where there is real responsibility, not molly-coddling.

3... Seminary to be phased out and replaced by living in the community, working in some sort of lay apostolate and attendance daily at lectures. Concept of ministry to be re-examined. What is a successful celibate? Development of individual talents - outlining of pastoral strategy - what do I see myself as?

4... (1) Course in ANTHROPOLOGY.
   (2) Simplify Philosophy course - apart from logic. Introduce lateral thinking also.
   (3) Learning to be linked with parish work.
   (4) Retreats to be away from college.
   (5) Courses on economics (Practical) book-keeping, cooking, yoga, magazine lay-out and design, modern foreign languages,

5... Much more pastoral experience - more 'talk-in's' from priests who work in parishes - rather than profs.

6... (1) Part of every academic year spent in a parish of the diocese in which the student is to work as a priest.
   (2) At least one year spent on deacon work in at least two totally different parishes with time back at seminary before ordination to chew over the experience.
   (3) Less emphasis on the academic passing of exams which are taken as the necessary qualifications of a good priest, and indeed for ordination.

7... (1) A short period (perhaps three months) spiritual formation in a monastery.
   (2) The last two years be geared to gradually letting
the student become involved in some pastoral project with help if needed and a minimum of supervision. That this work would gradually bring about a mature sense of responsibility in the student.

(3) One term during theology given over to the student to specialise in some theological field or on a study of the writings of a major theologian.

8...(1) More concentration on their country (parish/diocese) of adoption in their studies, holidays etc.

(2) A little more stability in seminaries. They don't lack change and variety these days. With the things being "tried-out" it's important the basics are clear when leaving. This is because the parish area is not so fluid as the seminary.

9... That the student be treated as a man. That association with women is not always sex orientated - that there's more to life than just sex. That students be given some kind of responsibility. Curates and parish priests sometimes don't seem to be really trusted either.

10... Less emphasis on rules and regulations and the outward observable behaviour. More consultation with students who tend to know their own needs best.

Word count: Parish (6); Diocese (2); community (2); academic (2); experience (2); Pastoral (3); responsibility (3); Theology (2); Real (religion, freedom) (2); Man, men (2) Women, females (2)

(5) IRISH DIOCESAN:

1... Students be like any ordinary student and attend University.

2...(1) To give prayer high priority.

(2) Much smaller groups of students to train together for the priesthood
(3) The training be such that we keep in mind that in the immediate foreseen future priests are going to live alone.

(4) A pastorally experienced priest to be on the teaching staff.

(5) An official link to be set up between seminary and its alumni for a specific number of years. It would help to guarantee a sense of belonging while the new priest adapts to his new situation.

3... PRAYER and commonsense.

4... More emphasis on learning to understand people. More responsibility given to students. Students treated as adults.

5...(1) I would suggest that every prospective student should have spent a few years working in the area in which he is to minister.

(2) More time spent on the training of the student in practical rather than the theoretical aspects of the priesthood.

(3) I would suggest a year of study about three years after ordination.

(4) Some of the holiday time ought to be spent in parochial work with a good pastoral parish priest.

6... It is difficult to suggest anything as the seminary I went to has changed quite a lot even since the three years that I have been ordained and I don't know exactly the present situation.

7... A deep appreciation of the need of spirituality in the priesthood. The Seminary course should be more pastorally orientated, in particular the Diaconate should be extended, to two years approx!

8... It would be a good idea I think if seminaries were built in close proximity to cities where there is an abundance of pastoral work that the student should be introduced to very early in his studies. He should also be almost brain-washed into an appreciation of the value of prayer in his life as a priest.
9... (1) I like the present mixture in seminaries between pastoral activity and learning (not to let pastoral activity become the most important).

(2) That in major sems. a student is given a "salary" by the Diocese. (It would avoid the present inequality where those who ask get all and those who don't get nothing.)

(3) That even more training be given in preaching - using modern TV techniques.

(4) That all sem. profs. have a few years pastoral experience first.

(5) That all students be made aware of what is happening in their diocese as they train for the priesthood.

10... That prayer and spirituality be seen to have priority in seminary life. That great emphasis be laid on the content of preaching and its relevance to the people.

11... How to relate their professional knowledge to unprofessional people. To be realistic in their learning. To be taught that they are leaders in their communities - not bosses or tyrants but leaders who "roll up their sleeves". To live moderately but socially and domestically. To be able to communicate as a professional and as a human being.

12... I would make the acquisition of a secular degree (B.A.) obligatory and also a degree or at least a diploma in Theology. Then, and only then, should ordination be given.

13... A clearer picture of what the priest is about. This would have to start with the bishops. The priest is not a secretary or a social worker - yet so much time is given over to this. After three years study - at least a year out working in a lay person's job. Then continue studies. Seminary courses should consider the needs of people who are living in everyday situations. Not people who exist in books. The
Professors in the seminaries I know have book knowledge. I have not yet worked out how they can give us good pastoral knowledge.

14... After surviving the trauma of being treated like a very junior schoolboy in seminary, one at least expects to be treated as a responsible adult at an age when most of one's contemporaries have children attending junior school. But this is not the case. One is still a schoolboy after ordination. Seminaries would do well to prepare students for this shock especially as I believe some seminaries treat students as men nowadays. So the trauma will be even greater for them reverting from men to schoolboys on ordination.

Word Count: Seminary (9); Pastoral (6); Prayer (4) and spirituality (2); People (4); Priests or priesthood (7); Learning (3); Studies (5) and student (2).

Overall count: Prayer (20); Spirituality (16); Pastoral (17); People (8); Parish (12); Community (12); Priest, priesthood (10).

It is noticeable that prayer and spirituality seemed to worry the overseas seminaries most, and the Irish least, but that this area of seminary formation appears to be the one which these respondents are most anxious to see improved.

---

APPENDIX IV

q. 12 Were you aware of any sources of strain or tension among the students when you were in the seminary?

(1) OVERSEAS:

1... The seminary I was in was for older men, consequently there were many grounds for tensions developing.

2... In some years strain between the older students (45+) and the younger ones, sometimes on lines of
Some students had difficulty with the fact of living in a foreign country, climate, language, etc. Some were unsuited to take advantage of living a long time abroad, and in Rome in particular. Financial stringency sometimes a factor in this.

3... A little mainly at the end of the term due to pressure of work.

4... The pattern of my seminary having changed considerably in the last year or so by accepting men of a much lower age group, I found some strain and tension amongst the younger seminarians, in particular during their first year - understandable by unaccustomed mild discipline which was more readily accepted (and appreciated) by the older men.

5... The age disparity was a source of tension. Also the rather dated monastic system which tended to force upon a student a certain style of spiritual life rather than helping students to develop their own. There was the ever present tension of knowing that the studies one was engaged upon were divorced from what was actually happening in the parishes.

6... Fully mature men, experienced in the world, being treated like teenagers.

7...(1) Strain arises because of the refusal to allow students to work with the staff in developing new community structures. This leads to a counterproductive "them/us" attitude and is real refusal to face the underlying problems of authority, community and ministry.

(2) Strain arises from taking students straight from school who have not had sufficient time to mature outside the seminary system.

8...(1) Immaturity which was by-passed.

(2) Too many students had led a very sheltered life.

(3) Lack of direction by staff.

(4) Trying to live community life when lacking this type of vocation.
9...(1) The desire to be part of/be helped by and help the immediate surrounding community and the inability to do so with the blessing or even tolerance of the staff.

(2) the difficulty in adjusting to an informal unstructured community - basically the difficulty in making friends.

(3) Staff/students - us/them in a small community.

(4) Desire to be a normal person and a respectable priest (as the ideal presented).

10...(a) Continental methods of teaching employed at the Gregorian University.

(b) Lack of adequate funds for basic needs e.g. Books.

(c) To a certain extent lack of real communication between staff and students.

(d) Little real commitment to people outside but in the region of the seminary

11... Plenty.

(1) Old "seminary system" in process of breaking up - causes all sorts of tensions while a new 'system' is being sought.

(2) Tensions between 'strict dogmatism' and 'lax experimentalist' breaking out in all sorts of fields.

(3) Transition to a community life, where people care for each other, caused strain among those who thought a community was somewhere where you couldn't talk to each other, and "what the boss says goes".

12...(a) Natural human relationships.

(b) A division - not to be oversimplified - between what for want of a better term can be called "traditionalists" and "modernists", but what my bias urges me to call those who wished to be out-going and have an "incarnational" approach to Christianity in the world (me!) and those who preferred a strongly self-contained seminary and spirituality and a clerical Church.
13... At times the strain of smallish community togeth­er for a long time (remember we were abroad) and attendant strains at times emotional pressures, etc. Only at exam times, pressure of work! A very occa­sional rebelliousness at what seemed unnecessary authoritarianism. Tensions of growing up and developing.

14... Living closely together sometimes caused people of very varied social backgrounds and very diver­gent views to clash. In a small number of cases the process of an individual's emotional growth (either too rapid or too slow, and therefore problem­atic!) caused distress and strain to the community. Discontent with the 'system' in my first years in ma­jor seminary. The majority deploring the rigidity. Latterly a small minority thinking it too lax!

15... Certain tensions caused by inability of some to adapt to foreign culture etc. Occasional fragmenta­tion of students as result of difference in theologi­cal standpoint...normal tensions which result when so many men are brought on top of each other and ex­pected to live!

16... System versus human development (personal) - con­flict between authority and students. During my time Vatican II post and ante. This called for a ma­ture attitude to change.

Not all the respondents wrote has been reproduced, lest it identify them, or break the confidence of their views, not intended for publication. But from what has been set out above, one can see a number of patterns emerging.

(1) Staff/student tensions.
(2) Student/student tensions.
(3) Personal problems, connected with being abroad, or study or emotional development.
(4) The effect of change after Vatican II.
(5) "The system", as opposed to "caring community".
(6) Lack of funds.
1. There was a distinct lack of any real sense of community - certainly among the college as a whole (i.e. students and professors) but also among the students themselves. Polarization into cliques was very much noticeable.

2. Different pressure groups, one way or another. Some satisfied and complacent about seminary life, others very radical and wanting extreme and drastic measures. Sometimes there was a healthy tension, other times not at all healthy. I must admit seminary life, like the rest of the Church, was under strain through post Vatican II change. Change is always hard to accept and swallow because not always to our liking whether we are radicals or conservatives.

3. Strain between right wing and left wing groups. Clashes of personality due to above. Strain between those who wanted greater freedom and less rules - and those who wanted a more structured community.

4. Staff-student relationship - the former being accused of being too distant and uninterested in the students as human beings. In my opinion this complaint was always greatly exaggerated; although I have to admit that it was sometimes the case, or at least appeared to be true. Why? Simply because of the Staff's hectic academic timetable, lecturing outside the college as well as inside etc...Without wanting to appear as a 'snob' in the broad sense of the word another source of strain among students themselves was due to varying backgrounds and the unwillingness of some students to recognise the fundamental importance of the academic work involved in training.

5. We were taught in the seminary and so learnt to a certain extent to act with maturity and responsibility and to treat others with respect. But I would maintain that inevitably no matter how good the formation, there is bound to be a certain immaturity in
seminary life. That maturity only begins to come a little with permanent attachment to parish or pastoral life. Hence strain and tension between "conservatives" and "progressives" and the things they want to do in the college and liturgy. Strain and tension due to work load. Strain and tension due to personal problems of vocation. Strain and tension about seminary system and staff.

6... Members of staff and some students with very small minds.

7... Cliques within the student body, often bitter and usually unnecessarily so, and often blowing out of all proportion, issues which arose from the staff, or within the student body. The system allowed for many diverse opinions.

8...Yes,
(a) there was felt to be a basic divide between
(1) the principle of the seminary that students should in the seminary be given the sort of freedom they would have as priests, to help each other come to terms with freedom and responsibility, not least by making mistakes, and
(2) the fact that several aspects of life (women, drink, morning Mass etc) were nevertheless governed by regulations;
(b) genuine problems of faith - which being forced to attend Mass hardly helped;
(c) personal relationship problems between the students.

9... The dedicated students found it hard to put up with those who seemed either through idleness or a crisis of identity to disrupt and destroy what should have been a reasonably good and mature system of education. This tension often took the form of older students being set against the younger. Lack of maturity causes so many problems everywhere.
Loneliness seemed the greatest problem; as in skyscraper flats people can live close together and yet be completely isolated - so also in seminary.

Only comparatively trivial strains.

I felt aware of the strain in many people; their own talents and possibilities were not fulfilled - they felt this keenly.

On the whole no. A small number of students may have found it hard to adjust from their earlier rather rigid training and thinking about the church. So this could be a source of a certain amount of strain and tension.

Sources

1. The system itself - though in many ways well updated - "big brother" was still watching. Element of fear - led to a fair amount of deception all round.

2. Immaturity; led to a false 'bonhomie'.

The lack of true responsibility given to the students. More often as not the student tended to be treated like a schoolboy which tended to make life somewhat difficult for the adult vocation.

The student who had come from a junior straight into a major seminary or straight from school or college into a major seminary, tended to have great difficulty in both relating to his fellow students and in coming to terms with his own sexuality. The process of emotional maturing for these students tended to be a source of great strain, being as they were, in an all male community. In some cases their fears of becoming or even feeling what they termed as 'homosexual' tendencies became a mania. Emotional feelings were certainly greatly feared.

Personal relationships often strained, but this in some sense expected in uni-sex setting.

Problems of faith often troublesome.

Pastoral problems and "follow-ups" often produced "heart-aches".
(4) Loyalty to football teams!

17... To an extent, there could be dissatisfaction with authority when they thought it was making retrograde decisions. At times it would make decisions on which the students should have been consulted and this did not take place.

18... Perhaps too much emphasis on examinations and trying to "keep up with the student". There seems to be very little room left for future John Vianneys.

19...(1) Normal academic boredom and strain.
(2) Tension between individuals.
(3) Tension between Pastoral/academic.

20...(1) Trying to act as adults whilst being treated as sixth formers.
(2) Often lapsing into juvenile behaviour when given the chance to act as adults.

21...(1) When the Seminary system changed so suddenly six years ago, from a monastery system to a system that relied on the student making his own decisions, a few students were unable to cope with the burden of ruling their own lives and began to crack up.
(2) The academic standards required were very demanding. An awful lot of students couldn't cope - found life very difficult.
(3) Some students did not receive Local Education grants. They really did suffer poverty. The Bishops (some) have since tried to help but the problem still exists. One sixth year divine lasted a month with 3p. in his pocket.

22... Living in an all-male community with possible hang-ups re their relationships (a) with each other, (b) with women.

23... Emotional development provided the usual strain - the tendency to be encouraged to seek perfection when we had not yet become fully human - e.g. Bonhaf-
fer's Cost of Discipleship - a very excellent work but highly dangerous in a seminary. Early on there was the strain of being in an unreal world but as the system changed at the beginning of the third year this vanished.

(3) SOUTH:

1... The strain of becoming aware of my own imperfections, weaknesses and of having to change.

2... The normal healthy tensions of personal relationships; but sometimes made more difficult by the authorities' apparent disapproval of allowing people to make necessary mistakes in growing up; by certain absurd views of spirituality (angelism!) and a terrible lack of formation in real prayer, as opposed to spiritual duties.

3... Yes, in that we were asked to live a semi-monastic life without the monastic spirituality to support us. Love in a real sense was often lacking - people looked on the seminary not so much as a community bound by love but a place to get through - often resulting in unnecessary strain and tension.

4... Lack of direction. Lack of declared sense of purpose apart from vague "wanting to be a priest".

5... Financial strain on older students. Tension of younger professorial staff not knowing how to cope with older students. One to one relationship between students and staff very difficult. Gulf between Student/staff - not Christian. Emphasis wrong.

6... Partly due to the beginning of a more "enlightened" approach on the part of the seminary rector and staff. In this new approach much of the rules were left up to student's conscience etc. Inevitably students initially found it difficult to cope.

7... A source of strain and tension was the adjustment between the old seminary system which generally was a system of rules and regulations to be obeyed
without question and the new system which was coming in which encouraged personal maturity and responsibility from the student - no longer a question of 'be at this place at this time - or else' but 'It's up to you - as you are now and intend to develop and make the effort - this is the type of priest you will be - no miracle or marvellous change at ordination'. The transition stage between these systems caused a certain amount of tension, uncertainty and caution.

8... Yes, with some who were converts of thought and discussed a great deal what we were taught - the new teaching was difficult to assimilate. Also with more militant members, who could not adapt to many apparent compromises in the Church. We were more concerned with Church than with those outside the Church.

9... Where there was a barrier between staff and students this tended to form a solidarity among students and practically removed serious tension among them. Later there was tension between more reactionary students and the majority, because former felt system was too lax, not taken very seriously - former were rather short-sighted.

10...(1) Must fit into a type of system or get out. It's a very wide one but not wide enough.
(2) One type ministry in mind only.
(3) Lack of dialogue between student-staff as a body and the Bishops.

11... Polarisation of students was very evident, the causes of course complicated. But roughly Conservatives and 'Liberal' if that's right word to describe it.

12... Lack of maturity in staff gave a certain 'orphaned' quality to the place. New ideas in immature minds led to unhappy divergencies of ethos.

13... None other than those one might expect among (a) an all-male post-adolescent community.
(b) preparing for a life so fundamentally different from others.
14... Only the crises which hit everyone, at some time, whilst trying to discern God's call. Also petty crises which boiled up because the lads had nothing better to think about. I often used to think it would be better if the academic and residential parts of sem. life took place in widely separate buildings so that students had to commute between the two.

15... Usual strains of students who lived in a make-believe world of the seminary. A fair amount of strain and tension came from the uncertainty of the rule of life and the frequent moving staff. One cause of strain was not enough fresh air, too much sitting around drinking coffee.

16... I think I would say a lack of maturity and a refusal to face up to reality were the main causes of tension. I think this was not helped by certain members of staff who seemed afraid to give firm guidance on some occasions when it was necessary and at times a positive encouragement to kick over the traces!

17... During my time at the seminary the whole system was turned upside down without sufficient regard for the effects this would have. The leadership was either too weak or too strong (dogmatic) to be effective. Many students were quite lost and the staff in the middle did not know which way to turn. For many it was hopeless!

18... Tension was caused mainly by the inability of the authorities to gauge the "signs of the times". There was simply a breakdown in communication and a stressing of a life form which to my own knowledge ceased to exist ten years previously.

19... For myself I felt scrutinised and spied on, which made me very insecure. The experience of fellow students, stopped just weeks before ordination, was not encouraging. I felt that I was judged by a completely different set of values by the staff from those by which I assessed myself. Nobody told me my strengths and weaknesses as a potential priest.
20...(1) Being forced to worry over things that won't make the preaching of the Gospel any easier.
(2) The seminary is an artificial society that of its nature can and often does become over-introspective.
(3) Is training geared towards producing Men of God for 1970's or social workers and not professional ones at that? Since I was at the seminary this question may now be irrelevant.

21... Obviously to some degree tension is bound to happen in that during one's time at the sem. one is making a decision which affects totally one's life - i.e. whether to commit one's life to Christ in the Priesthood - and whether one has the call to do this. Other sources of strain - studies and exams, Student/Rector relationships and relations between students. Small things can become important when a community is inward looking.

22... General pattern of the place - arising from a rather excessive preoccupation with internal politics - arising either from the insensitivity of authority or the narrowness of some students. Partly due I think to a lack of interest or contact with people at large.

