

1986 - add 1

THE IDENTITY OF THE RELIGIOUS BROTHER IN HOLY CROSS:
AN HISTORICAL REFLECTION

*
* * *
*

BROTHER JOHN PAIGE, C.S.C.
FEAST OF BLESSED BROTHER ANDRE, C.S.C.
JANUARY 6, 1986

The Identity of the Religious Brother in Holy Cross:
An Historical Reflection
by
Brother John Paige, C.S.C.

FOREWORD

This paper is adapted from a presentation made on the topic by myself at the Province Meeting of the Brothers of Holy Cross, Eastern Province, November 2, 1985, at Valatie, New York. It is an attempt to synthesize the history of the Brothers' Society in the Congregation of Holy Cross in a particular format, and at this particular time in history, as we prepare to adopt a definitive constitution at the general chapter. I hope that my reflection will inform your thinking and discussion on the very nature of our congregation, and on its possible future direction and development.

FORMAT

My chosen format is that of an historical reflection. While I make no claim to being an historian by profession or formal training, I feel there is value in reviewing our story as a community, and I feel competent to pull together the information, and present it in one piece.

One value of historical reflection is that we can see more clearly where the Spirit has led us as a faith community and thus better appreciate what we have today. On the other hand, we dare not allow history to dictate our future nor impede our growth and response to the Spirit today--neither as individuals nor as a congregation. Every founder to some degree broke out of his history. We, too, may be called to nothing less ("History of the Two Societies in Holy Cross," presented at the Midwest Province Forum, November 1980, by Brother James Moroney, C.S.C.).

I introduce a bias into this paper because I am synthesizing our community history from a particular perspective, namely, that of the Society of Brothers in the Congregation of Holy Cross--an association of two (originally three) societies in one religious congregation. Therefore, I am not as concerned with documenting parallel situations or circumstances in the Society of Priests or in the Sisters' Congregations, except as they are related to the topic at hand, the Identity of the Religious Brother in Holy Cross.

I take this bias for the purpose of narrowing the focus of the paper. At the same time, the view that I am giving--an historical reflection from the perspective of the Brothers' Society-- could be taken from the outlook of

the Priests' Society, from the perspective of the Sisters' Congregations or, theoretically, from the view of our lay co-workers who have collaborated with us in ministry over the years.

Finally, I have arbitrarily chosen to present this historical reflection utilizing the categories made popular by Cada, Fitz, et al. in their work, Shaping the Coming Age of Religious Life (Seabury Press, 1979).

This, then, introduces a sociological model by which I hope to organize the important dimensions of particular periods of our history. I have identified five historical periods for consideration.

I: Brothers of Saint Joseph

II: Association of Holy Cross

III: Congregation of Holy Cross, U.S.A.

IV: Twentieth Century, Part I

V: Twentieth Century, Part II

I will organize the events of much of those periods according to the categories of: Foundation (or Re-foundation), Expansion, Stabilization, Breakdown and Critical Phase.

PERIOD I: BROTHERS OF SAINT JOSEPH

A. Foundation

Our foundation as the Brothers of Saint Joseph began with Father James Dujarie after the French Revolution. Among the many structures of society that collapsed in the wake of the Revolution was education, an enterprise carried out primarily by the Church. With that Revolution, education and many other aspects of church life came to a grinding halt. Dujarie first established educational opportunities for young women, and then educational opportunities for young men in his parish at Ruillé-sur-Loir, France. Because Dujarie was the sponsor of these schools, the women who taught for him became known as the "sisters" of Ruillé, and the men, who were doing their teaching under his direction and sponsorship, became known as the "brothers" of Ruillé.

Eventually, Dujarie helped these two groups organize as Sisters and Brothers, and the Sisters became the Sisters of Providence, and the Brothers, the Brothers of Saint Joseph.

In the 1820's in France, if a group was organizing, the government feared the "why's" of their existence: was the group trying to overthrow the government, or re-establish the monarchy? Dujarie, in order to have these men classified so as to teach in the primary schools, had to indicate an official reason for their existence. Therefore, he wrote that the Brothers of Saint Joseph exist to provide primary education of young men in his parish, and to assist

in his parish, especially in what we would now call the "mission chapels" or "out-stations." The brothers were laymen who worked alone, or maybe two together, exclusively as teachers. We might ask, did Dujarie found a religious community or fulfill a government requirement? These men became a religious community, however, in this sense: because they needed some direction, Dujarie sent one of the first recruits--later known as Brother André Mottais--to the Christian Brothers to make a novitiate. André, being the most astute of the young teachers helping Dujarie, was to come back and to train others who would come as volunteers to this particular organization. André trained them as he had been trained--as a brother. So Dujarie became the superior, then, of a religious group of brothers who called themselves Brothers of Saint Joseph, and he organized them and gave them a reason for existence conformable to the requirements of the French government of the time. The establishment of Dujarie's sisters followed a similar pattern.