23... Continued sense of insecurity brought about by the unstable attitudes of those in authority who hold the students' future in their hands. They do not know the students as people, yet they alone have complete control over their future. To say they don't know a student after three years let alone five years speaks more about themselves than anything else.

24... There was tension between "the seminary" and "the student" so some students and staff sided with "the seminary" and some with "the student". There was much talk about the seminary being a family; little was done to make it so - there was a generation gap.

25... Latterly that students were not able to turn to staff for guidance (maybe due to staff shortage) - usually they turned to each other in a rather intro-
spective fashion and their strain seemed on the increase. My own personal strain was that I didn't think the 'system' cared enough for the individual or catered for personal development.

(4) IRELAND GENERAL:

1... Strain usually was personal based on indecision or unhappiness in vocation; this affected behaviour towards other students. Strain also with authority, conflict based on fact of Twentieth century young men brought up in open-minded, freedom-centred society having to cope with outdated authority system.

2...(1) A constant tension for many including myself was the unnatural surroundings and pressures the seminary brings, in contrast to the real problems of ordinary living. Small insignificant things tended to be blown out of all proportion.

(2) Drink problem for many - excessive drinking as students indicated deeper problems.

(3) Through social work, clash between celibacy and normal contacts with women.

(4) Lack of real education - teaching and outlook inward looking rather than open and outgoing.

3... Decisions concerning students and their future were taken by seminary staff on the basis of student behaviour and exams. Students did not feel that they were known as persons. Staff remained aloof. Staff did not seem to have an inspiring vision of the priesthood. In many fields student took much of the initiative in community life which led to much friction between students and left staff even more isolated.

4... Basic uncertainty about future. Unsettling effect of priests and students, who left the ministry. Tension sometimes between staff and students.

5... Financial. Overcrowding. Question of celibacy. Fear of responsibility. Unhappy about their prayer life. Unsure of their own sexuality. Theory not shown to be pragmatic. Inability to express themselves.
6... We never knew for sure if we were going to be called to orders - this was a source of strain and tension for some.

7...(1) Being in Seminary when it began to change as a result of the Council, one saw tension when changes were introduced without adequate consultation with the student body.

(2) On the other hand the changes that students saw necessary were a source of tension among the students themselves. Apart from two attempts at students' strikes the staff always listened and implemented the changes if they saw them as necessary. One thing that avoided tension was the gradual change of things over a number of years, apart from the few occasions when changes were suddenly introduced.

8... Yes, the staff often acted in a way which removed all responsibility from us as students. There was I think a certain tension among students that they did not have the power or responsibility to act and behave as adults.

9...(1) A Seminary - because it is an institution for a specific purpose will always to my way of thinking be that bit artificial. Therefore, there is always a tension (unavoidable) between the "artificial" and the "real" thing.

(2) The various trends in "theology"; particularly the liturgy, priesthood.

(3) Activism and contemplation.

10... Students always had the impression with regards to entertainment that they couldn't be trusted. Students were always treated as boys, very seldom as young men.

11... The inability of the authorities and the system generally to accept them as adults.

(5) IRELAND DIOCESAN:

1... The strain students had was the lack of decent lectures, also adult men being treated like children.
Tension between students. This was aggravated by the general unrest of the later sixties. I would describe them as normal, considering incompatibility, living so close together and man's tendency to dominate and his desire to be seen to be better. Sources of tension? Background, and students' personalities. Apparent favouritism from some staff members.

Personal opinions of students not well received by those in authority.

Students felt they were not trusted. Among students themselves natural strain which an all-male community imposes.

I thought there was a lot of unnecessary strain caused by overcrowding in the seminary I was in. Until recently most of the students did not have single rooms, which I consider absolutely essential. Also staff were too old - this has been remedied since; also hours of work too long. There is no virtue in exercising unnecessary pressure on people's energy.

No!

Some supported seminary renewal. Others opposed. This seemed to be a constant source of strain.

It was a period of change. Some felt the changes were not coming fast enough. Most were very happy - with the odd crib, about food, Professors, etc.

There was not enough confidence and trust by staff and students in each other. There was also an unfortunate lack of openness by the authorities. Certain difficulties were I think created by the fact that there was a lack of policy to be either "progressive" or "conservative" and an air of indecisiveness hung about the place.

The system was often under criticism and rightly so, but the solutions offered were no better. The subject matter being taught wasn't seen to be relevant to life in a parish - now it isn't as bad as we thought.
Students felt inhibited - little freedom to do pastoral work - but what was there wasn't used in anything near its full potential. It's a fact of life - what we couldn't do always seemed best - forgetting about what we were allowed to do.

11... A lust for authority - engendered no doubt by the system. A desire for "revolutionary" change instead of evolutionary change. Lack of explanation and meaning of traditions which appeared anachronistic.

12... Not with the student body as a whole. Perhaps with individual students. The need of some to dominate, to be too forceful. A scrupulous person could cause great tensions for others etc.

13... Well, the obvious strains of any group forced to live together for a long time. At the beginning of term people got on very well but as the term went on to its close there were often shows of temper and resentment especially on the sports field. There was also the strain that those in authority could throw you out at any time for any whim and there was no appeal to Caesar or the Lords.

---

APPENDIX V

q. 13 Are you aware of any sources of strain or tension among priests which can be attributed in any way to the seminary formation which they were given?

1) OVERSEAS:

I am unable to speak for the general run of seminaries and the influence of their formation. The students with me were of such an age that "formation" did not have much effect on them one way or the other. After only a short time as a priest it is difficult to see which "tensions" are due to a natural shyness or inexperience and which due to seminary formation or lack of it.
2. . . . I am not sufficiently experienced to judge
though aware of great strain and tensions
among priests.

3. . . . No.

4. . . . Only very limited experience. Perhaps we can
include a certain insensitivity or general
lack of knowledge of how people behave, especial­
ly when they are in difficulties. Emotional im­

5. . . . Seminary training seems to me to be unrelated
to modern life in the world, and priests en­
tering the ministry find themselves untrained for
meeting people, many of whom are far more advanc­
ed intellectually and even spiritually. This
seems to me, inferiority complex in some cases
and results in defensive eccentricity. I feel that
faults caused by this tend to be self-perpetuating.
A P.P. who is unsure of himself tends to treat his
curates badly and fails to attend to trying to
train them properly. They in their turn, get
'bloody minded' and tend to treat their curates
in the same way as they were treated, if promotion
does come.

6. . . . (1) Strain arises because they have been trained to
provide the answers in the past. Now they find
these answers are not acceptable and this under­
mines their self-understanding.
(2) Their emotional growth in personal relationships
has been under-developed and this makes for poor
personal relationships and seeking compensation
in golf, drink, material possessions and bachel­
orhood.

7. . . . Major source of strain is psychological imma­
turity - seminary by-passed problem in most
cases.
8... Perhaps the tendency to superficial bonhomie relationships (friendships without involvement) and insecurity outside the brotherhood of fellow priests.

9... Lack of preparation for "clericalism" and presbytery life.

10... Plenty.

(1) Unwillingness to admit someone else could ever know better than they do. (e.g. "We have all the answers" to questions of faith, morals, politics, etc.)

(2) Dogmatic adherence to inessentials, faced by a complete indifference to essentials, causes a lot of strain.

(3) Inability to take the simplest of decisions on our own initiative - in its worst aspects this amounts to a lack of an informed conscience.

11... Vastly differing outlook and theology in which priests trained recently: they have a much better understanding and breadth of thought about contemporary needs, and yet by comparison with our elders we are often lacking in compassion, resilience, and are more unstable, because, underneath better facts, we have a less certain faith and try to follow a much more difficult approach to spirituality because much freer, (not with notable success so far).

12... In some cases immaturity, also priesthood seen almost as a secular job with materialistic outlook. Frustration among younger clergy that the vision of Vatican II not really implemented. Clash of mentality between age groups in some presbyteries - also "mental-age" groups.

13... Basically a sense of inability to 'cope' attributable to either:

(a) rigid formation followed by a demand, in parishes, for a more fluid life-style both in activity and in opinions.
(b) Insufficient preparation for the 'intangibility' of priestly work, its variety and consequent extreme variation in 'job satisfaction' or lack of it, from day to day and from hour to hour.

14... Many older priests seem to feel inadequate (I think unnecessarily) in the face of younger priests trained in the "new" seminaries. Some tensions stem from being Jack of All Trades but Master of None. Is it too callous to suggest that some priests who have had the junior seminary - to senior seminary - to priesthood experience might not really have been given a chance?

15... Unable to say with any confidence.

16... Some priests aren't fitted for the kind of loneliness they will have to live with - no instant comradeship.

17... Many older priests' tension caused by not being able to understand the recent changes in the Church, liturgy, etc. Due to some extent, I think, to the former 'closed' seminaries and a narrow approach to theology. Among younger priests (up to 5 years or so ordained) a feeling of having missed out on something, due I think to seminary training, until recently, being cut off from people.

18... Definitely.

(1) Lack of training in relationships - no effort to really relate. Always apart.
(2) Refusal to change; to open their minds.
(3) Look on people as being there for them, not them 'to serve and lead' the people.
(4) Credibility gap between what they preach and do.

19... Radical inability when the chips are down to make a decision. Hide behind authority. Then on the other hand a frivolous attitude to authority.
(2) NORTH:

1. Yes. Young and old - in some cases there is conflict. Lack of Tolerance and Understanding of each other's background. In some cases very very touchy.

2. Yes.

3. Not able to spend as much time together as they would have liked, due to commitments etc - disappointment at students' failure to appreciate their problems especially re question of time. Also disappointment at students' failure to appreciate that they have to take long term view, therefore more "cautious" approach. Students themselves only in seminary for relatively short period of time.

(Evidently this respondent misread the question, but he has offered an interesting comment on seminary staffs.)

4. Those priests formed before Vatican II - sometimes strain in understanding correctly recent developments, especially among middle aged priests. They think they have to prove that they are with it - while misunderstanding much of recent theology. Those since Vatican II - sometimes unreal idealism which fails to accept people and situations for what they are, and tends to mistake means for an end, for ends in themselves.

5. Many of them have fixed ideas about parish life, and have become very parochial in outlook - bothered over small unimportant details.

6. I feel that I am too recently ordained to be able to answer this question adequately.

7. (1) Relating to women, and
   (2) subsequent difficulties over the celibate state.

8. Not really. I only know of one system of formation - Ushaw.
9... The inability to be fully human and form relationships. The seminary inculcated a bastardized monastic approach diametrically opposed to sharing one's life. The exact opposite of what Dallymple stresses as most important. *(The Christian Affirmation* pp. 25-41)

10... One cannot answer this question fairly. There are multiple factors in every case of strain or tension, though I would say "Yes" to a certain degree.

11... No.

12... Among older priests – the unwillingness perhaps inability to show their feelings or allow their feelings to be seen.

13... No.

14... Sources of young/old priest clash usually a question of authority. The Home men seem too self-assured and dare I say it, 'snobbish' – perhaps they see Ushaw men as uncouth boozy yobboes!

15...(a) Their inability to adapt to the reforms of the Church.
(b) Their inability to relate to people because of the fear of becoming involved – with women emotionally involved.
(c) Their inability to come to terms with the 'alone' life of the priesthood.
(d) Their inability to adapt their role to the needs of the Church today.
(e) Their lack of vision and missionary zeal which results in crisis of identity.

16... (1) narrow vision of so many subjects and no incentive given during training to develop interests; (I refer especially to older priests.)
(2) Idea of "permanence" given is now set at risk by such rapid changes.
17... Sexual hang-ups are predominant among older priests - often showing a total lack of understanding of society's inverts - e.g. homosexuals. Inability to talk to curates, (in some cases).

18... Maybe a source with some is the tension of celibacy through not making it totally part of you at seminary.

19... Maybe celibacy. But I'm not sure that there wouldn't be strain anyway.

20... The tension between being taught and trained as though religion were the prerogative of the middle class. Then finding the bulk of parishioners do not respond to this approach.

21... Many priests still have the attitude "This is my parish. I'm the priest." This results in non-consultation. The Seminary should stress that the parish is his to serve not to rule. An authoritarian manner causes tension in the parish.

22... Concerns, worries etc. re forming relationships.

23... There does seem to be a tendency among some to carry a complaint that in some way they were deprived of real choice, of real development, while at seminary: under the older system this would be understandable but not the new.

(3) SOUTH:

1... Presently - no - the seminary started changing while I was there and is still groping.

2... After ordination meeting a great number of very intelligent non-Christians, and only now just beginning to realise how sheltered we were intellectually. Not having any real knowledge of Judaism, Islam, etc. Being Catholic in the most narrow and dangerous sense of the word. The total security of the sem. system cushions us from many material realities, and so we preach a spirituality that is useless for ordinary married non clerics, etc.
3... Yes, a sense of order was predominant in the seminary way of life, and so it has become a way of life totally unreal to the way of life a secular priest has to live in a busy inner city parish.

4... Everyone waits for person above to approve or disapprove of particular courses of action. Inspiration, leadership on part of "young" priest dangerous, often seen as a threat, upsetting status quo.

5... Staff knowing that no-one was in the pipeline to replace them in their particular field of study.

6... Some priests due to their seminary training are unable to relate to other people and even with their fellow priests. The older priests (some of them) see the priest as the man apart - younger priests saw him as a man for others. Older priests had negative attitudes to real healthy mature relationship with fellow men and women.

7... Largely the same problem as in seminary except that the new 'system' (really the different more open approach of Vatican II) has now caused a tension between the old times when everyone knew their station and place in life (same in industry, commerce, etc.), and today when things that were once taken from granted without question are now examined closely and questioned with a view to positive growth.

8... Some show signs of not being able to cope with responsibility - in their seminaries they were probably given very little.

9... Lack of communications, a fear of "not getting orders" in the seminary breeds "silence" in priests when they come out, so often. Openness must be strived for from all people.

10... No. Mainly because the seminary system is unreal and so has no lasting effect to my mind on life hereafter.

11... No.
12... None that would be blamed specifically at the door of the sem.

13... None, either in young or old. What I miss most after leaving sem. is not the social contact of a like age group and like outlook, so much as the deep realisation of God's mission found in prayer together. Priests just do not pray together, nor talk in anything but shallow terms about the spiritual life.

14... The only strain I can think of is the narrow minded outlook of some of the priests.

15... Again I would put down some of the strains and tensions to a refusal to face reality. Another and very common source I would say was the basic selfishness of human nature - a lack of 'give and take'.

16... No. Those who survived seemed to ride the storm. But I am not in close contact with the clergy. In my opinion many older (40's plus) priests do not understand people today. (Do I?)

17... I don't think there's anything specific, apart perhaps from the dissimilarity of seminary life and parish life. Seminary life seems very far removed from the "real thing".

18... (1) Theological uncertainty. 
(2) Ignorance of essential ROLE. 
(3) Power complex. 
(4) Obsession with seniority. 
(5) Lack of honesty and frankness with colleagues.

19... Lack of help in emotional development. Obsession with law - in such a way as to give the impression that law does more harm to people than good. FEAR still abounds.

20... To the extent that they have not accepted the priesthood as team work and wait for directives from above before doing anything. A result I think of the kind of training received and attitudes still at large among a sector of students.
21... The unnatural attitudes of those in authority towards the priest: being normal and cultivating normal human relationships with each other. If they can't do this in seminary then they will never do it among the people with whom they work, live, and minister to.

22... The student and priest today is open. The student and priest yesterday is closed. When the two meet there is tension. The generation gap again. (This is an over-generalisation.)

23... No.

24...(1) Lack of community life.
   (2) Lack of community support in evaluation of rôle and problems.
   (3) Lack of factual information and practice in marriage talks, convert talks, etc.

(4) IRELAND GENERAL:
1... Yes. Being taught to believe in Dogma rather than Jesus.
2... They are not sure of the 'big-bad' world. They certainly don't have a business approach to life. Too much is given to the student - let him do something towards earning his living. (E.g. pay him for pastoral work to buy some of his meals.)
3... Effective rôle playing creates affective rôle playing. In the seminary at the moment I think the affective comes first (and probably rightly so) but the effective is somewhat blurred.
4... I suppose the question of authority in church on one hand and human responsibility of priest on the other hand - this particular tension.
5... No.
6... Different kinds of seminary training for older and younger priests have given them different outlooks on the life and work of priests.
7... Perhaps in relationships with women - becoming too fixed on certain issues.

8... I would think many priests felt that the structure of the Church before Vat II tended to be a crutch which when removed unsettled them. The barbarity or injustice of a system which they had to undergo left some with chips on their shoulders.

9... The normal human devices of ridicule and criticism which may have been heightened by their lack of formation.

10... The concept of authority and superiority of one year of students over the younger classes in the seminary tends to support the "Parish Priest" cult. Priests are now being asked to work as a team in their ministry but were trained by a process of Authority and Obedience. If one was obedient enough one was given Authority; to have to share this hard won authority causes great strain in some priests.

11... Undue and needless importance given to the status quo and to the 'yes men'. Later with responsibility and maturity the realization that you were conned (tricked or misled as to what priesthood in practice was like). N.B. Didn't give you experience of living with one priest - older than you with totally different value system and outlook.

12... Monastic emphasis on authority, leading to conflicts between P.P.s and curates.

(5) IRELAND DIOCESAN:

1... Difficulty in relating to people.

2... Sorry I cannot help here.

3... Too much emphasis on Canon Law has made priests inhuman and insensitive to the needs of people.

4... Tension between older and younger priests.

5... Among older clergy I find a lot of distrust and competitiveness among themselves even. Also some seem to have a very servile attitude towards their
work. They see their ministry as a duty rather than something they enjoy.

6... Yes. Though some priests may be mature in years they lack a mature attitude to life, due to background and more especially seminary training!

7... The difficulty of living with a parish priest who is much older. I think the Seminaries (and the Church Authorities) are very much aware of this. It's not easy to be helped by the Seminary on this.

8... Difficulties in praying and spiritual life must I feel be connected with the seminary formation, also it seems to me that in recent times some seminaries seem to breed intransigent characters.

9... The seminary lacked the ability to bring men to maturity. Many priests today, behave like children - little sense of the real work of a priest, i.e. say Mass, give Sacraments, and keep to yourself. This is the motto instilled in the seminary - and is now carried on. Priests I know don't think for themselves. They look for guidance from authority - but nothing comes. The seminary didn't help us to think for ourselves.

10... Lack of flexibility - owing to strict discipline. Unwillingness to accept divergence of opinion - owing perhaps to formalisation.

11... Again, maybe with individual priests. It is personalities basically which cause strains and tensions.

12... An inability to be decisive because every decision has been made for them previously. This often causes great strain.

--------
APPENDIX VI
--------

q. 14 What are the good qualities of priests you know which can be attributed to their seminary formation?
(1) OVERSEAS:
1... Probably a good many - tenacity, putting up with things, devotion to prayer, willingness to be available at all times. Hard work, patience, long suffering.
2... A sense of brotherhood among the clergy. I can't think of any other qualities that can be attributed to their seminary formation that priests would not have had without it. I am inclined to think, cynically, perhaps, that they have them in spite of their seminary formation.
3... To always be ready to listen to people - kindness.
4... Not qualified to judge.
5... Holy lives.
6... None that I know of!
7... Some have a greater easiness for being with people - affability, and sociability, warmth. Some are very committed to a deep regular prayer life.
8...(1) Sense of prayer and commitment to Christ.
   (2) Zeal for their mission.
   (3) Had "spots knocked off them" by other students - maturity.
9... Faith, Importance of prayer. Tolerance. The good side of accepting other priests immediately as brothers.
10... Prayer life. Dedication. Concern.
11... Firmness of faith. All should be (and are) also found among the laity - but seminaries did give you a marked stimulus in these directions - often too much of a stimulus!
   Confidence in the Church.
   Attachment to prayer, especially the Rosary.
   Obedience.
12... Dedication. Relationships among themselves - friendships, etc. - essential to retain humanity in celibates. (Not always successful.)

13... Imaginativeness - ready to try things and risk and accept failure. Readiness to be really involved with people, and to give up any vestiges of authoritarianism or paternalism. Readiness to work equally with lay people together. Interest in and search for deeper spirituality.

14... Prayerfulness and concern. Seeing the value of people as human beings (this often very deeply theologically rooted without being explicitated). Ability to work hard. A "presence" and ability to relate to people (for good or ill).

15... I think the many good qualities which priests show today are part of their individual characters and are fostered by a good seminary but not to be attributed to it. However the experience of living in a community surely plays a decisive role, although the seminary ought not to be the only place for this.

16... One can perceive a great dedication to the task of the priesthood among those priests I know who were with me in Lisbon, which can be directly connected with the training received there.

17... A capacity to listen, a tolerance of people which comes from close living in the seminary community. Many priests have a decisiveness and 'presence' which seems to have its source in seminary training.

18... I am speaking of seminary formation as I experienced it. An openness with people. Avoiding 'prejudging' or forming instant opinions about events or people (a trait which I find disconcerting among older clergy). Willingness to be open and to accept change. A broader spirituality which seems to make the person more whole. A sense of "mission" rather than of "maintenance".
19...(1) Openness.
(2) Frankness.
(3) In every word and action they are "servants and leaders" of their people.
(4) Can communicate, understand.
(5) Prayerful, men of God.
(6) Work to their utmost.

20... Priests who attended our seminary - ability to live without affluence. Tolerance and patience.

(2) NORTH:

1... Discipline in seminary, especially before my days of training in seminary, I see in other priests as coming out in the way they live, and their discipline in visiting. Modern clergy more open-minded and wider studies via detailed research done by themselves. The prayerful priest - usually older clergy from their seminary training. Priests becoming more humane and understanding in some respects, especially over personal relationships among own people and fellow clergy - comes from training.

2... Social concern; concern for liturgy.

3... Other priests: consistent, systematic. "Learnt" theology etc. (Therefore I am implying younger priests not as systematic, could be due to having learnt more etc). Older priests - strong sense of personal discipline, but not so with younger priests because seminary system re discipline not kept up with academic changes; so ironically younger priests have largely failed to discipline themselves, regarding college rules as 'immature' but putting nothing in their place, or, more generally, failing to appreciate spirit of law etc. Younger priests: without any doubt strong academic and pastoral base, especially with ability to adapt to change and development within and outside Church. (Older priests static and sterile especially re instruction and preaching, regarding what they learnt as sufficient!)
4... (1) A spirit of charity and fraternity amongst the clergy.
   (2) Fidelity to the priestly ministry.
   (3) Human concern for the needs and problems of the people.
   (4) Selfless dedication to the work of the Church.

5... Adhere to regular hours - prayer at regular times. Generally a more ordered life.

6... (a) Perseverance - fidelity to high ideals.
   (b) The sense of personal responsibility - encouraged by the newer seminary systems, but previously perhaps much more to be attributed to the given individual rather than to the priestly training system.
   (c) The sense of corporateness among the clergy.

7... A good quality prayer life. A true humility. A real care for the less fortunate.

8... Generosity - particularly with regard to material goods.

9... Understanding of people. Preparedness to "give" rather than "take". (New System). Counselling techniques. Individual freedom to find one's limitations/capacities. (New System).

10... I think that the seminary has encouraged the human and spiritual qualities inherent in the priests whom I know.

11... Again among older priests a slavish sense of duty - as a priest I must e.g. sit through endless, fruitless meetings, etc. Leading to the phenomenon of the ecclesiastical policeman. I must go to the Club because the priest must be seen even though his presence is a strain on others.

12... A friendship and fellowship among priests which I think can be attributed to this. Although there are plenty of other good qualities I find it hard to say whether they are directly attributable to seminary
formation. Certainly it seems to have produced good and genuinely kind priests.

13... Undying friendship – they know when to listen and when to tell you to "snap out of it". A genuine Christ-like concern for a person as an individual. A sense of humour – definitely on the bawdy, crude side; just to give a healthy view of celibacy!

14... A difficult question to answer for what I consider good qualities can only be attributed to the fact of the struggle of these priests to retain their individuality in a 'seminary formation' which at all times tried to stereotype them. Probably the finest quality one could attribute to their seminary formation is that of tolerance.

15...(1) Love for Mass and Church.
(2) Love for their people.
(3) Strong sense of unity and brotherhood.
(4) Keen sense for Tradition!

16... I could not really say at this stage.

17...(1) Trust.
(2) Loyalty.
(3) In some – always the willingness to listen.

18... Understanding. Patience, Knowledge. Prayerfulness.

19...(1) Obedience to conscience.
(2) A care for the individual.
(3) Realisation of necessity for prayer.

20... I know many priests with good qualities but how much can be attributed to their seminary training I cannot assess. Sorry I can't help on this one.

21... Willingness to work hard. Willingness to put others first. Willingness to try and listen rather than talk. Willingness to try and make Christianity meaningful rather than imposed. Willingness to try and explain Church as being all the People of God, and not just the clergy. Not wanting to be respected ex officio, but to win love and respect of people. Wanting to try to make prayer, especially
liturgical prayer, helpful.

22... Education and appreciation of a very wide ranging calibre. A strong yet individual approach to prayer. Dedication and zeal reinforced by the seminary formation though not specifically attributable. When six years of anyone's life is spent in a situation, it is impossible to judge what is a natural development, what is done by the system.

(3) SOUTH:

1... Patience; approachability; prayerfulness.

2... A sense of humour born from some of the crazy things we had to do in the sem. Being able to mix well. Sense of responsibility.

3... I honestly can't think of any good qualities that could be attributable to seminary formation, but I can list a number of bad qualities.

4... Surprising ability to adapt to the strangest of circumstances. Certain tenacity in hanging on to their own identity.

5... They pray and work fairly diligently despite lack of immediate leadership from above; namely Bishop's lack of real leadership. Can cope with most contingencies fairly well.

6... There is a sense of loyalty and brotherhood which seminary formation helps to deepen. The feeling of belonging to presbyterate to brotherhood of fellow priests.

7... Patience; fortitude; faith and trust that the Holy Spirit is changing us for the better.

8... Living with others; ability to discuss; friendship.

9... The fact that some of them could survive a system like ours, provided them with an ability to withstand pressures encountered in parish life.
10... Questioning in theory even if not in practice. Opportunities for pastoral-social work, etc., if one makes the time and is interested - qualities which can be found in the seminary students today.

11... Unworldliness. Ability to listen. Ability to help.

12... Endurance.

13... Companionship; respect and love for "senior" priests; love of theology as worthwhile.

14... Where there is a will there is a way, seminary system or no seminary system.

15... Their dedication and life of prayer.

16... Perseverance in difficult circumstances and in many priests, particularly older ones, a great devotion to prayer.

17... Love of God and people - and Church. Need for prayer. Concern to answer difficulties of today's societies. A willingness to question their own position. Working with groups. Preaching.

18... Determination! Perseverance. Patience. Understanding. Faith, hope and charity.

19...(1) Great charity for others' welfare.
(2) Unstinted hospitality.
(3) Broadmindedness.
(4) Tolerance.
(5) Humour.

20... Perseverance! The course is certainly broader and more comprehensive than in my early days at the seminary.

21... In spite of any criticisms there are some damned good blokes who are priests. However how much of their goodness and enthusiasm can be attributed to their training I am uncertain. Perhaps the group set up, where it has been encouraged to work in the seminaries, has helped students more than anything else to come to a common realisation of the presence of Jesus in their lives and their work.
22... Sense of discipline, both personally and in regard to their work.

23... They are good and holy men. They are like sausages, fat and juicy but in skins. You have to cut the skins to see and share their goodness. Cutting is a painful process.

24... Ability to mix and work as a team. I think, because (in the old days) seminary training was an ordeal. They are well able to keep their heads above water in times of crisis.

25...(1) Preaching.
   (2) Development of individual skills (but not sufficient opportunity for many to do this).
   (3) The "good" qualities would have been there anyway - but skills can't be learnt.

4) IRELAND GENERAL:

1... Faith; concern; dedication to work; use of imagination; willingness to try new ideas. Perseverance.

2... I am not a cynic but there are practically none that I can think of. If saying 'yes' to everything without question is good - then seminary did this.

3... The gradual breakdown of the old system seems to have produced priests who are much more approachable and relaxed with a spirit of service.

4... Generosity, dedication, availability, prayer.

5... People who lead - in prayer, enthusiasm, and with humour and honesty.

6... "Habit" of prayer - always being on time for Mass - able to relate with other priests.

7... Ability to meet new people and get on well with them. Knowledge and conviction about Christianity.
8... Any form of formation will leave its mark. I am not sure if the seminary formation leaves the best marks; neither am I sure if the good qualities are solely attributed to the seminary.

9...(1) Standard of education and knowledge.  
(2) Friendliness and openness.

10... The one positive and good quality that younger priests have (and indeed the good older ones too) is their availability for and with people. This comes from their seminary. When it falls down for some younger clergy is I think the effectiveness of their availability.

11... One essential quality that I find is that you must be able to listen, know when advice is needed and give it. Some qualities coming from seminary formation – kindness, a generous outlook, showing people that you love them as individuals, not as a group.

12... None.

(5) IRELAND DIOCESAN:

1... Nil. Most priests are self-educated.

2... Communication and mixing well with people, but these qualities possessed by far too few priests.

3... Loyalty to each other.

4... Ability to speak before crowd.

5...(1) A quality of Brotherhood was formed.  
(2) Community concern.

6... Certainly I personally found the prayer formation pretty sound. Especially the practice of dividing it up into the different times of the day which I consider essential. Therefore the faithfulness to the recitation of the Breviary is one of the good qualities I attribute most to the seminary. Also of course you become very conscious of the brotherhood of the priesthood even if sometimes you know that divisions do exist, still you are keenly aware of your close ties to
your brother priests.

7... Priests tend to care about people. Comes from knowing that when you serve Christ by serving people. Hence the attempt to teach us about Christ serves well. A sense of humour is important without being (too) flippant. Living with other students helped here. The theology imported was good but the application to life was lacking.

8... Friendship; dedication to work; habit of frequent and regular prayer.

9... Prayerful, dependable, and concerned for their people.

10...(1) Discipline.
(2) A tendency to support and help each other.

11... A constant application to work. A desire to be good and do what is right.

Word count: Prayer (19); Spirituality (3); Prayerfulness (6); People (18); Individual (8); Personal (4); Listen (7); Understand (5); Availability (3); Approachability (2); Tolerance (5); Humour (3); Openness (3); Open, open-minded, concern (8); Dedication (8); Work (11); Patience (6); Ability (10); Perseverance (5); Development (4); Church (8); Faith (5); Discipline (4); Brotherhood (8); Fraternity (2); Fellowship (2); Corporateness, Presbyterate, Friendship (6).

Only six respondents were negative.

-------------

APPENDIX VII
-------------

The respondents were invited at the end of the questionnaire to add any other remarks they felt were apposite.

(1) OVERSEAS:

1... Although I seem to be very critical of the college I was very happy there. Our year was a very united
one due partly to there not being a great disparity of ages. There was a tremendous change whilst I was there - but the basic atmosphere was unaltered. With a new Rector I gather that things are different. The short period which I did as a deacon in a parish was of very great value. What we learned was not geared to any pastoral situation. We received no training in psychology nor in how to deal with children or young people. The big question which needs to be asked at every stage when preparing a seminary course is "So what?" Is what I am being taught helping me to bring people to knowledge and experience of God in Christ?

2... I feel more time should be given to Pastoral Theology and that the Professor giving it should be an experienced man.

3... I am sorry that I am unable to give very firm views - through lack of experience and the fact that my own approach to the priesthood was unusual.

4... In the light of my long experience in the world as a layman I am very critical of the seminary system. I suggest that instruction should be more practical and related to life in the world, and that there should be much more bias towards the spiritual life. Instructors at seminaries ought to have at least ten years experience in a parish before starting teaching. There should be instruction in such things as parish finance (even adding up figures is essential); how to organise one's day; how to carry on a conversation when visiting; what one comes up against when visiting; even how to behave when one is asked out to dinner; these are just a few points.

5... Psychological screening should be taken as an essential part of selection procedures - especially as related to a person's capacity to undertake celibacy. Greater stress should be laid on bringing students to emotional maturity and to a personal responsibility for their response to God's call. i.e.
Vocation should not be judged by a man's conformity to rules but by his total personal response to God's call (interiorization, not merely external compliance). Intelligent and fearless questioning should be encouraged so that a truly intelligent and stable faith can be implanted in the student.

6... Any attempt at understanding priesthood will fail unless it is seen in theological terms.

7... The biggest shock on leaving the seminary was to find that I missed community life and community prayer, which had been my life since 12. Learning to live on my own, with no-one to fall back on, has made me realise how I used the seminary as a bolt-hole: a community which welcomed me back when I needed to lick my wounds, take a break from the work I was doing outside.

8... To my mind the supreme benefit to be obtained from the seminary training was the extent to which students "educated" each other in Christian living, sharing, and in human relationships. The dangers of this is that it may "shield" one from the knowledge of the colossal indifference of the world at large to the Christian message. This can come as a shock to a student after ordination.

9... Re q. 11:
(1) No strong guidance needed except from Holy Spirit, who's quite guidance enough.
(2) There always is a crisis of faith.
(3) But the Church is 'political' whether it likes it or not.
(4) Yes, the Church must uphold all (responsible) law and authority. No, it must not be a right-wing organisation upholding unlawful and irresponsible authority, backed by repressive laws.

10... In combination with what I saw at end of No. 7 about a new look at ministry itself, while I welcome this survey I would welcome much more a survey
into every aspect of the life of the Catholic Church in this country, conducted by professionals. Thank you for doing this.

11... Inevitably in a questionnaire some things are very broadly generalised, and in some cases I would qualify some of my answers. I think that perhaps the seminary should try to communicate a vision and idealism, and should try to create an open-minded, broadminded kind of priest - open to both people and change of all kinds, ready to learn from others, with a deep spirituality and a very broad understanding of what being a Christian and what the Church is, and is about.

12... If some of my answers appear contradictory it is because I find human nature (and therefore the Church, seminaries) and the priesthood a self-contradictory phenomenon. This is their beauty.

13... In college the main thing is to have the priest ready to be open to whatever situation he finds himself in. Specialization demands this also. It demands openness and fairness and being willing to take risks, knowing the Holy Spirit is our driving force. Fear is really a negative thing. So know oneself - use all means to find this, group dynamics etc. Know others - some. Truth is truth - but our whole life develops, is dynamic - our understanding of it. A fear that leaves one clinging to what was taught in seminary leads to dogmatism, inability to express in relevant terms. With younger students, demands a lot of the staff's time to talk, listen, and lead.

14... I have made clear my criticism of the questionnaire in several places. Large sections of it seem to be phrased in a manner that is not very scientific, and therefore I would question the usefulness of much of the end product. However, I hope this particular one doesn't have to be destroyed! Thank you for your concern.
I'm very doubtful of the value of this form.

Some of the questions just won't do, cf. 8 (7) and (8). If you can tell me what these predominant values are I'd be very grateful — otherwise how can I answer the question? I detect here perhaps a note of censure on modern society? If so, how does this connect with question 11 (3)? This kind of language, imprecise as it is, and coloured by value judgements, is out of place. cf. again 10 (4). The shades of meaning conjured up by the emotive word 'thrust' are beyond objective measurement. Question 11 (10) won't do either. I presume the object of the question was not to discover priestly attitudes to Africa and her problems but rather to revolutionary movements. Well why not say so? And if I'm being too critical, why was Africa chosen, and not South America whose problems seem to me to be as great, if not greater, than those of Africa. What 'Freedom Fighters' are you referring to? What exactly were you trying to discover from this questionnaire? I think the failure to pin-point precisely what was the object of the exercise has vitiated the whole thing so that the questions in fact are tending to betray an attitude of the questioner. The questions in other words are slanted according to a particular view of seminary, Church, etc. Therefore not very scientific. (P.S. Sorry to write so much — I'm in the confessional with some spare time — nobody sins as they used to).

I think the seminaries should give more opportunity to individuals to develop their own personal talents. Perhaps one person is very capable of communicating with old people, or with industrial workers, or with the mentally ill. To this end the seminary staff should know individual students to a greater depth and then perhaps direct part of their studies and formation along the lines of those talents. Avoiding, however, any idea of turning out 'specialists' — this can be done after seminary studies. The seminary should give the student ample opportunity to discover
and/or develop his talents, without detriment to the idea of community life which is basic to seminary formation. The idea of community could perhaps be seen in a much wider perspective. A community based on common purpose and round the Liturgy. Everyone doing the same thing at the same time does not necessarily make a community, although fairly frequent expressions of community living should be seen; the most appropriate being a full community celebration of the Eucharist at least once or twice a week. Formation should take into account the possibility (the certainty in some areas) that in the foreseeable future some priests will still have to live alone. A spiritual formation to enable the student to communicate with the people of the time. I think a more flexible approach to seminary formation is needed. A basic requirement then would be a deeper knowledge of the prospective student - to give the student a type of formation suitable to him and his life and work.

(2) NORTH:

1... I was at seminary from before the impact of change till a 'completely' new structure was formed - a personal director system. My conclusions: having waited in frustration for a change of system brought me to a realization that ultimately systems mean very little. What counts is the personnel involved. Their attitude, their dedication, their personal concern, and I think that if there is any conclusion I could draw on my eight years in training is that the inspiration and the kindness of the staff was of paramount importance.

2... We had a change of system in 1967. I was happy in both systems - in fact very happy during all my stay in seminary. Many people who left did not continue as Christians and I thought that this in some way reflected on the seminary training. It should have prepared good laymen as well as 'good' priests.
I think there is a need for a few seminaries, because if there were only one national seminary, for instance, it might lead to stereotyped priests. It would appear that the idea of a seminarian who left the seminary being a failed priest has died, but it is essential to eradicate the idea completely. I do not think I suffered much through being in junior seminary but we must now look elsewhere for priests.