B. Expansion

In 1823 the government provided a Royal Ordinance of Approval for the men. A Royal Ordinance allowed men who became Brothers of Saint Joseph or who worked for Dujarie in this way to be exempt from military service, but not to have property rights. Dujarie also introduced annual vows of obedience in this association of the Brothers of Saint Joseph. A period of expansion followed, and by 1828 there were 105 members in this association, spread over fifty houses/schools.

C. Breakdown

There came a breakdown rather rapidly in this period of our history, and there were several individual stresses that contributed to this, especially the political turmoil in France and internal disorders in the community.

Finances were one problem. Since the Brothers could not hold property, the land and money of the community were held in the name of the Sisters. The Sisters determined to require some accountability by the Brothers for their use of money, but the Brothers were not cooperative in this matter. As usual, when you are arguing over the books, there are problems, and the Sisters finally decided to separate themselves from the Brothers in terms of finances, petitioning the Bishop of LeMans to do so. The Bishop agreed to the separation, but the split was not a happy occasion for the Brothers of Saint Joseph and the Sisters of Providence. In the end, the Bishop literally had to come and divide the firewood between them, piece by piece!

Another factor contributing to the internal disorder was poor formation

and laxity among the Brothers of Saint Joseph. This was due mainly to Dujarie's own age and infirmity (he had rheumatism, and was unable to give the group the leadership and supervision they needed). The formation of the Brothers consisted of an annual retreat and circular letters that Dujarie, with the help of Brother André Mottais, would write. Otherwise, they were out of Ruillé for the entire school year, one or perhaps two together, teaching in primary schools.

There were also cultural transformations in the society of the day that contributed to a breakdown in the community. For example, the Revolution of 1830 in France had a great anti-religious sentiment associated with it, and introduced a spirit of independence to the country. In that year, one-third of the membership of the Brothers of Saint Joseph quit at the end of the school year, an obvious blow to the small community. There was also poor annual retreat attendance among the Brothers after that time, and a disintegration was apparent. It is interesting to note--and providential in my opinion--that Brother André Mottais (one of the first recruits, and an influential Brother) had chosen Basil Moreau (a priest and seminary professor) as his spiritual director; others of the Brothers followed his example, and so we observe a link not only in geography, but in a spiritual relationship between Basil Moreau and these Brothers of Saint Joseph.

D. Critical Phase

A critical phase happened for the Brothers of Saint Joseph in 1835. Dujarie relinquished the superiorship of these Brothers whom he could no longer govern. Moreau accepted the superiorship of the Brothers (at that point there were sixty Brothers and nine novices), and introduced immediate reforms. For example, Moreau transferred the novitiate of the Brothers from Ruille to LeMans, so he could personally direct their formation. He also immediately assigned some Brothers to teaching, but also assigned other Brothers to auxiliary services. Moreau also introduced the vows of religion as a point of stability, and in 1836 Brother André Mottais was among the first of the Brothers to pronounce perpetual vows.

In 1837 a Fundamental Pact was signed between the Brothers of Saint Joseph and a community that Moreau had already gathered about him, the Auxiliary Priests. At the time of this Fundamental Pact, there were about fifty Brothers and ten Auxiliary Priests.

And so we have seen a situation of foundation, expansion, fast breakdown, and into a critical phase with the Brothers of Saint Joseph being taken over by a new superior, reforms instituted, and a pact signed, joining them with a

group of priests. The question at this point is: will the group of Brothers of Saint Joseph become extinct, survive in a minimal sort of "maintenance state," or is there to be a revitalization?

PERIOD II: ASSOCIATION OF HOLY CROSS

A. Foundation/Revitalization

The mission became definite for these Brothers once they became organized and reformed and joined with the Auxiliary Priests in the Association of Holy Cross. They were lay religious; they were primary-school teachers, and they did auxiliary services. Their institute became one of three societies in an Association of Holy Cross along with priests and sisters. A unique characteristic of this new institute--the institute known as the Association of Holy Cross--was an autonomy between the societies: each had its own particular superior, and each had its own particular chapter. The members of each society--priests, sisters and brothers--exercised equality and mutuality in the affairs of the entire Association.

In terms of the union of these three separate societies in one association, such union was facilitated through collaboration in the apostolate, through an annual general chapter, through the same general superior (Fr. Moreau), and through a "spiritual dedication" that the founder proposed to the members: the priests (Salvatorists) would be dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the brothers (Josephites) to the pure heart of Saint Joseph, and the sisters (Mari-anites) to the heart of Mary, pierced with seven swords.

In his Circular Letter No. 5 in 1837, Father Moreau wrote to the Brothers of Saint Joseph:

Happily this is what is taking place at Sainte-Croix. . . Here charity reigns and unites the one hundred and more souls Providence has brought together. Let us earnestly ask our good Master to make this happy state of affairs last, for it is my greatest consolation and the glory of your Institute. It also brings joy to your venerable Founder, who is still vigorous enough in mind and body to take an interest in our labors.

B. Expansion

A period of expansion ensued in the Association, and priests, brothers and sisters were sent from the Motherhouse at Sainte-Croix to Algeria, Indiana and Canada. In 1840 there were 86 brothers (in 39 houses), 45 novices and 15 priests. The first priests pronounced public vows in this year (1840), led by Father Moreau himself.