3... Sorry, having great difficulty answering with any form of honesty as I did not "fit in" particularly well. I got on very well with just about everyone of the students well enough - I made a very small number of very close friendships; but basically I hated the place - FIT IN! I tolerated the place, did my own thing (though not flagrantly, or what might give scandal) in what I felt was important in my training for the priesthood. If a rule obstructed me and I had what I felt was a good enough reason, I would ignore it, and would be surprised when others didn't - nay stunned. The priesthood is one of the most responsible jobs anyone can be called to do - the care of people's relationship with God and each other - RESPONSIBILITY - my 'beef' with the seminary was that this word (in practice, or when the crunch came) was a dead letter. There was little training in responsibility. FIT-IN meant compromise, not CONFORM as in previous years, which in practice meant be yourself some time (they allowed you to go out for a pint) but on other occasions bow down - or face being trodden on; I was often trodden on by authority. I hope it has not made me sour, cynical or arrogant. It's just that I feel it does authority good to have two fingers wagged in front of its face; it may help it to remember that infallibility is a monopoly only of the Pope "ex cathedra". "FIT-IN EASILY" - difficult phrase for me - but I will endeavour to answer question 8 now - you know now how I feel about the seminary.
4... The best of luck. The seminary training system changed radically at our seminary in September 1967. The course of Pastoral studies helped to put things in perspective and to right some of the more obvious wrongs in the system.

5... I hope that my participation proves to be of some use. The remarks that we were asked 'to ring' proved none too easy - in that one would like to make some comment about them. You may feel that my answers to 12, 13 and 14 are a little glib, but I honestly feel that taken as a whole my fellow students (particularly those who reached ordination) were a well-balanced crowd of people. Finally I would like to say that my attitude to answering the questionnaire has been greatly influenced by the fact that I consider the system which we implemented in September 1967 to be forward looking, expertly guided and spiritually and humanly formative.

6... I think that there should have been separate question for those who went through junior seminary from people who only did the senior sem course or were late vocation, especially in question 8.

7... Thank God my priesthood is not the priesthood of seminary days!

8... Par. 5 and 6 of this document woke from me the comment that the seminary as I experienced it was not a monolithic system, i.e. the same system at the same time affected different people in different ways, and this precisely because, particularly in the whole pastoral field, each student would find himself offered a variety of experiences, only some of which really appealed to him, and only some of which he therefore developed. Hence, precisely because of the practical basis of much pastoral training, one student might be of the opinion that the seminary was superb at training people for deaf work, while another might be certain that preaching training was the seminary's strong point. Consequently most of my answers
necessarily refer to what I got out of the seminary system and the opportunities offered there, rather than strictly to what the seminary itself was good at and where weak.

9... I feel that I cannot answer many of the questions because I came through the junior seminary, right through to the senior seminary. However, a great deal in my own formation is due to the fact that I was constantly in touch with a large group of friends outside, many of whom were not Catholic. Also the questions concerning values which the world had to offer before I went into the seminary do not apply, as I only came to know them in the context of being a seminarian. The actual seminary system was very flexible, and allowed for a great deal of personal choice. The academic system was updated after Vatican II, but the corresponding discipline has never caught up; this could often be a source of tension; the usual way out was to ignore the rules, or keep going and asking for all sorts of permissions.

10... So often, it seems to me, problems in seminary training and the priesthood can only too easily arise:

(1) from not consciously and explicitly affirming to oneself the sincerity and integrity of parties with whom one may disagree, etc;

(2) the lack of real listening to discover exactly what another thinks or believes, and the consequent "labelling" of persons or groups. Obviously where the reverse of these two points is true – problems still exist. But nevertheless I think that lack of these basic attitudes increases the problem, and often vitiates the possible solution. Thank you for the opportunity of the questionnaire.

(3) SOUTH:

1... I hope some of your work filters through to some of the actual running of seminary training, and
not be regarded as merely sour grapes of recently ordained priests. Most of my peer group don’t go to the seminary, don’t give their views on the training, because they think it is a waste of time.

2... I have read through the questionnaire but feel unable to answer the questions. This may be because I am so close to the seminary experience that I am not in a position to evaluate but I found most of the questions phrased in such a way that they did not express my own feelings.

3... Please send a summary of your findings – do you think we can become too introverted in the Church – have found some difficulty in acclimatising to the ‘structures’ of Church life, in parish, etc. Difficulty in adapting to the latent Conservatism of many parishioners. The personality adaptions needed when first beginning as a priest are often not allowed for enough in the system. P.S. A course in Domestic Science would also be a great help.

4... Comments regarding my experience should not imply bitterness – just sadness that the college functioned in the way it did and that there are still colleges that follow a similar pattern. The idea of foreign seminaries today is in itself not bad, but in practice it is extremely difficult to keep in touch with the situation for which one is being prepared.

5... The sample of questionnaires will not be representative of your population. The questionnaire is too complex. I just do not know the answers to some questions. The subject himself is not the man to distinguish between environmental and inherited influences on his attitudes. Teach them to pray, the rest does not matter.

6... I found many of the questions difficult to answer because they tend to be too clear-cut! I know this is the problem with all such questionnaires but it doesn't help! I hope I haven't confused you too much.
7... I sometimes wonder whether the exclusiveness of the Seminary system is a good thing at all. Why have a Seminary today when education could be better obtained elsewhere (at every level) and pastoral experience can only be gained in Parishes? I think a National Policy of Priestly formation is needed. Even as it stands the seminary should be more open to the Catholic population and involved in Diocesan Pastoral work—week-end courses, retreats, etc. And especially used during long vacations. I think it is absurd that even priests are not allowed to stay in it, during the holiday, to do work and study. In reality "Seminary" and "Monastery" are synonymous but Monastery sounds more inviting.

8... I'm sure some of the answers given are illogical. However, I happen to be illogical. In question 8 I am sure as a human being I developed in spite of seminary, home, work, and school life. None of us are static. Neither did I think much about my humanity! God gave me a job to do, and with the limited brain power and intelligence to use it as best I can. Surely the job of all thinking beings?

9... In February our year went back to the seminary for three days' review. We were in session for six hours on each of the two days. The outcome of these discussions was important and enlightening. Did the staff not want a report? As far as I know none was asked for. Don't be afraid to break away from tradition even if Bishops don't like it!

10... The work done by deacons, when out working on a parish, clearly indicates the need for this to be earlier in the course. The parish priest at least needs more information about some deacon who comes to him—as this parish work is becoming an extension of the seminary course.

11... Most of this is my own experience and applies to me. My experience of other forms of training has led me to the belief that formation that is 'examin-
able' is 'forgettable'. That the best way of 'learning' is by 'doing'. That a short course of instruction followed by doing, followed by discussion and further learning and doing, would be best course of action.

(4) IRELAND GENERAL:

1... How do you avoid making seminarians remain 'boys' - a giddy attitude to life? Of course not all are. Some of it is due to the fact of the big numbers in seminaries. Some priests are still boys, they don't understand what living in 'the world' means. I always had to support myself not because my family wouldn't but because I wanted to. In fact as I stated in the questionnaire they should be made to earn money for their living such as being paid for pastoral work. Then with that money they buy their food. The food in seminaries is pretty good on the whole, but when one leaves they don't realise what has hit them when they have to support themselves. No presbytery is like a home and never will be, but at least the colours could be a bit brighter and indeed they could be in the seminary. Some priests seem to have been born in a collar - just the attitude, everything must be perfect, and every small detail remembered. Can't there be a little more brightness in life if only in the colour of your socks. N.B. Most important of all - parish visiting.

2... After six months I am convinced that confessional practice was totally neglected in seminary. Not so much in being able to answer the question and solve the problem, but in having sympathy and understanding for people. One point in favour of my particular seminary, it gave me an international view of life, and the Church - a lack of which has cursed the Church in England for so long. In students the ghetto mentality must be got rid of if the Church is to make any headway.
3... After only a few months in the parish I find a lot of the presumptions held by professors to be untrue. I find people are tremendously good, tolerant with their priests, want to know more about their faith. Their faith is very fragile over here - are often bored by priests.

4... Some of the questions are hard to understand. Also the National Conference of Priests conducted a similar survey last year and you may find that these questions were touched on. The conclusions were published in one of their news-sheets.

5... (a) The immediate and utter frustration of one arriving in a situation where one is doubted and frowned upon because of slight deviation in dress (blue shirt instead of black etc.) - honestly, the disillusioning process is terrible. I would hate to lose my bit of humanity and individuality. (b) I sometimes get the feeling that I belong to the Church of the old and decrepit - the Church of the status quo - the Church of the middle class values - the Church of mediocrity. The Seminary system to my mind is responsible to a large extent for this. The man who is lauded in seminary is the 'safe' man - the man who never makes mistakes - who questions nothing - who makes life easy for everybody. I would encourage the man of vision - even though he made mistakes - big minded and big hearted people rather than those with niggardly outlook. Unfortunately the Professors themselves have not had the experience of parish life, presbytery life, and seem to call on their 'book learning'. In other words, form real men, not effeminate do-gooders.

(5) IRELAND DIOCESAN:

1... I want to add something about seminary Rectors and staff. You must be very special people because you are shaping the lives of the leaders of the church
of the future. A lot of what professors said in class when I was in the seminary I have long since forgotten, but what still stays with me and what has obviously become part of me is their own attitude to the priesthood. I still recall vividly the great enthusiasm for work, for prayer that oozed out of some of the staff and sadly also the damage that a cynical or half-hearted seminary professor does. To me your own personalities are as important as the system you work within.

2... I haven't got a lot to add, just to wish you every success in your research. I hope you get enough co-operation. I think a simpler type, not suggesting the sort of replies, would be more interesting from respondents' point of view, though I realise it helps you in the analysis. There are some things I would insist on in seminaries:
(1) Training definitely not less than five years
(2) Formation should foster brotherhood of priesthood.
(3) Condition of living and food should be good.
(4) Reasonable discipline.
(5) Prayer life and academic life must be insisted upon.
(6) It must always be stressed that our lives are for other people. Our learning, our celibacy, our prayer, is directed towards being able to help others.
(7) There must also be some pastoral work undertaken by the students right from the beginning, i.e. caring for people, in some way or other.

3...(1) I see a positive danger in the seminary system of some students living in a world of unreality affecting the priesthood.
(2) I see the modern changes and the relaxation of the old rules as good when they give more freedom and consequently more responsibility to the student. One can see more readily how the student accepts responsibility. There has at the same time to be discipline to bring about the self-discipline which is so necessary in parish life.
4... Some questions are more meaningful than they first appear to be; this takes up time. The main reasons why I completed this form were (1) possibly to help future priests, (2) because you cared enough to stamp an envelope and address it by hand. I would be interested in learning results of survey if possible.

5... Looking back over my questions and answers I seem to have presented myself as a very negative person who sees everything as black and white. This I assure you is not the case. I have answered the questions as honestly as I could, allowing of course always for my own petty prejudices.

6... My main dissatisfaction was with the seminary training academically. All seminaries, I feel, should be affiliated to a University. That each student should have a secular degree and a degree in Theology before ordination. There is also the lack of specialising in one subject. At one stage during my seminary course I counted twelve different subjects, both major and minor. That is too many for anyone. Admittedly all these go to form the person as a whole. But there is no possibility of coming to terms with any one subject. We were dabbling in too many.

7... I would like to see all seminary professors being allowed to teach only if they have about five or six years experience in parish work. I would like to see special courses - at least a year - for chaplains of schools or hospitals and then when appointments came they would be sent to appropriate parishes. What is needed is specialised courses. When all is said and done - the best "seminary" of the lot is the home from which you come.
During 1971 I had occasion to interview twenty secular priests in the south east of England, all of them ordained within the previous four years. Here are their answers to the questions I put to them.

**CAN YOU DESCRIBE BRIEFLY THE PEOPLE YOU ARE MOSTLY CONCERNED WITH?**

Three of the priests were working in inner-London working class parishes.

"A one-class society" said one, "very materialistic, with the people living a day-to-day existence. Even in the East End one can see the traditional environment being more or less torn up by the roots; what was one huge family is now segmented and afflicted with individuality and apartness. Old people are cared for, but in one block of flats: there are no relationships, no common denominator binding people together."

"Almost total lack of culture" said another, "bread and circuses, narrow vision. Most of the people live in tower blocks. No unemployment, yet nobody is happy."

"In the twenty-storey flats the people don't trust me", said the third priest. "They come from the East End, and are totally irreligious, interested in nothing but accumulating money to buy more carpets, to get better standards of living. Religion doesn't come in. But after I have visited a family, I am no longer a threat, I can smile, and smoke a cigarette - I am vaguely human."

Commenting on religious practice, the first priest said 30% of Catholics came to Church, at an optimistic guess. The second said the priests were pleased because the top class at the primary still went to Church.
Five of the priests were at work in working class suburban parishes. One described his people as a transplanted population moved from inner London between the wars. 40,000 lived in identical houses. They were fairly well off, but many were highly inadequate to face life; many could not hold a job. He said the district was totally dechristianised.

Another said most of his people were Irish, and ten per cent of them were Goans from East Africa, mostly professional people, living now in damp and misery. This parish is a re-development area; the newcomers live in tower blocks, and they do not know their neighbours.

And another priest spoke of the problems in his parish - loneliness, family break-down, immigrants trying to adapt, the pressures of suburban life, a low level of education, an inability to cope. People are not particularly happy, and they are subjected to the stresses and strains of modern life, the rat race. Bringing up children is a strain, and many are inclined to rush back to the security of Ireland, to protect their children from the influences on them at school. People have a problem of relationship in marriage - a lack of mutual support. There is a demand for spiritual rejuvenation, but their lives are centred on seeking contentment by escapist activity.
In another area the people had mostly been rehoused from slums, on a ten-year old estate. They were still not really settled and had little sense of community. "There is a tremendous loneliness, a general inability, because of the set-up of the place, to meet other people. They have a desire to get friendly, with more people, but it doesn't work."

In one parish the priest thought that one in five of the Catholics practised, which meant 2,000 out of the total population of 40,000 went to Church for Easter Communion.

Another five worked in suburban parishes that could be described as wholly or partly middle class. "The people are basically middle class" said one, "and they look forward to a visit, and are very welcoming. They are fairly settled, mostly English, with quite a number of converts. Among the young people a lot attend Mass and have some sort of faith."

One priest said he visited six different schools, and was chaplain to the fourth year in a Comprehensive. Of the latter he said: "If they continue to go to Church, it is mainly because they don't want to offend their parents. The two top streams think with a slightly more adult mentality - they think more in terms of Christianity as a practical philosophy of life. Teachers are unwilling to teach religion because they are so much at sea. They want to go back to a stock syllabus."

This priest said his parish was divided into two halves. The half he visited had middle class people. A fair number were Irish; some were elderly. They were not professional people but mostly in small business, not unduly pushed by pressures. Of these between a third and a quarter practised; just under 1,000 attended Mass in the parish. Other Christian congregations did not have more than 100.

Two priests mentioned the effect of different social classes living near each other. In one parish there was a working class estate, in the middle of a prosperous middle
class area, with commuters, professional and business people. On the estate the people were non-practising. The priest thought the place itself had an enclosing effect. It was "a cosmos of its own, of a pretty hideous nature". He said the middle class were happy, so far as they could be in the rat race.

The other said the working class members of his youth club felt they were not wanted. He admitted he got on better with the middle class. The young people were aware of a need to grow. They were being channelled more and more. They were narrow-minded, politically; though some took their rôle in society seriously a number had no interest in it.

Three priests were in parishes outside London. One said he was in the commuter belt; he too found it hard to contact working class people. His Family Circles were almost entirely middle class. He had a group of nurses, half of them Catholics. Many nurses suffered from loneliness and homesickness.

In a country parish the priest met mostly working class people, including a number of immigrants from Europe. In a seaside parish where most people were retired, there was a council estate which was "a community within the community". The old people had "cheerful resignation and hope, despite the rising cost of living". Teenagers tended to leave home to find work. This priest found young people discouraging to work with, but most of the people in the district were kind and welcoming to him as a priest. "They feel at home; they are not strangers in a foreign land."

Two priests were University chaplains, and two were students. One chaplain spoke of the range of commitment among his Catholics. In the University there was more concern for the Gospel than for the Church. One student priest said the religious knowledge of his fellow Catholic students was childish. They suffered from loneliness. The other spoke of Anglican students who were trying to be good without knowing why.
I asked a series of questions relating to the ministry of priests and an alienated society.

1. **How do you think your ministry affects the dignity and self-respect of the mass of people you serve?**

Several thought there was some danger of the priest reducing the dignity of people. Six did not think their ministry affected it either way. "Priests are to do with the religious part of life; they don't come into an appreciation of their social awareness and self-importance, except: 'God loves me'. I would like to think my ministry would help people to a greater self-esteem; it may do, at a personal level, where people are personal friends."

One said he did not think that being a Catholic or being a Christian had anything to do with self-respect and dignity. "For the pious and devout you almost expect to be treated like dirt. To me personally it is always unconvincing - the dignity of man and the dignity of work."

But another said that presumably any Christian life does affect it. Another said his ministry consisted of falling in love on a vast scale with the poor and the wretched. One said: "To think each person important, created for a special role in life, pinpoints the whole life of the priest. But it doesn't impinge at all on the mass of people, who are in a state of half-consciousness."

2. **How do you think it helps to give a meaning to their lives?**

One said he would like to think that a priest stands for a belief that life has a meaning, despite all the signs. Yet it was part of the priest's own crisis that he was taken to stand for something clear which in his own life could be false.

One priest said it was very rarely that he ever talked to anyone about meaning except in terms of what he was, what he stood for. Another said that when priests visited,
the people were reminded that they were important to God. God cares. As another put it, in this business of relating to God, sometimes it can't be done without relating to me. If I were irrelevant to them, the Church would become so.

3. How do you think it helps to develop adult consciences?

One said that something or someone seemed to have been doing just the opposite. Another complained that people have their consciences formed one way or another by the time they reach adulthood. Opportunities to change conscience were very limited except in confession. One said people just want the priest to answer questions. "They don't want their own consciences. The priest is a slot machine." Another thought a lot of Catholics have child-like consciences, and may have no conscience. But one priest said he used the confessional as he had been trained to do, to cut out the washing-machine approach and cultivate a personal one instead.

In the University, one of the chaplains said, there was more hope of leading people to decisions, to seeing the problems within their faith, within Christ - without necessarily giving them any clear answer. "I am more and more finding myself giving less answers, and helping to explore a line of approach. But even younger people find this bewildering, and the processes are painful. They are not used to so much responsibility." He added that he himself found himself moving away from norms that used to be very clear. "I suppose I have moved forward to a situational ethic, getting people to see decisions they make as involving responsibility in a community larger than themselves."

Another priest, who described his people as very materialistic, said he tried to form their consciences through sermons, but he thought that only time would allow the opportunities for people to open up and discuss things formally. This could be done in house groups, where they could explore what it means to be a Christian.
4. How do you think it helps to lead them to complete self-fulfilment?

One priest saw this question in terms of "man fully alive". He said he would like to think his preaching led people to a fuller life, but he did not know how effective it was. Too many Catholic students were timid, and their anxiety and timidity were partly due to the anxious upbringing they had had. Too few people around were alive, full of life.

Another commented that the flats caused "a terrible breakdown. There is no common bond of feeling; people live in a rabbit warren. The women never talk to each other, because their husbands don't let them. Wives are virtually slaves." He was working to build up the YCW to have an effect in producing some people to break out of the pattern. "From an early age these people are bound up with sex, with boy friends and girl friends. And once that happens you have virtually lost them, as they are in the grip of emotions and self-interest."

One priest said the people he met were estranged, and wanted no longer to be estranged. If one were successful in one's priesthood, in communicating oneself as another Christ, they became less estranged. But another said: "Our time is taken up almost exclusively catering for our own people". He wondered if we were forming other apostles, and said: "We are not even scratching the surface."

Another said he tried to help people by getting them to discover the depths of themselves. One said: "I am not interested in making them Christians, but in getting them to reflect; not to take the surface clichés for granted; to penetrate the thick wall of the mass media; to give them a sense that life is depth."

One said: "My every word I utter is to lead people to a deeper participation in the Mass and the sacraments; to lead them to God as much as possible. But as a curate I find my greatest obstacle is trying to sit down to discuss all this with priests."
And one said: "The question presupposes a fair degree of self-fulfilment in oneself. Until one has found it and is convinced of it, it is not possible to communicate it to others."

5. **How do you think it helps to build up a community?**

One priest wondered what a genuine community is. "It is not necessarily something people do when they are together, but a unifying frame of reference, not necessarily intellectual, where their link with each other is something above their link as human beings. My ministry is not a question of forming a community already there, but of establishing relationships on a different scale."

Another observed: "We have no genuine community. The question facing priests is, How do you build it? You wander round, virtually the only bloke who has a relationship with so many different people. They have relationships with small groups, but there is hardly anyone to whom so many people can relate. Just knowing people is the first stage of the effort. It really means trying to draw people together in some way. Groups try to draw them, but most are virtually untouched.

Another said: "We have group activities in the parish to try to give people friends. It is something more than being isolated. They need people to trust, people they can talk to, and rely on. But as for building a real community in the area, you get nowhere. It is a process of realising more and more how distinct groups are, class-wise."

One said community building cannot be done unless you can create wheels within wheels, cells within a larger organisation. "Breaking a parish down into street groups is part of the answer. We have to recharge the groups we already have."

For one, "The Catholic community is obviously centred on the Eucharist". Another said: "Good liturgy will bring this, but people are not involved in it yet. It is still the priest up there doing something". 
Another said that as soon as people participate in the activities of the parish and of the liturgy they stop feeling that there are just a few 'holy ones'.

And one priest said: "What people want is a charismatic leader, a new Moses. This not a rôles I want to fill myself. There is not much sense of community, but the people are not lonely or isolated. They are too busy for that. They want things to be laid on, to make them part of the community - when they want to be part of it. The rest of the time they want to be on their own."

6. What tensions are you conscious of in the lives of priests?

One man was aware of tensions arising from the way authority is exercised in the Church, particularly of tensions arising from the way leaders fail to see priest's problems; another spoke of priests who had no responsibility and could not fulfil themselves. Some priests were so dead that they could be described as inward drop-outs.

Another priest said the lack of proper leadership was tremendously important for young priests; basically the tension was caused by the Bishop, because there was no diocesan strategy and no concerted policy at deanery level. Parish priests were autonomous, little tin gods. Priests lived in isolation, internal and external, from priests around them. There was a lack of group thinking, so that one became highly individualistic in approach. It was not taken into account that priests were human beings, persons, with all that went with that, human dignity. He said: "We are very much numbers. Any potential an individual may have is not realised. Square pegs into round holes. Priests are befogged by spiritual tensions, and the lack of a clear rôle in an ever-changing society. Celibacy does bother a lot of priests. Not lack of a sexual outlet but lack of companionship, which is not supplied by deep relationships with other people." One priest was so lonely that he got a canary.

Another priest said loneliness was the general experience of all priests he had come across. It revolved
around relationship problems. He thought there were too many jobs to be done for a priest to be able to do any one job well, though he did not get a sense that priests were wasting their time. Church going was relatively good and they had a sense of work. But another priest complained of "the identity thing" - an unsureness about one's mission. There was a tension between the tremendous number of contacts one had, and loneliness, which came either from living by oneself, or from living with someone who was not particularly compatible. As another one put it, there is a tremendous tension between the old school of priests and the younger ones. There is a lack of team work. Priests are very alienated from one another. It is a forced marriage, and he said that if only priests with the same ideas could get together - what a tremendous amount they could do. And he added: "Many priests do not want to get involved in anything new. Celibacy is a source of strain only if you are in a quandary about it. Nobody accepts it completely, but it is not a major source of tension. Older priests are a source of tension, especially if they are apathetic or pessimistic."

Another also said "that 'priests wanting to be married' was only a symptom of a deeper tension, and it seemed often to be an escape." And one said that a lot of priests were going through difficult times; there was not one with a clear settled view of anything. "The trouble with celibacy is that non-celibates are priests - people who should be enriched by marriage. Priests suffer from isolation and loneliness. This can happen when you cannot share your vision with anybody or be sustained and helped; when there is no team. There is a general depression at the tawdriness of existence. A number of priests have just gone away. It is such a vast field, you have the feeling you are doing nothing properly."

Another said he saw symptoms of tension associated with celibacy, like drinking. Priests were lonely but did not admit it. Another said that when priests come together it is an artificial, superficial gathering. "We are all
too ready just to sneak off in our own sweet little ways. Many have given up without going off."

One priest spoke with strong feeling of others, whom celibacy had turned into crabbed bachelors. But another said that real tensions do not come from the priesthood at all, but from the fact that priests are living in the middle of the world, and making decisions on which they believed the souls of their parishioners depended. "The basic tension for all priests is caused by the apparent absence of God in modern society, and reaction to this in different ways. If priests were happy in their priesthood celibacy will sort itself out."

Another one also talked about the crisis of faith which he said was very widespread, among all ranks, young and old. "Something has gone wrong somewhere. Many hide this crisis by a life of feverish activity, so that they do not have to reflect. Only those who are complete cabbages are not affected."

Some did not admit to any personal tensions. "Loneliness is no problem for me" said one. "I feel idle if I am not doing something. Something in my personal make-up makes me restless." "There cannot be enough hours in the day" said another, "and I have no identity crisis, though I know one priest who does have one". And a third one said he was not conscious of many tensions, apart from ordinary fatigue, and some opposition from lay people to his preaching. And, he continued, with considerable warmth, to announce that "My generation have called the bluff of the parish priests, and we have the law in our favour. The junior clergy are not getting on with the job, or being allowed to, but this will not last. Priests round here are tied up with desperate financial problems, which have kept them ten years behind Vatican II; they don't really understand — but no one can blame them for that...."

Finally, two priests spoke of a tension they experienced in the actual possession of the priesthood. The first experienced it "living the priest first-hand and living it
second-hand. I happen to be this sort of person, and given all that I am, I am a priest. It is very much part of me. But then sometimes I act the part of Father X. I don't want to be a 'normal priest'. One of the tensions is living as a priest as I should like to be, rather than as one is expected to be. A lot of priests do not have tension, because they fail to face the fact that they are not living as proper people."

The other said there was a tension between the 'sacred' ministry, and the welfare-work ministry. "There is a sense of irrelevance; at root my ministry is not irrelevant, but it gives me a different approach to life. The mass of people are on a different wave-length to committed Christians. It is not in my nature not to be part of a crowd. The system of the parochial ministry is not designed to be of use to the people. We ought to be considering how to improve it, even if we can't. Nothing in the parish is organised, except the provision of the sacraments and financial administration. Celibacy is a secondary problem, though it does take on an importance in the lives of priests. It is the problem of identity and of the meaning of the priesthood that is upsetting them."

Though several of the priests claimed to be working in a team ministry, with the parish priest, or with other priests working in schools as chaplains, or with lay people, only one of the twenty was part of a formal team ministry. He thought that his team needed to make a regular review of life together, to help them to be more critical together. The two university chaplains, and a priest working in local radio, said they formed part of ecumenical teams.

**FUNCTION AND ROLE OF THE PRIEST**

A good part of the interview was given to a series of questions in which the priests were asked what they thought was their main function as a priest, what part of their work they felt they were neglecting, what their understanding of the priesthood had been when they first went to a seminary, and at their ordination, and how they
had been influenced in that understanding by various people.

While a number of the priests said that the main function of a priest is to say Mass and administer the sacraments, from which all else follows, others were not too sure. One said the main function was to be a sign of Christ around, caring and understanding and sometimes teaching, and being a unifying person for Christians, someone for them to relate to. One priest chewed his collar thoughtfully before he replied that the main function was to be a man of Spirit, filled with prayer, whose job is to wake others up to the work of the Spirit in them. And one priest quoted Rahner, in saying that for him the main function of the priest was to be a preacher, as an ordained minister of the Church.

Most of them said they should visit more, and three said they should pray more. The people expected priests to be human or approachable, someone who cares for them. They wanted a personal relationship with the priest as a source of contact, to bring others to them. But one said that people want the priest to do everything for them. And another said that if he read out The News of the World on Sunday morning people would still say "Thanks be to God".

Parish priests had been both a positive and a negative influence. For one priest they had shown him all the things he did not think the priest was - a narrow vision, old-fashioned, conservative in outlook, threatened by young people, and by ideas now current. But three parish priests especially received high praise, as did priests who worked full time for the YCW. One of these was commended for his humanity and simplicity and "lack of clerical bombasticism".

One recently ordained priest said his Bishop had affected him personally, and also his understanding of the priesthood, by leading him to have a sense of care for the people rather than a sense of duty towards them. This Bishop cared for his priests. But other Bishops were criticized for not knowing their priests, and one priest said: "What Bishop?"
Though only four of the twenty mentioned their parents among lay people who had influenced them, others said they had learnt a great deal from laity since their ordination, and several said that lay people had deepened their faith. Non-Catholics had not had a very pronounced positive influence.

Reading did not appear to play a big part in their role understanding; six said they read very little. Nor were they much influenced by films and TV except in understanding human relationships better.

When several of the priests entered the seminary - three at the age of 14 - their (recollected) idea of the priesthood was one of awe, with the priest seen as a man set apart. This still held for some of them at the time of their ordination. A number of them had experienced disturbed days in the seminary and were ordained in a state of some perplexity. Some said their ideas had opened up a good deal in the seminary, and they had come to see the priesthood more in terms of service, an opportunity to be in contact with large numbers of people. One said he had gained a good deal from the time he spent as a deacon working in a parish, "after all the junk" he had heard in the seminary about the priesthood being irrelevant. One priest confessed that he had left the seminary as what he called "a purely secular man", but he no longer held the advanced views he had been ordained with.

One priest who came from Africa and studied in Rome said he had come to see his priesthood in the perspective of commitment, and of the new ideas current when he was ordained - of total service to the whole of the local community. One big influence on him and his friends had been a young Italian priest who stressed that dogma is the science of our times, a call to the Church to reformulate the Christian message in language understandable by the people, and related to their needs.
One priest said that for two years there had been an honest open-minded look at the seminary. This, and the community he had then experienced, had had a tremendous positive and practical bearing on him - an assessment of freedom, and an attempt to accept sincerely in faith the inevitable chaos that he suspected had caused panic and reaction. He said the priesthood might be irrelevant to the Christian community, but it did play a rôle at present. There was a need for full time men, but not for clergy.

One said the whole idea of the priesthood was going through such a self-examination that he found it hard to say how things should be changed in the seminary. The seminary should be open-ended. Priests were very inadequate at relating to people at a deeply personal level; the students became dehumanized since the priests who ran the seminary had themselves been trained by priests. The African thought his training had been inadequate. An Irishman thought his had been lamentable.

Others mentioned various gaps in their intellectual and spiritual formation in the seminary, but for all of them it had been admittedly a time of change after Vatican II. One said most of what he had learnt had been irrelevant, because the priest today must be a leader of people, capable of taking the initiative himself, but competently. The old system was for training obedient priests to keep the system going. He would like to see a more practical training, such as nurses were given. One Roman said that by the time he had left there were no rules or regulations - and it was essential that there should not be. When the meditation rule went, people began to pray because they were interested, not because they had to.
"What tensions are you conscious of, in the lives of priests?" That was question 29, in an interview I have been carrying out with a number of priests ordained within the last five years, and working in South East England. The previous five questions were all based on an assumption: that the mass of people in our society are alienated. The five questions rested on the five categories of alienation suggested by Melvin Seeman. Some American sociologists, such as the Whittier College Group, think that his five different aspects of alienation, namely, powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement, and isolation, form a process culminating in the last named situation. Isolation is the end-product of what modern society is doing to modern man. Man finds he cannot relate with others, cannot establish anything more than superficial relationships, cannot build a human community. In Durkheim's words, society has become no more than a dust of individuals.

All this is only theory. The very word 'alienation' is only a concept, not a 'fact'. But it sums up what many thinkers have seen in our society, and this five-fold classification is a useful tool of analysis. My very small study of young priests in no way claims to prove anything. But like the verbal tools it employs, it does make a start in looking at contemporary problems, in the Church and in society.

My interviewees were not very forthcoming in response to the five questions about their people's supposed alienation, and the bearing upon it of their own priestly ministry. As several of them said, "I'll have to think about those questions more." But what did impress me were the answers they gave to question 29. I decided to circulate the first ten answers I received to a number of my acquaintances, and to some assorted social scientists, and in this paper I have tried to weave together their comments
with my own reflections. I should like to reproduce these ten answers again, adding after each what category of alienation I think I can discern in it, and underlining key points. The answers are given in the order in which I received them, so any apparent flow of ideas from one to another is fortuitous.

THE TEN ANSWERS

1. The basic tension for all priests is caused by the apparent absence of God in modern society. It leads to crisis of faith. If priests were happy in their priesthood, celibacy would sort itself out.
   (Meaninglessness, self-estrangement)

2. The celibacy issue is one of many. There is definitely a terrible crisis of faith. Very few are not affected - only those who are complete cabbages.
   (Meaninglessness, self-estrangement)

3. It is a problem of authority - not taking into account the fact that priests are real human beings, with all that goes with it - human dignity. Celibacy bothers a lot of priests; not lack of a sexual outlet, but companionship, which is not supplied by deep relationship with other people. I got a canary, because of loneliness. But "put not your trust in canaries". (Powerlessness, isolation)

4. Priests who have not been given responsibility have the problem of not being able to fulfill themselves, because of authority's attitude. Tension comes from one's fellow priests, not from the work itself. There is lack of community within the Presbytery. I am worried about the older priests who can be so dead - inward drop-outs.
   (Powerlessness, self-estrangement, isolation)

5. Tensions come from not knowing what to do next - not on a day to day level, but what we should be doing. Celibacy is a source of strain only if you are in a quandary about it. Nobody accepts it completely, but it is not a major source of tension. Older priests are a source of
tension in some cases, especially if they are apathetic or pessimistic. (Normlessness, self-estrangement)

6. A lot of priests are going through difficult times. There is not one with a clear settled view of everything. The trouble with celibacy is that non-celibates are priests; people who should be enriched by marriage. Priests suffer from isolation and loneliness; but this can be an apostolic loneliness, when you cannot share your vision with anybody, and you are not sustained or helped, when there is no team. Tension comes from emotional involvement through the pressure of the work itself. It is such a vast field that you feel that you are doing nothing properly.

(Normlessness, self-estrangement, isolation)

7. I see symptoms of tension, as when priests drink, because they lack a woman. In most places you say, "Thank goodness I am not here" — because of the housekeeper problem. I would not like to get attached to them. Priests are lonely, but would not admit it.

(Self-estrangement, isolation)

8. There is tremendous tension between the old school of priests and the younger ones with a completely different attitude. There is lack of teamwork, lack of another priest one can really talk to about what one is doing, and who will be interested in it. Priests are very alienated from one another — it is a forced marriage. If only a group of priests with the same ideas could get together, what a tremendous amount they could do.

(Normlessness, isolation)

9. Tensions come just from personal relationships with other priests with whom they live. I never thought in the Seminary that I could get to the position of saying things, almost hating another priest. Celibacy is a very challenging thing, part of the struggle of the priesthood, which will be there until you die. It is a contributory factor to becoming less of a man, forgetting manners and gentlemanly touches, turning priests into crabbed bachelors.

(Powerlessness, self-estrangement, isolation)
10. When priests come together, it is an artificial, superficial gathering. We don't see the real me or the real you, because of the barriers present. Many have given up without going off. (Self-estrangement, isolation)

REFLECTIONS

The language used by these young priests may seem to be predictable and stereotyped. It contains the clichés of the day. Words in themselves are only one clue to underlying attitudes and attitude-changes. It has been suggested that priests are more inarticulate about themselves than most of us, partly because we need interaction with the opposite sex for self-discovery.

Dr. Susanne Bano, who lectures on communications, has suggested to me that the alleged crisis of faith could well be explained in terms of a communications breakdown - poor feedback. All forms of communication suffer if we are under stress. We need to communicate not only with others, but also with ourselves and with God. If we are undergoing stress we cannot easily communicate with ourselves or with God, so we think we have a crisis of faith. She adds that in her opinion all these tensions described by young priests are simply part of the overall stress pattern of our times, and in fact married people suffer from them far more than celibates.

Bearing all this in mind, I am still inclined to think that these ten answers are reporting alienation among priests that is peculiar to them, and I have arranged my reflections along the five-fold classification already mentioned.

POWERLESSNESS

When Marx wrote about alienation as powerlessness, he was thinking of the factory worker who is rendered unmensch by the wage system - he is unmanned, emasculated. Celibates may agree to be eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, but they still smart if not accorded
basic human respect, to say nothing of the dignity of the priesthood they have heard so much about in the past. The feeling of unimportance came out in other answers in my interview, which referred to the lack of contact with bishops.

A psychiatrist gave it as her opinion that lack of independence and of responsibility are the two main problems now facing the clergy. Celibacy may seem to be a problem, but it is only one among many, a focus perhaps for other discontents. Though priests often have a great deal of freedom in the way they set about their daily ministry, they remain dependent on the Bishop and the parish priest in a way that is surprising to those outside their ranks, and they may not be given real responsibility until an age when their contemporaries are becoming grandfathers. (2)

MEANINGLESSNESS

The crisis of faith may be no more than a breakdown of communications, but it came as a surprise to the lady psychiatrist just mentioned. In her view, what is causing tension is a crisis not so much of faith as of acceptance of the priesthood by priests. Another explanation came from a priest entering into his middle years, who thinks the crisis of faith is indeed something to be reckoned with. "I should not attribute it myself to the 'apparent absence of God in modern society' but to the Church's loss of credibility since the Council".

Max Weber saw meaninglessness as something that follows on from the increasing secularization of society, the disappearance of traditional religious beliefs. It is perhaps those priests who have tended most to express their faith in unchanging and very traditional terms who now feel a sense of meaninglessness in their lives, or who think they see it all around them. Those who happily adapt a 'this-world' theology, and who seek to follow the Vatican Council's injunction to 'read the signs of the times' may be less alienated in this particular way.
NORMLESSNESS

Normlessness, Emile Durkheim's 'anomie', is found in those who are lost in the face of vast problems. They are looking for teams in which they can work out new forms for the priesthood in a changing world. They feel the role of the priest they have learned is no longer appropriate, either to the work to be done, or to their own changing identities. Such role-strain is again likely to be felt by less adaptable priests, particularly by men in their late thirties and forties who may be encountering delayed maturation problems.

SELF-ESTRANGEMENT

Eight of the ten answers suggest this as something younger priests detect in their elders. They think they can see "non-celibates who are priests", "inward drop-outs", "crabbed bachelors". One older priest himself wrote to say that he can see a crisis of morals among priests, not of faith. "Priests are obsessed by guilt, and by a deep sense of failure".

The parish priest quoted already made this comment on "the many who have given up without going on": "This is a terrifying diagnosis, because so recognizably true". He attributes this to compulsory celibacy. And he adds, "another contributory factor is the growing sense of failure which the apostolate carries with it. It is one thing as a student or young priest to accept once for all the prospect of apparent failure; in a sense, Christ himself was a failure, preaching to people who refused to listen, dying at the hands of his enemies. But it is not easy to live with a seemingly endless sense of failure that deepens from year to year".

In answering an earlier question, one of the young priests admitted "I've never really felt a vocation to celibacy, but have accepted it as something that's gone with the job". A hospital Sister made this comment on the ten answers: speaking of priests she has known: "Celibacy
was no problem to begin with; they had learnt in many ways to avoid temptation, and women are a 'source of temptation'. They begin to question the attitudes some priests have to women. Often they go out of their way to make friends with women, just to prove they are human beings with feelings, and not all out to seduce them. A few have affairs that last a short time, and no harm is done; they may part with mutual consent. A few lead a double life. They can destroy so many young priests who become aware of this situation, and also destroy the female, whom they use at will for sexual satisfaction without any true feeling or concern for her."

A parish priest commented that he knew many priests who are perfectly chaste, but who are self-estranged because their creativeness had been killed by their housekeepers. Dr. Dominian has written recently of how many are leaving the Religious life with the feeling that the individual's integrity, seen in terms of growth and realisation, is threatened vitally. "Sometimes this can be clearly put into words, sometimes it leads to an inexplicable tension and frustration which expresses itself in symptoms of depression, anxiety, restlessness, and acute unhappiness."

Perhaps such symptoms are present in answer 7.

Dr. Dominian went on to say: "The ability to form intimate bonds of one to one relationships we are taught in childhood. Their extension into adult life is a mark of human integrity. Such relationships provide the source of personal reassurance, growth in confidence, deepening awareness of oneself, and the means of expressing tokens of affection and love which are essential to human integrity. From these one to one relationships, there emerges the strength to care and to love others."

In some of the other answers I received from the young priests it was evident that they were searching for such personal relationships. Their criticisms of their elders implied that they thought some of them had failed to find such self-fulfilment.
ISOLATION

One lady thought the canary was a symptom of tragic loneliness. Another thinks that more people are turned away from the laity by celibacy than are released by it. She called it twisted celibacy.

The lady psychiatrist said she was surprised murder had never been committed within a presbytery. She thinks two priests should never be put together in one, and the priest's home should be kept separate from his work-place. The sister already quoted spoke of cold unfriendly presbyteries, where the parish priest treats the curate as a schoolboy and of one place where "the housekeeper came first, the cat second, and the curate last.

An elderly parish priest, who has tried to create a warm atmosphere, still has this to say: "Loving an elderly priest will compare very unfavourably with the love of a young woman, and the Common room of the presbytery even the Colour T.V., very unfavourably with the bright conversation of a pleasant family with young people of both sexes. A man must not think himself odd for preferring one to the other. But will he make the effort which Christian love demands? It is truly said: charity begins in the presbytery."

It may seem strange that priests of all people cannot relate, cannot form communities. Their inability may be a personal psychological problem attributable to his early socialisation. Or it may be seen as the end product of a whole process of alienation within society, in which he shares. If loneliness is not just one rather widespread social problem, but the crucial feature of our disintegrating society, it is not surprising that priests should experience this malaise.

EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE FOR CELIBATES

Celibacy is not chastity. Priests, like anyone else, need to keep an eye on the latter virtue, especially if they are inclined to adopt what the Americans call the Third Way. Celibacy has its own demands.
Bishops wear rings. Whether this is a sign of medieval pomp, or to symbolise marriage to their diocese I am uncertain, but Bishop and priest alike, married or celibate, do represent Christ as the Head of his Church, and I do not think it is stretching metaphors too far to see them also sharing in Christ's love for his Bride. Whether as bridegroom or as father, the priest has some close bond with his people, and if he is a celibate, his state of life does more than simply release him for his ministry. It symbolises, proclaims it, expresses it. The marriage of a married priest would do the same, but in another way.

If a married man examines his conscience, he should surely ask himself how much he loves his wife and his children. And so should the celibate ask himself how much he loves and cares for his people, how much he visits them, how much he troubles to express his affection.

If he is to fulfil his duty of loving his people, the celibate has a duty to keep on growing as a human being, and not to become alienated from them. The first place to establish relationships that will help to grow and to find self-fulfilment are in his home, with his family, and in the presbytery, with other priests, and with the housekeeper.

A celibate needs to examine his conscience about such deep personal relationships, not in a spirit of fear of the consequences, but with concern that the absence of such relationships may have unmanned him. Relationships with any other human being can go all the way from superficial to total. If the priest represents Christ, he represents total self-giving, total relationship. We all tend to make use of others for the satisfaction of our needs. We need food, and sexual fulfilment, and companionship—tea and sympathy. Through these needs we are drawn close to others. But Christ calls us to a closer relationship, which transcends these basic human demands. Just as human beings, but still more as Christians, and especially as celibates, we must try to relate with the real 'you', the person behind the persona, the actor playing the part.
A celibate has the potential to establish deep relationships with men and with women, in a way that is easier for him than for others. Some priests are good with women, because they are aware of their own and of the woman's sexual identity, and take pleasure in it. Others remain miserable and ill at ease. In the past much of this emotional immaturity has been attributed to a shoddy approach to celibacy in the seminaries. It is interesting to note that in one seminary celibacy has suddenly begun to make more sense for the students, because of the pastoral courses, when they stay with Catholic families. There they have found the great regard of the people of God for the man who will represent God for them; the man they look to for a living witness to God's affectionate care for everyone; the man at home in every home.

CONCLUSION

Is alienation a 'bad thing'? Not necessarily. In his book, Mirrors and Masks, Anselm Strauss has written: "Certain alienated persons eventually discover that others are facing similar problems and experiences, and the new terminologies arising out of these discoveries are shared products. These take the form of new philosophies, new interpretations of the world, of situations, persons, and acts. Such radical transvaluation is equivalent to new vision, a re-seeing of the meanings and ends of human life."

If priests are alienated, they should get together, and help their people get together, to tackle the problem at its source. If celibacy is to become a positive gift for the whole Church, and not an embittering impediment to growth, we need to look back along the whole process of alienation. We must start with priests learning to treat all men with respect, and especially their brother celibates. We must go on to deal with Meaninglessness, through a sharing of prophetic insight into the meaning of faith and the meaning of the Modern World, in which we find the signs of the times that contain God's will. To deal with 'Anomie' we must form fully adult consciences,
beginning with our own. To overcome Self-Estrangement, we need a Passover by which ordinary weak and inadequate human beings can share the alienation of Christ in order to share His Completeness. And finally, when all these things are done, we can begin to get at the roots of Isolation, and begin to create a true Christian community, in which celibacy and marriage will cheerfully co-exist and complement each other.

Canaries are really not enough.

FOOTNOTES

(2) Cf. the study by Father A. Greeley of American Clergy made this year.
(3) Professor E.F. O'Doherty has developed this point in his lectures on Vocation. But he writes to comment on my paper that Celibacy is meaningful only in the light of faith. "My personal opinion is that the empirical human sciences do not illumine it very much."
(4) "Integrity and the Person" in ADOREMUS July, 1971.

"Men see through the alleged motives - sociological, psychological, and mythological - for celibacy, and recognise the irrelevance to true Christian renunciation. Today the Christian who renounces marriage and children for the Kingdom's sake seeks no abstract nor concrete reason for his decision. His choice is pure risk in faith, the result of the intimate and mysterious experience of his heart. He chooses to live now the absolute poverty every Christian hopes to experience at the hour of his death. His life does not prove God's transcendence; rather; his whole being expresses faith in it. His decision to renounce his spouse is as intimate and incommunicable as another's decision to prefer his spouse above all others."
Eric Fromm is quoted by Illich as saying that when we speak of man we speak of him not as a thing but as a process: we speak of potential, of developing all his powers; those for greater intensity of being, greater harmony, greater love, greater awareness.

Phil. ii, 7. Lutter translates kenosis as Entfremdung — alienation.

ROBERT BOGAN
Cambridge, November, 1971

APPENDIX X

Is Christianity just ending, or just beginning? In his book Theology of the World, J.B. Metz plumps for the latter. Perhaps what is ending is 'religion', meaning something which leads us to opt out of this world, as we know it. The true religion of the Word made flesh, began many centuries ago, long before the Incarnation. But can it begin to be really effective until man is really man? And man is really man when every single man is able to become a complete human being. The past history of the human race has seen man struggling to become truly man. In the past, man was dehumanised, by slavery, by poverty, by tyranny, and also by many forms of 'religion', based on fear of the unknown. Such religion often tied man to an acceptance of injustice and misery.

Man today is still dehumanised, and often by many of the factors mentioned. But modern man is dehumanised in a modern way, by technocracy, be it Western Capitalist or Eastern Marxist, or just plain chaotic. Modern man is more thoroughly alienated from complete humanity than any of his ancestors.
Yet alienation is not the whole of the human picture. Christians must be optimists, living by hope. They must see man's struggles to be free, to be his true self, creative, intelligent and cultured. There is hope that such a liberation is on its way for every nation, and every man, and every woman. And the Christian hope has substance: Christ is alive, the Complete New Man, offering complete fulfilment to every unmanned man. And when that hope is fulfilled, we can say that Christianity has at last begun. Perhaps it will have to await Christ's Second Coming. Hope tells us to believe it can come sooner.

Has the Church Failed?

A book appeared last year by an American priest, Richard P. McBrien entitled *Do we need the Church?* (Collins, 28/-). This is a question many young Christians and ex-Christians are constantly asking. Recently there seems to have been a shift of mood among the questioning young. Instead of drifting out of the Church, or diving headlong from it, as many continue to do, a growing number of them are ready to stay within it. But they are questioning a great deal of the institutional side of the Church, as well as a great deal of her accepted teaching, as it has been presented to them. Like J.B. Metz, they are after a new Church.

Did Vatican II come too late for this new generation? Or has the Church simply failed to promulgate its decisions adequately? Perhaps she is now far too preoccupied with constructing new structures and not sufficiently aware of the underlying malady afflicting her.

Father McBrien says we do need the Church all right—but only if we go through a complete revolution in the way we think about her. "The Church cannot be conceived as a giant umbrella, under which a segment of mankind huddles, to avoid the drenching of the sinful world. Membership in the Church confers a responsibility and a mission". (p.172).
Another book to appear recently was Leslie Dewart's *The Foundations of Belief*. He has a section entitled 'The Style of the Church'. The new style, brought in by Pope John and the Council, was marked, he tells us, by "more commitment and less devotion, more spirit and less superstition, more autonomy and less authority, more society and less herd, more concern and less worry, more spontaneity and less guilt, more creativity and less rote (as in "learning by rote")! more joy and less fear, more humour and less pomposity, more thought and less talk." But like Father McBrien, he does not think the Council went nearly far enough.

"I discard the possibility that the institutional Church will altogether disappear. Like every other socio-historical, cultural reality, man's faith - however "supernatural" - must be embodied in institutions; and if no institutions exist to give cultural forms to human experience, or if institutions decay or disappear, new institutions are created by him who might very well be described as an institutional animal, man. Indeed, the institutional Church is likely to be stronger, more cohesive (but also more spiritual, less inflexibly structured), in the near future than at any previous time." (Dewart, pp. 484, 485).

Dewart does think, however, that many of our ecclesial institutions will become so irrelevant to the life of the Church that reform will not be needed. And here is his punch-line: "Of all the traditionally ecclesial institutions the one who marginalisation is most devoutly to be hoped for is that of the clergy". By clergy he does not mean the priesthood or the hierarchy, but "a sociological and juridical reality embodied in manners, mores, attitudes and other formal and informal institutions which make up the clerical cultural complex, which has long constituted the sociological heart of the Catholic Church, and which, to a rapidly diminishing but still decisive degree, still does so today".

In England we lack the roaring anticlericalism of so many Catholic cultures. We tend to think of clergy and
priesthood as synonymous. Dewart still wants priests, ordained ministerial priests, but exercising their priesthood in a very different manner from what we are now accustomed to; not dominating the Church, but exercising their authority in a Christlike Servant way. And the Church they serve must become more and more a Church of the Laity, The People of God, fully participating in her missionary and liturgical life. "Like human culture as a whole, Christianity in the future may become more of do-it-yourself affair than at any previous time."

The Church's Modern Mission

The Church's basic mission has always been the same: to be the Sacrament of Christ for all mankind. If we want her to fulfill that mission today, unencumbered by obsolete institutions, what must we ask her to do? What must we make of her, if we agree with Dewart's 'Do-it-yourself'? 

A Sacrament is a sign, a communication. The Church has to communicate with modern alienated man. What sign is needed for all those millions of men and women who are nobodies, powerless in the face of a vastly complicated technological world? For all the millions who find their lives so meaningless? For all the human beings who are strangers to themselves, because of the inhuman work they must do, of the inhuman conditions they are forced to live in? For all the millions who have lost their way in the jungle of modern urban society, with its immensely rapid changes? For everyone who is isolated; who hunger in vain for the support of a human community, in a world that has become, in Durkheim's words, 'a dust of individuals'? 

The Church of the Word-made-flesh must respond with love to this manifold alienation of mankind; and the new style we are seeking must flow from that response. To men who are nobodies, powerless, lacking all dignity, the Church must fiercely proclaim that each and every human being is called by God, here and now, to the dignity of divine sonship, the dignity of sharing in the divine nature. What style of Church does that demand? It demands a Church that
herself respects all men. A Church that gives all her own members not only respect but an active share in her own inner life. How can the Church fight for man's dignity, if she does not believe in it herself? How can she fight for a radical change in human society, to ensure that respect, if she is not fighting for a radical change within herself?

One way that this can come about is the creation of numerous small groups of Christians, replacing the present unreal parish structures. Whether they are youth groups like the Y.C.W. or the Y.C.S. or house groups or family groups, or specialised groups, or ecumenical groups, they all provide that face-to-face community in which the Christian idea can take root and grow again and again. But they all need leadership; they all need formation.

Priests

Christ saw the need for leadership in the Church; he gave much of his time to the formation of the apostles. The function of leadership in the Church, as in any social group, has never been restricted to the official leaders, the hierarchy and the priests. But today there is a greater need than ever before for a widespread sharing of the work of leadership in the Church. The work of the full-time ministerial priests will be more necessary than ever, but it must consist more and more of calling and forming and encouraging a multitude of other leaders in all these new groups. And every member of the Church who is actively participating in her life will be a leader for the people around him in his street or in his work. By doing so, every Christian will be exercising his Baptismal priesthood. For priesthood exists to build a community, in which men can meet God. The priestly rôle is a leadership rôle, not only in the Eucharistic community, but throughout the whole of human society.

Prophets

How does the new-style Church we want to make, respond to the apparent meaninglessness of modern life? She does it by exercising her neglected prophetic rôle. Writers like
Gabriel Moran have reminded us that God still speaks. And He speaks not only through the Teaching Church, but to every man, by the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is the Church's task to study the Signs of the Times, to become so absorbed in the mind of Christ, through contemplative prayer and Scriptural meditation, that she can readily interpret events in the light of the Gospel. And this is a vital work for all mankind. In the new small groups of active Christians, Reviews of Life will show the members of the Church how God wants them to live. They will also help all men to understand and interpret our confusing universe.

As Michel Quoist points out in *The Christian Response*, the Review of Life, with its logical thought-processes of See-Judge-Act-Reflect-Act, based on concrete events in daily life, is not simply a group activity. "If you take the trouble to look back over your day in the light of your faith two or three times a week, or, better yet, each night, alone, or if you're married, together with your wife, you can rest assured that you will eventually attain to a mature Christian life." (p. 172). Movements such as Y.C.W. and F.S.A. specialise in helping their members to make Reviews of Life, and those who wish to learn more about this practice should contact them.

There is always a danger that Reviews of Life do not go deep enough, but simply skim over the surface. This is all right for beginners, but making Reviews of Life should become a way of life in itself. A mature Review of Life should give us a new vision of life, a new insight into apparently trivial or meaningless happenings. The "judgements" should develop far beyond the hasty and shallow reflections that most of us make. If a Review of Life is to be carried out properly, by an individual or by a team, there is a need for contemplation, for living constantly in the presence of God.

Does this rule out most people? Is not contemplation a very special call to a select few in the Church? By no means. Our Baptism calls us to it. For by Baptism we all
put on Christ, share his mind, his love, his vision. And
groups such as the Secular Fraternities of Charles de
Foucauld, now established among Liverpool dockers, and the
experience of countless Y.C.W. groups of ordinary working
boys and girls throughout the land, demonstrate that a
team approach to contemplation can be accomplished. And
so too can good Reviews of Life be carried through, even
in England, where we are supposed to be so illogical.

Passover

The new style of Church has already begun to exist,
hidden very often behind the older institutions. It is a
Church in which every member is a priest, and a prophet.
But changing the Church is not enough. The Church is here
to change mankind.

Every single man alive is capable of complete human
development. That is why he is alive, emerging every moment
from God's creative love. He is capable of going along with
Christ, in the journey we call the Passover. Christ died
for all men, as the Mass reminds us in the words of Conse-
cration. No matter how sinful or degraded or despised any-
one may be, like Mary Magdalene he is called to pass over
from sin to love, from death to life. Call it sanctity, or
sanity, or holiness, or wholeness, every one of us is called
by God to fullness of life, here and now.

We must not expect that every man will answer this
call by visible membership of the Church. In fact the Church
may well decrease in numbers very dramatically. But the
visible Church exists to be the Servant and the Sign of the
Kingdom of God on earth. The new style of Church must be
marked by a profound consciousness of this universal call
to new life. It is interesting to see how this is in fact
happening today, in groups such as the newly formed Young
Many of the members are not professed Christians at all,
but Moslems or Buddhists, or agnostics even. Yet they are
all glad to follow Christ on his journey. And this is true
of many young people today who will tell you they are not
Catholics or Protestants of any kind but quite simply Chris-
tians.
Adult Conscience

There is a danger in all this, as there always has been in the Church. Small groups of perfectionists have always splintered off from the main body of the Church; schism is still too easy a solution. What everyone must aim at is one Church, gathered around the risen Christ.

One great area of disagreement, which threatens to lead to schism, is the whole question of authority. For many traditionalists in the Church, much of the thinking quoted earlier in this article is simply evidence of Modernism and Protestantism within the Church. Yet the Church today must respond to men who reject not only her authority but all authority. For they have lost the long-established readiness to accept authority which kept our society together. No human group can continue to exist as an interacting body unless its members agree on a certain number of rules, or norms and values. But many men today are in a state of 'normlessness'. They have moved right away from the society they used to know into a strange world where no rules seem to apply. They have lost their compass through life.

The Church has always proclaimed that she teaches with God's authority, and that men must listen to her. Yet the way that authority has been understood and used has changed very much over time. St. Paul reacted to the religion of the Pharisees he knew so well. He preached Christianity as a Gospel of Freedom. From time to time members of the Church have called for complete freedom of conscience, and the whole Birth Control issue has raised this problem once again.

The problem is that for many members of the Church conscience is half-formed, childish, irresponsible. At least some of the blame for this can be put on the Church herself, for failing to develop adult consciences in her members, and even for suppressing conscience by exaggerated stress on her authority, as exercised by hierarchy and priests. Now conscience can be free only when it is genuinely human conscience; and to be genuinely human it implies that the individual has internalised the norms and values and guide-lines of the society to which he belongs. This
applies to membership of the Church as well. But one of the Church's great values is freedom. Her part in forming adult consciences is like a local authority building a road. The road is not meant for children to drive along. But it is meant for adults, who can use it quite freely, provided they observe the traffic laws which are made for the general good.

If men are to be really adult, they need to develop into maturity in an atmosphere of understanding, encouragement and love. What does this ask of the Church in practice? It means a great deal of rethinking in our educational policy, especially in the much neglected sphere of adult education. Gabriel Moran is convinced that education of parents is the only answer to the problem of Religious Education of children. Whatever happened to the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine every parish is meant to have, according to the Code of Canon Law? In the schools there is far too much stress on rigid and unreflecting authority, buttressed by appeals to obedience, and far too little real moral education of our children.

Once again we come back to small groups of thinking Christians as the answer. These groups, doing regular reviews of life, will help their members to discover for themselves - and within themselves - the implications of Christian freedom. Many Catholics will dislike such a notion. The old-style authoritarian Church was much easier to live with, far less demanding. And freedom has many enemies. People who live freedom in this complex modern world of the technocrats must expect to lose their freedom, and even their lives. Like Thomas More, they may find they haven't many friends at the end.

Community

A society which has lost all its established norms and not developed new ones, is no real society at all. Its members just cannot combine into a real community. That is why so many people are lonely today, and why so many, no
People now increasingly try, just cannot establish genuine relationships with other human beings. All too often they give up trying, keep budgies, and watch the telly box within their little housing box, cut off physically and mentally from the 'real world' without. When they do emerge, they form crowds, not communities.

Here the Church really does have something very concrete to offer, in the shape of Holy Communion. For Holy Communion is not simply a good Christian receiving the Body of Christ. It is Christ coming into every Christian who will have him. And the presence of Christ in the members of His Body, the Church, is Holy Communion. Holy Communion produces Holy Community. Complete Community. Or it should do. Why doesn't it?

If Holy Communion is still producing Unholy Isolation, it is very much the fault of the Minister. The priest's function is to preside over the Eucharistic Paschal Banquet, the Mass. And presiding means more than wearing vestments and saying the right words. It means bringing the Community into existence, keeping it in existence, deepening its existence. That is what the priest is for, and for precious little else.

The trouble is that we have very few priests, not nearly enough to go round all the little local and specialised groups we need. So we have to re-examine the idea of priesthood. Instead of talking about parish priests, we should talk about priest-parishes. Each little sub-parish, and the whole Christian community in a neighbourhood should be consciously exercising the priestly role. And this happens not only in the Eucharist, but throughout the whole work of creating and sustaining Holy Community. For Christians are called to bring Complete Community to alienated mankind, to the lonely, the misfits, the poor, the outcasts. Priests are not meant to be community workers trying to build up the Catholic community. They are meant to be leaders of a large-scale attack on the fundamental weaknesses of modern society, an attack in which the whole Eucharistic community gladly takes part.
The new-style Church will no longer consist of a chain of ghettos, of shut-in Christians huddled together for comfort in a wicked world. Instead it must consist of myriad leaven-groups, fomenting the love of Christ in all the world around them, being that love in every human situation. "Preach the Good News to all Creation". (Mk. 16, 16).

How on Earth can we do it?

Does all this imply that the Church must be reduced to a few group-minded enthusiasts, and stop being St. Peter's net for all the R.C. fish? How on earth does this kind of talk affect the great mass of Church members, even the great mass of priests? How is it to be translated effectively for the not very well educated people who make up the backbone of our congregations?

We were told to preach the Gospel to the poor. For this we were anointed. A strong and haunting sense of mission to the poorest is still missing from the Church in England. You meet it in France. You meet it in Mother Teresa of Calcutta, in the Little Brothers of Jesus. You certainly meet it in Cardijn. And Cardijn's famous Truth of Method remains valid for us today. He worked it out as the synthesis of his dialectic between the Truth of Faith and the Truth of Human Reality. It is the blue-print for our new-style Church: small groups of young workers being completely themselves, both as Christians and as young workers, so as to win their fellow workers to Christ from right inside the working class environment.

The Church today has been called corrupt, and self-centred, and authoritarian, and unintelligible, concerned only with bricks and mortar, and worst insult of all, a stranger to the poor. To anyone within the Church who utters such complaints, we can only say: You are the Church. Let Christ rise in you, and start all over again. Easter never stops.
When we sat down six years ago to rethink the seminary, I tried to organise my thoughts along these lines:

a. What kind of world are we moving into?
b. What kind of Church does that call for?
c. What kind of ministerial priest does that kind of Church need?
d. What kind of formation will that priest need?

I still find this a useful device, and this paper will seek to develop it.

a. What kind of world are we moving into?

The question itself suggests a world of rapid change, with all that this involves, a searching for new norms and values, for new ways of communication of ideas, a questioning of long-established roles and functions. In analysing our society and what it does to its members, I find the concept of alienation useful. This does not imply that everything happening to us is alienating, or that alienation in itself is necessarily a bad thing, to be equated with original sin. But the concept does sum up what Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Fromm and the existentialists have had to say about the effects of industrial society. Melvin Seeman, an American writer, has suggested that we can place into five distinct categories all that has been written about alienation. These categories are as follows:

1. Powerlessness: the threat to the dignity of each individual man, represented either by industrial capitalism (for Marx) or by technological society of any political hue (Big Brother). This thinking has greatly influenced Paul VI's thought, and lay behind Humanae Vitae. The individual person is alienated from himself and from society if he is made to feel less than a man, by his work, by his pay packet, by his unemployment, or housing conditions, or political condition, or by any undue exercise of authoritarianism.
ii. **Meaninglessness**: the state of mind of those who fail to see any comprehensible meaning in their work, or in their lives, or in their total existence. It is a state connected with secularization and the decline of formerly, commonly accepted, religious values, which served to explain the universe to believers. It is bound up with education in 'scientific values' and growing materialism, and is illustrated by the search for a meaning in pop religion and superstition.

iii. **Normlessness**: or what Durkheim called anomie: the state of mind of those who find that the norms they once learnt to govern their life's decisions no longer seem to apply in a changing world. It is bound up with the disintegration of small compact societies such as village life used to represent, where no one had much need to think for himself. They are illustrated by the search to belong to a small group, or to some cult such as the 'pop scene', etc., etc., in which one's decisions are made by the group.

iv. **Self-estrangement**: the state of mind of those who cannot 'fulfil themselves', emotionally or in any other way which they consider appropriate to them as human beings, in their work or in their family life or in their leisure. It is bound up with what Erikson calls the Identity crisis. *Populorum Progressio* spoke of the ways in which the individual and society should develop together. (See Jack Domini-an's article on emotional development in Clergy Review, January 1972, and his article on 'Integrity and the Person' in 'Adoremus', July 1971.)

v. **Isolation**: the state of society in which individuals are unable to relate to each other or to communicate except in a very superficial way; it means the disintegration of community, and the widespread problem of loneliness afflicting men and women of every age and social class.

An unproven suggestion which I favour is that this is more than a list of concepts. It is rather a process, by which people who suffer in a variety of ways from powerless-
ness or meaninglessness or anomie find themselves self-estranged, and being self-estranged are unable to relate to others, and therefore suffer from isolation.

I am not suggesting that the only thing to be said about our society is alienation. In many ways society is improving immeasurably for millions of people, thanks largely to scientific discovery and technology as is seen in the so-called 'Green Revolution'. The very fact of alienation produces widespread efforts to mend the situation, such as the workers movement to overcome powerlessness, a great deal of philosophical and theological thinking to counter meaninglessness, a great development of freedom through education to overcome normlessness, a new interest in everything that makes up man and woman and human living, and a return to religious and contemplative values, to counteract self-estrangement, and many praiseworthy efforts especially among the young, to rebuild society and develop community, to counteract isolation.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that 'alienation' is a key to much of what is happening in the contemporary world, and the key also to the koinonia, kerygma, and diakonia of the Church within that world.

b. What kind of Church does that call for?

The question again presupposes a highly important consideration, namely, the Church should respond to the world and its problems. Today the Church herself put on my lips a prayer (II Sunday of Advent) that I should despise the world and long for the things of heaven. I'm afraid I despise the prayer instead, and the dualistic mentality it evokes. All these years after Vatican II and its Pastoral Constitution on the Church and the modern world we should not still need to say such obvious things, yet I am convinced that many members of the Church, especially among its leaders, still think in terms of an other-worldly religion.

This is not the place to spell out all I think about the Church. (See an article I wrote in 'New Life', Nov-Dec, 1970, 'New-Style Church'.) But simply to take up each of the
five categories of alienation. I think the Church of Christ has a comment to make on each, and a word to say to herself about that comment.

**Powerlessness:** The Church proclaims that every man is called to be a son of God, to share the divine nature, to participate in the Kingdom of God not in some remote future, but here and now on earth, and that all this should be reflected in man's daily life at work, at home, at leisure. The Church should be assisting man to achieve his full dignity here and now. (A word for the Church: she has inherited along with the Gospels and all her tradition of holiness a whole heap of ancient, medieval and modern cultural hangovers which have succeeded in standing the Gospel on its head, so that the Church herself, and the way she tends to exercise her authority, has become one of the greatest agents of powerlessness in modern society. "Leave it to Father.")

**Meaninglessness:** The Church proclaims that Christ has entrusted her with his truth, and that those who accept this truth will discover a meaning for life. (A word for the Church: she has kept the truth bottled up, for fear of contamination. If she is to exercise her prophetic function adequately, she must base her theology on a reading of the signs of the times, as Pope John and Vatican II insisted. Because she has failed to do this young people in the Church will not listen to her reiteration of ancient truths in ancient accents, and so cut themselves off from a discovery of the truth which will indeed open up meaning for their lives.)

**Formlessness:** The Church teaches morals as well as faith; in her origins she represented the freedom of the Gospel, as distinct from Pharisaic legalism. But over the centuries she herself has tended to become increasingly legalistic. The task of the Church today is neither to dictate in an authoritarian way to her members, nor to acquiesce in the breakdown of conventional morality and its
substitution by a vague humanism, but to build up adult consciences, with great care and respect for the freedom of her children. (Yet the Church herself, through an over-preoccupation with her own affairs, has failed to work out her own norms appropriate to the circumstances of our age, and consistent with the Scriptural foundations of Christian morality. This is evident in the recent Synod's failure to say anything worthwhile about justice in the modern world.)

**Self-estrangement:** The Church witnesses to the Resurrection of Christ, still living on through her. She thereby witnesses to her hope that every man can in fact develop into a complete human being, even if this must often be accomplished by the way of the Cross. In other words, the Church is basically optimistic about man's prospects, but in a realistic way. She exists to make men holy, to make them whole, to make them complete, in Christ. *(A word for the Church: she is in fact neglecting to offer the means of holiness to all but a handful of her own members, in a world that is starving for spiritual and emotional fulfilment. Moreover the Church herself is unfulfilled, in her leaders. All too few of them appear to take seriously the pursuit of holiness. Even fewer see this pursuit as embracing the whole of man. There is still a great deal of Manichean dualism at work in the Church.)*

**Isolation:** The Church not only proclaims the *communio sanctorum*; she makes it available through Holy Communion, and the establishment of Christian community around the Eucharistic table, and through the sacrifice of Christ made present in that liturgy. *(A word for the Church: all too often her 'community' is based not on the liturgy but on the crumbling social needs of second- or third-generation immigrants clinging together in a strange society. For many Church-goers today the motivation is not liturgical but social, respectability. The Church has tried from time to time to revive community based on an out-of-date parochial system, and she finds that only a constant*
nucleus of parishioners establish any kind of community among themselves. Even in the seminary attempts to stress community break down because they are not based on a slow development of new ties among individuals who come more and more from a non-community. Restoration of community must take its time, and understand the underlying reasons for social disintegration - Durkheim's 'dust of individuals'.

The Church in this country particularly seems to have lost a missionary impetus. Ecumenism should be a stimulus, not an obstacle, to a completely renewed sense of mission to the entire British community, of every class and cultural background and every age; a sense of mission that prompts the Church to see her parishes as missionary units, as priest-parishes, not so much preaching the Gospel to those around, as mediating in every way God's redeeming presence within our society, serving thereby every single member of the entire community. This calls for a pastoral rethinking of all our resources, in manpower and in materials; complete overhaul of the whole concept of the lay apostolate and of formation for its leaders; above all a rethinking of the parish itself, in terms of communication by the whole Church of power and meaning and morality, self-fulfilment and community in Christ, to the entire society. Sometimes priests are accused of preferring social work to the ministry of the Gospel. This strikes me as a false dichotomy; preaching the word with integrity, and an attempt to live up to it, must lead Christians to serve their fellow men in every way, including the demands of justice and of charity. On the other hand, if my theory is correct, for the Church to insist on every man's dignity and self-fulfilment cannot but lay the foundations for a genuine community life, such as this country did once possess with the help of the Church and of the medieval emphasis on the doctrine of the mystical body of Christ.

c. What kind of ministerial priest does that Church need?

There are plenty of voices ready to suggest that the ministerial fulltime priesthood is a thing of the past, a clerical monopolising of a priestly function that should be exercised by all members of the Church. It is true, in
my opinion, that the priestly role of every Christian does need to be brought out and built up. But for that work of formation and animation, I am convinced that there is still a need for full time ministerial priests. I cannot understand those who assert that there is no longer any role for the priest, because so much is now done, or should be done, by the laity, which the priest formerly kept to himself. This development merely releases the priest for his real work, which is not just the celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments, but the prophetic work that must accompany this liturgical ministry, to give it an authentically Christian and non-Pharisaical flavour. The priest is a relating person. He must relate to God, and in that way relate others to God; and he must relate people to one another in the Church; and finally he must lead the Church in the task of relating all men to the Church, and therefore to God. Whether he can do this best by working full time as a priest, or (as I have had to do for most of my own priesthood) in some other occupation, seems to me to be irrelevant. Whether the priest works as "priest" or as "priest-worker", he does so in order to be God's man among men, God's representative, not in a way that sets him apart from the rest of the Church, but in a way that leads the rest of the Church to follow his example, and be itself a priest for the whole of society. The priest leads in priesthood. He animates a priestly community. His life-style is meant to typify "priesthood" as an example to the whole community. (cf. I Peter 5, 4)

How is the quality of his own priesthood affected by what we have said about alienation? In the first place, priests themselves tend to be alienated. (See my paper "Celibates and Canaries"). This alienation is at once peculiar to them, yet something they share with all modern men. It should lead them to understand modern man, and deepen their ability to lead the Church in a way that will be of service to the whole of modern society. (More and more I get the impression that the Catholic Church is becoming the de facto established Church, especially in working class areas. More and more should priests see themselves as ministers to all society, through and with the Church they serve.)
Powerlessness: priests must not only proclaim the dignity of man; they must also respect it, starting with respect for one another. According to Greeley the greatest problem facing American priests today is not celibacy nor the loneliness that leads to it, but the way authority is exercised in the Church, and the way priests are deprived of responsibility for so many years. Priests must respect their parishioners, listen to them, not patronise them, not bully them. We have inherited a tradition of 'leadership' in what were largely uneducated and very poor immigrant communities. The priest was built up in his own estimation, inside a very hierarchical society. Today society has changed and priests are caught out as men of power trying to preach Christ crucified to the alienated masses. No wonder they don't listen.

Meaninglessness: the so-called crisis of faith can be caused by many things, such as failure in communication brought on by too much stress, It can be genuine loss of belief, or a state of doubt brought on because of bad teaching in the past. Certainly it does affect many priests, and many are affected in their faith in the Church, rather than in God. So they see their priesthood as meaningless, and many carry on as 'inward drop-outs' because it is easier than leaving.

It is true that a priest who experiences doubts in this way is in a better position to sympathise with others in the same state; but I am sure that a great number of these doubts spring from bad theology, or from good theology badly understood. Priests need to read, to think together about theology, to read the signs of the times with their people and with each other. They need to develop a strong spirit of prayer in faith. And priests must be men who are well capable of communicating the faith to their people.

Normlessness: priests must be good formers of adult consciences, of conscience based on genuine freedom in Christ, and not on a list of moral do's and don'ts. To form consciences priests must have well formed consciences
themselves, a strong sense of responsibility, and the calm and relaxation with which freedom of decision becomes possible. Especially in Confession and in spiritual direction priests can form consciences, and help others to become adept at doing so. A conscience implies a clear vision of the totality of life around one, a clear Christian judgement based on the Gospels and not on a vague humanism, and a strong power to act upon one's conscience. But many priests are narrow-minded, with little sense of social justice and injustice, much influenced by ordinary prejudices and emotions, childish in their values and feeble in their resolution, or cowardly to act.

**Self-estrangement:** a priest lives to bear witness not only in his liturgical function but with the whole of his life, to the Resurrection of Christ, and to every man's passover from death to the fullness of life. He stands for holiness, for wholeness, for integrity. Many priests are self-estranged because they fail to come anywhere near practising what they preach. We need holy priests who see their fulfilment in terms of offering the means of holiness to the masses of people around them, and not to a tiny spiritual élite. This comes back again to prayer in the whole of life, fed by frequent periods of explicit prayer. It also implies a very Catholic - all-embracing, that is - approach to holiness; "spiritual life" is tolerable as an expression only if it implies the influence of the Spirit on the whole of life, including emotional development through deep personal relationships with others. A priest's celibacy is too often twisted and negative, when it should be a way of sharing in Christ's all-embracing love, consecrated for all men.

**Isolation:** Loneliness affects many priests, largely because they cannot relate easily, owing to their defective socialisation. But a priest, whether he is lonely or not, is called to lead others into union with God and with each other. The priest is most obviously doing his priestly work when he is presiding at Mass, the time when he can do most to unite the people with God and with each other, and with
the wider society they will be rejoining, provided he is a true man of God, and a man who loves his people so much that he really takes great care to bring this liturgy alive for them. Priests are often forced to live in isolation from each other, but wherever they can they should help each other in team ministries, rather than driving each other out of the Church by their alienating lack of mutual love.

d. What kind of formation will that priest need?

All this has been by way of introduction, but I think this roundabout journey is necessary, if we are to get the seminary right. My final question even leaves open whether or not we need seminaries at all. But at present it is impossible to see how we can go rapidly to some alternative system of formation.

Yet even now the formation of the priest is by no means confined to the seminary. What happens to him before he is selected, and after he is ordained, are of equal importance, and so is all that happens to him during his seminary course, outside what the seminary itself has to offer.

(I think the most important work in the Church is now that of vocations director, and these priests need much more careful selection and formation themselves. It takes great skill to see what men have the capacity for growth, as men and as Christians, which they are going to need in their years of formation for the priesthood. Maturity does not correlate with age. We need men of such openness to their experience of the world around them that in a way they will not need a pastoral course at all. And men of such strong commitment to the Church and such strong faith that the studies will not be handicapped by mountainous barriers of apathy and doubt. In fact such rare vocations must be the products of a renewed Church, and of a renewal of faith in the ministerial priesthood on the part of those who may now be without it.)

To form a priest who can cope with the state of powerlessness in the world today, we need to give him great self-confidence, self-respect, in his formative years. We must
treat him as a son of God, as the mature human being we want him to become. He must not be kept in servility, as some kind of peasant in a feudal domain; he must be listened to, allowed maximum participation in all decisions; obedience must not become a weapon to browbeat him, for the sake of a trouble-free community. The young man of today needs constant reassurance of his own worth, not a constant reminder of his own unworthiness. In his years of formation he must be given every chance to play a full and active part in the work of the Kingdom of God on earth.

To form a priest to cope with meaninglessness, we need a course of studies that will strike him as significant and important, for the needs of the mass of people he is called upon to serve in the role of a prophet. May I suggest the following rather drastic revision of the timetable of studies?

Year I. A year, as now, in the sem., including those who are going to Universities later. It should be less a year of introduction to the studies as one of a very thorough grounding in prayer, in the simple but vital notions of God, of prayer, of suffering. This year should begin the study of Scripture, with an intensive study of the Gospels.

Years II, III and IV - if necessary - time spent in a University, in a teachers' training college, or in some other way that can be seen as an integral part of the studies: a study of people and their needs.

Year V (or III) - spent in a team in a parish, with every kind of pastoral experience, and opportunities for preaching and teaching. This year to cover most of the pastoral formation.

Years VI (or IV) and VII (or V) two years intensive study in the seminary, of theology, with philosophy as needed; working for a diploma, that has to be obtained; if they fail, they have to sit again. After the previous pastoral formation, during which the Scripture course is kept going, I would hope the students would approach their studies in a far more serious fashion than they do at present.
Year VIII (or VI): a whole year’s diaconate, to include a programme of study, and with a review with PPs half way through.

The University or College of Education course to include, when possible, such subjects as sociology and psychology.

It is tragic to see young men come to the seminary and there lose their commitment for serving the people of God, because they have not been selected carefully enough, or because they cannot see the connection between their studies and the work ahead of them. The contrast between the pace of work in the university and in the seminary is striking. Admittedly not all the students at the seminary are capable of this concentrated effort, and for this reason it would be good as far as possible to teach through tutors, requiring each student to work at his own pace, rather than through lectures and seminars. To concentrate the studies, apart from Scripture and 'Natural Theology' into a two year basic course, will involve lightening the course for some of the students. A two-year diploma course could also be opened to lay students, as is now done in Maynooth.

I am not putting these suggestions about curriculum forward with any great conviction that this is the answer to the studies problem. What I am sure of is that somehow the motivation of the students towards their studies must be improved, and that a great deal more time and attention should be paid to pastoral formation along the lines of the Fraser courses. Visiting is so important that even what we now provide is not enough preparation, though a vast improvement.

Perhaps the diaconate year would be the occasion for remedying one gap in the studies reported to me by a number of young priests, who find they now have to spend a good deal of valuable time in preparing instruction courses for marriages and converts, which they wish they had done in the seminary.
The problem of communication remains to be dealt with, and I still think this is of great importance, and needs to be taught by an expert in the field who can communicate with Church students. This should include lectures on pedagogy by a college of education lecturer, and a solid period of time in one or more schools.

**Normlessness:** It is the role of the Moral Theology department to help the students to prepare to cope with this situation, but it is even more the province of the spiritual directors and of the groups. I do not think the groups have been properly understood or developed as they should have been. They were originally designed to help the students to work out norms of conduct, by which they could learn to exercise freedom, instead of living by a number of rules. The impression given, rightly or wrongly, that there was a return to rules in 1968, caused general apathy towards the groups, which became pleasant but innocuous talking shops, an opportunity to let off steam and to get to know a few students better, and a useful link with the staff, but light-years away from the idea of the group being in its own right a basic cell of the Church in the seminary, united through its own liturgy, and engaged in the task of enabling its members to develop adult Christian consciences capable of taking in with collective perception the total situation the members were in, of judging this situation by mature Christian values worked out through regular meditation together on the Gospel, and leading on to effective action to create an environment of Christian living necessary for the growth of vocations to the priesthood today. This means the employment of the 'review of life' techniques, not simply in the cerebral sphere, but in an active and well thought out commitment to the present and future apostolate. I had hoped that familiarity with this technique, once acquired in the seminary, would serve as an excellent preparation for a renewal of parish life through family groups and many other varieties of apostolic groupings based on face-to-face collective thought and action. Many recently ordained priests are now employing such
already mature, as men and as Christians, before entering the seminary; in the interview every effort should be made to see that this is so, and not by armchair hunch methods, but through objective testing, so far as this can be accomplished. But it would be unrealistic to expect more than a capacity for growth, and to try to ensure that the seminary environment in fact contributes to that growth, rather than stunting it. To assess this growth I strongly recommend the presence on the staff of one or more shrewd women, who have a talent for perceiving character that seems to be denied to most of us men.

Preparation for celibacy must come through the pastoral courses, whereby the students come to realise how the people both need and appreciate the special quality of love that only a really dedicated celibate can offer them. Of course, all I am saying here runs the risk of simply exposing the student to emotional upheavals that will cloud his sense of vocation. The answer to this must lie in the work of each spiritual director. Fear and timidity, leading us to protect the student from the awful effects of women's wiles, and his own instincts and emotions, are understandable enough, but in my view potentially disastrous.

Isolation: how can the student be prepared to cope with loneliness in himself and in others, and to be a relating person, especially through the exercise of his liturgical function as President of the Euchærist? Community cannot be forced on anyone. You can manipulate people into ant heaps, not into human community. I think that attention to all the other aspects of alienation will itself do most to break down isolation. Loneliness is not just the state of being on your own, for it commonly occurs in the 'lonely crowd'. It is an inability to relate deeply with anyone, including God and oneself. It probably has its roots in personal psychological factors such as childhood family relationships, as well as in sociological factors and the creation of stress. It appears to be the most crucial factor affecting the resignation of American priests, according to the Greeley report, and my own survey of young priests reveals that a number of them find it very hard to relate to other priests.
apostolic methods, and are also crying out for teams of their own to work in, and in which they can develop norms for the Church's activity. But I doubt whether the groups in the seminary are of much help in preparation. I think they can be improved if each group can link up with a local parish, and visit it each week-end, as the Missionary Institute students do. This would transfer the focus of group interest away from the students' own somewhat narcissistic problems to the problems of the masses of people whom the Church is called upon to serve. I would not hesitate to begin this work in the student's first year in the seminary, when he is not yet affected by the apathy of other students. The basic lesson to be instilled into every student from the start is that his priesthood is given to him (already in Baptism) for all men, and that by ordination he will be consecrated to the service of men in a new way that demands great preoccupation with the problems and anxieties of others; his studies should all be directed to that end, as should his growth in prayer and the love of God. The first year should certainly be a kind of noviciate, but a noviciate for the secular priesthood, not for the cloister. We all said this six years ago, but have not as yet effectively dealt with the problem.

Self-estrangement: the student for the priesthood, and for celibacy, must be helped to develop to the full as a human being, if he is to give his life to the Church in witness of the Resurrection of Christ the Complete Man. As Dr. Dominian points out, personal growth means integrity, and that involves deep personal relationships with other people of both sexes. The seminary has always given students an excellent opportunity to grow in friendship with other future priests, but there is now a growing recognition that close friendship with women and girls is not simply a risk that must be taken to test out a student's staying power, but a necessary condition of integral growth. The student must learn to handle his emotions, of aggression as well as of love. His growth in holiness must incorporate this emotional maturity. It would be good if all students were
A successful liturgy, in the sense of a consciously communal act of worship, should flow from community; in the absence of a strong sense of community, as has been the case in the seminary, it is not surprising that the liturgy has not seemed to be 'right' somehow. Can efforts to repair the liturgy perhaps assist the creation of community, putting the cart before the horse? (It is the same problem facing us in regard to ecumenical inter-communion.) This may be so, if the liturgy itself is not associated with unpleasant feelings and antagonisms, alienating those who come together to celebrate the death of the Lord. We feel the students should be more mature and rise above their reactions to personalities and the irritation of unwelcome rubrics. If we can deal with the problems of self-estrangement this may be possible, but in fact we have to deal with people as they are and not as they ought to be. I personally feel the time has come to limit the 'Community' celebration to one day a week, say on Saturdays, as is done in the Missionary Institute, before they all go off to parishes. Otherwise I would leave both office and Mass to each group, until the sense of a larger community has come to mean something to the students.
Aggiornamento: a word associated with Pope John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council he convened in 1962. The Italian word implies, more than "coming up to date", a need for the Church to be an integral part of the age we live in.

Angelism: a mistaken belief that men are meant to live like angels, disembodied spirits. It is an expression of dualism, derived from Persian mythology, according to which a good God made the soul and an evil God the body.

Apostle: originally one of the Twelve chosen by Jesus to bear special witness to the resurrection, and to lead the Church in its mission to preach the Gospel to mankind. The name of Apostle was claimed by Paul and Barnabas, who were not part of the original Twelve. In recent times the phrase "lay apostle" has been used to suggest that laypeople, members of the LAOS, or People of God, (a phrase originally associated with the Israelites, but applied to the Christian Church by Vatican II), and not only Bishops, priests, and nuns, are called to preach the Gospel by the way they live their everyday lives.

Ascetic Theology: this is a systematic study of the self-discipline expected of a Christian seeking to achieve a state of perfection.

Bishops: these "overseers" of the Church are heirs to the Apostles in the task of leading the Church. Like the Apostles, they form a College or team, and since Vatican II this has been emphasised by the establishment of Bishops' Conferences in different countries.

Blessed Sacrament: this is the name attached to the Body and Blood of Christ, which Catholics believe replace the bread and wine consecrated in the Eucharist.

Breviary: a book containing an "abbreviated" version of the liturgical services for each day in the year, (originally sung by monastic choirs,) which those in major orders, (deacons, priests, Bishops,) are required to recite each day, with others, or on their own.
**Canon Law:** the laws of the Catholic Church, as codified at the beginning of this century, and now under revision.

**Celibacy:** the single state, obligatory for priests of the Latin rite since the early Middle Ages.

**Charismatic renewal:** these words have been appropriated by the Catholic version of the Pentecostal revivalist movement, though the entire Church is in a process of renewal since Vatican II, and charismatic may be applied to any "gift of God".

**Cleric:** from a word meaning 'lot' or 'portion'. In the Middle Ages and until recent times a cleric was a man who chose the Lord "for his portion", in a way which gave him a niche in the feudal scheme of the division of labour. He was marked out by the tonsure, or special hair-cut, and by clerical costume of some description. (The Roman or clerical collar was of very recent origin, coming to this country only in the last century.) The cleric was protected by special laws. All students for the priesthood had to enter the clerical state (and thereby become "Reverend") some time before they received ordination. "Clericalism" has become a pejorative word synonymous with a certain lifestyle by which the cleric is isolated from ordinary people; in many countries it has bred a strong anti-clericalism. Though we still have "clerics" (collectively clergy) the tonsure has now been replaced by a brief ceremony called "Entry into the clerical state".

**Confession:** this custom is part of the sacrament of Penance, now renamed Reconciliation. A person who seeks forgiveness for his sins must confess them to a priest, if they are "mortal" (serious enough to have "killed" the life of union with God given to a Christian at his baptism). The usual custom is for this to be done in a small room called a confessional, in which priests will sit waiting for penitents at stated hours each week. There has recently been a considerable decrease in the number of those coming to regular confession (which is not necessarily limited to serious sins). It is part of the priest's work in confession to give the penitent advice, as well as 'absolution' and a 'penance' commensurate with the sins confessed.
Converts: this applies to members of the Church who have joined it not as infants but later in life.

Curate: this has a slightly derogatory ring about it in this country and is often replaced by "assistant priest", whose task is to help the work of a "parish priest", who is "in charge" of a parish. In some Irish dioceses parishes cover a large area and there are not many parish priests, so "curate" is more of a claim to respect. In England a curate may have to wait for "his own parish" up to 30 years after his ordination, but it may take far less time, depending on the diocese. The average for the country is probably about 15 years.

Deacon: this is a function in the Church which for many centuries was relegated to a step towards the priesthood (following the "sub-diaconate", now abolished). Since Vatican II an attempt has been made to revive the idea of a permanent diaconate, in which an ordained deacon works in a parish alongside the priests. The word comes from the Greek DIAKONIA, meaning ministry, or servant role; the resuscitation of the function is intended to offer the people a minister who will personify the servant role of the whole Church, particularly in its care for the poor. Married men may now be ordained as deacons. Students for the priesthood now work as deacons for some time in a parish.

Diocese: a term for a division of the Church ruled over by a Bishop, borrowed from the phrase book of the late Roman Empire. A "diocesan priest" is attached to a diocese, and may not leave it to work elsewhere without his Bishop's permission.

Divine: a word applied to students of divinity, or theology, as well as to the object of their study, in certain seminaries.

Encyclical: a message from a Pope intended for world wide perusal.

Eucharist: from the Greek word for Thanksgiving, the name applied to the action of Jesus when he gave thanks, broke bread, and gave it to his apostles, saying: "This is My Body - do this in memory of me". This has become, in various forms the central act of Christian worship of God in communion with Christ; in Western (or Latin) Catholicism, it is
known as the Mass, from the old form of dismissal at the end, "Ite, Missa Est" - "Go, the Mass is ended".

**Evangelization**: from the Latin word Evangelium, or Gospel, or Good News, which it is the Church's task to preach to all mankind.

**Ex Cathedra**: "From the Chair" - a Latin tag applied to Papal utterances intended to carry the full weight of authority claimed for the Pope as successor to Peter.

**Faith**: this can refer either to the efforts made by a believer to accept truths which seem to go beyond rational explanation, or to the content of those truths, often referred to collectively by a Catholic as The Faith. The word has more cognitive and less emotional implications than it often has for many non-Catholic Christians. A "crisis of faith" implies either that the believer discovers that others "in the Faith" do not include in their own Creed various items which he may have thought essential, or else he may experience some disturbance in the motivation for his belief.

**Family Circles**: or family groups, are occasions when a dozen or so neighbours meet together to discuss the relationship between their lives and their faith, sometimes in the context of a "House Mass" celebrated in one of the homes.

**Gaudium et Spe**: (Joy and Hope) is the name of the document issued by Vatican II dealing with the relationship of the Church to the world of today.

**Gregorian**: in this study generally refers to the Theological University in Rome run by the Jesuits, and attended by students from a number of colleges, including the Venerable English College (but not the Beda College).

**Group system**: a term used in the seminaries to describe meetings of a dozen or so students, in which some participation is offered in the running of the seminary.

**Holy Hour**: an hour spent in prayer, usually in a Church where the Blessed Sacrament is kept in a "Tabernacle" (an ornate safe) or is "exposed" (put on view) in a "monstrance".
Humanae Vitae: (Of Human Life) - an encyclical issued by Paul VI in 1968, in which he upheld the traditional condemnation of contraception.

Incarnational: associated with the Incarnation, the Christian doctrine concerning Jesus, who is believed to be the Word of God made flesh (i.e. made man).

Laicisation: reduction of a priest to a lay state; sometimes called unfrocking, when not sought voluntarily by the priest.

Liturgy: from a Greek word meaning "service"; any formal worship undertaken by the Church as such.

Marriage Instruction: priests are obliged to give a series of instructions (or talks) on the Catholic teaching regarding marriage, and other aspects of the Faith, to partners of prospective "mixed marriages" involving a non-Catholic.

Ministry: though priests are not often referred to as ministers, they engage themselves in a ministry - a way of serving God as a leader of the Church. The word implies diakonia, or the "servant-rôle of Christ. In the early Church there were numerous ministries, or ways of serving in the Church; the "priest" office gathered many of these together over the centuries.

Missionary: while the whole Church has a "mission" to preach the Gospel, certain members of the Church are called missionaries, when they devote their lives to that task, usually in some territory overseas. Various religious orders specialise in aspects of this work; such are the White Fathers, who work in Africa.

Monastery: a place where monks live and pray together. Monks take three vows, of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and spend much of their time in celebration of the Liturgy. A monk, not necessarily a priest, is to be distinguished from a hermit, who lives mostly alone, and a Friar, (from Frater, Brother) who is less tied down to a stable existence in one house. All these are known as Religious.

Moral or Moral Theology: students for the priesthood traditionally spend four years in this study, which examines the morality expected of a Christian, and is mostly a preparation for the work of hearing confessions.
Office: a word sometimes used to denote the daily task of the priest in reciting the liturgical hours.

Orders: "Holy Orders" is the name of one of the seven sacraments, in which deacons, priests, and bishops, are "ordained", to receive the powers of their new function in the Church. Before the reforms of Vatican II reception of these major orders, (plus the subdiaconate) was preceded by four minor orders, which students in the priesthood would receive as "stepping stones" on the way to the priesthood. These were Doorkeeper, Reader, Acolyte, and Exorcist, the first and last of which have now been abolished. Acolytes are called upon to assist the priests and deacons in the liturgy. Students for the priesthood still have to "apply for orders" at regular intervals and wait anxiously to see what the seminary staff and the Bishops decide about their future. Sometimes a student is "blocked" for orders, and has to re-apply later on. Much of the fear and uncertainty reported in the study refers to this practice.

Parish Priest: the senior, or sometimes the only, priest attached to a parish, an area of a diocese. He has considerable independence both from the Bishop and from the people, though he is liable to removal by the Bishop.

Pastoral: referring to the work of a Bishop or priest as pastor, or shepherd. Pastoral training for the student consists in a process of growing acquaintance on his part with the many problems facing the people among whom he will be working.


Professor: ("Prof") - a title bestowed on seminary lecturers. Not all teaching staff are priests, though most are. There is an increasing tendency for nun theologians to fill the gaps left by recent departures from the priesthood.

Prophet: there is no formal office of prophet as such in the Church today, or anything corresponding to the Old Testament "schools of prophets", but Vatican II reminded the Church that everyone baptized "into Christ" shares his
prophetic rôle, as well as his priesthood and his kingship.

**Religious:** can be an adjective referring to Religion in general, or it can be a noun referring to a member of a religious order, in which the traditional three vows are taken.

**Roman Congregations:** including that for Christian Education, responsible for Seminaries, correspond to Ministries or Departments in British bureaucratic structure.

**Sacrament:** an outward sign of a hidden mystery. For Catholics there are seven sacraments, marking various important stages or conditions of life: Baptism, for initiation; Confirmation, received from a Bishop to mark reception of the Spirit at the start of adult life; Holy Eucharist; Penance; Holy Orders; Marriage; and the Sacrament of the Sick given in preparation for death, or at times of serious illness. Priests are "ministers" of most of the sacraments, especially of the Eucharist, at which they preside over the meal-sacrifice, and "administer" Holy Communion. Deacons may also administer Holy Communion. Recently, selected religious and laypeople have been empowered to do the same.

**Secular:** refers to saeculum, Latin for "the age" or "the world", and is distinguished from "religious". Secular priests belong not to a Religious Order but to a Diocese, and they live not in a monastery away from people, but in a presbytery close to people. (They are normally forbidden, however, to take up "secular" work.)

**Spiritual Directors:** are entrusted with the guidance of someone's soul, or spiritual life, or life of prayer, work often though not always associated with Confession. Seminaries generally have a priest acting as "spiritual Director" to the whole establishment; a recent development in some Colleges has been the insistence that each student must have a personal Director.

**YCW:** The Young Christian Workers is a movement of young workers who seek to incorporate Christianity into the working class movement. They began in Belgium where young Abbé Cardijn, at the turn of the century, discovered the rejection of the Church by the working class, and set out to teach his boys and girls to "See, Judge, and Act". Many of his ideas found a more universal expression in Vatican II, which he attended as a Cardinal.