C. Stabilization

For the Brothers of Saint Joseph, stabilization was a by-product of their

association in Holy Cross. The relationship of the Josephites to the Association of Holy Cross is outlined by Father Moreau in his Circular Letter No. 14 of September 1, 1841. (Father Barrosse calls this letter the "Magna Carta" of Holy Cross.)

You are associated with the apostolate of the priests of Holy Cross by the services which you render through your various obediences, either to them personally, or to their students, as well as by the instruction you give to the numerous children in your own schools. As an Institute of primary teachers, your expansion is no longer confined to France alone, but has spread over into Africa and America. With the Sisters who devote themselves to the housework and the care of the sick in our principal establishments, you are united in a spirit of zeal and prayer. . . .

The development of your Institute has been greatly aided by the Association of Saint Joseph, which the Sovereign Pontiff, at the express wish of the good Bishop of the diocese, has deigned to encourage by the grant of numerous indulgences. From all this you can see, my dear sons in Jesus Christ, what a source of blessings, success, and merits is yours. You can appreciate the beauty and glory of your calling if you but know how to make yourselves worthy of it by faithfully imitating the hidden and public life of our Lord.

Assuredly, all these different works, with which your Society is connected in varying degrees, contain many elements of disintegration. Considering them only from the standpoint of human reason, it is difficult to explain how they could begin, organize, develop, and harmonize up to the present. . . .

But the same spirit which gave movement to the wheels of the mysterious chariot in the vision of Ezechiel, . . . this self-same spirit, I say, seems to have breathed on the different instruments of the work of Holy Cross. Here, notwithstanding differences of temperament and talent, the inequality of means and the differences of vocation and obedience, the one aim of the glory of God and the salvation of souls inspires almost all the members and gives rise to a oneness of effort which tends toward that more perfect union of hearts which is the foundation of the unity and strength of Holy Cross.

Woe, then, and anathema to the priest, Brother or Sister who, by word or action, would attempt to separate establishments which God has willed to unite under the same general authority.

In 1847 Moreau published the first complete set of constitutions for the entire Association of Holy Cross: priests, brothers, and sisters. The union of the three societies highlighted these constitutions. Therein he stressed fully the principle of shared responsibility and the autonomy of each Society, and he

wanted to see collaboration, dependence, attachment, and mutual harmony among the three.

D. Breakdown

Seeds of "breakdown" in this period of the Association can be found in several events. In 1846 a "Brief of Approbation" of the two societies, which the Bishop of LeMans opposed, was not approved by Rome. Some Josephites voiced complaints about the nature of the union of brothers and priests, wrote to Bishop Bouvier of LeMans about it, and took their complaint to the General Chapter of 1849.

The Revolution of 1848 in France fomented an unrest in the country and community that led to a large number of departures. The future of the community looked uncertain. Brother Leonard Guittoger and about ten or fifteen Brothers in France and Algeria discussed a plan for separation. They feared the dissolution of the Association and wanted to preserve the Brothers' Society. However, their plans were dropped before the General Chapter of 1849.

The General Chapter of 1855, in view of receiving approval and approbation by Rome of the congregation, provided for the merging of the autonomous governments of the two societies. Provinces then became mixed, but the distinction of the two societies was maintained. All Brothers belonged to the Brothers' Society.

In 1856, Rome issued a Decree of Praise, a final and necessary step toward full approval. It reads:

Worthy of praise is this institute made up of Priests and Laymen so joined together in friendly alliance that, while the nature of each Society is preserved, neither prevails over the other, but both cooperate in the best possible way in realizing their respective ends (Quoted in Fr. Barrosse, Circular Letter No. 24, p. 7).

We see, then, that:

The distinct clerical or lay character of the societies is recognized. Their equality is affirmed: "neither prevails over the other." Their collaboration in achieving their respective "ends" --today we would say "carrying out their respective ministries" --is acknowledged as the purpose of their union. Holy Cross is given existence as a papally approved religious congregation precisely as a congregation characterized by its recognition in its very structures of the distinctness and equality of clerical and lay vocations and their collaboration in mission (Fr. Barrosse, Circular Letter No. 24, p. 7).

E. Critical Phase

In 1857 the constitutions were approved for the men's societies. The scheme of the Association of Holy Cross was significantly modified in that the sisters were separated from the men's groups; the autonomous governments of the men's societies were fused, and there were to be priest superiors in the houses,

except in those houses exclusively of Brothers. Parity (equal numbers of priests and Brothers) was maintained on the general council and in the general chapter. At the time of our approbation there were 322 Brothers and 72 priests in the congregation.

In 1866 Moreau was forced to resign as general superior. Bishop Dufal (of Bengal) was elected in absentia as general superior. The news of his election and his subsequent return to France was greatly delayed by the complications of communication and travel. When he finally arrived in 1867, he found the congregation in the midst of great confusion and staggering financial difficulties. He was greatly distressed and overwhelmed by the situation.

Dufal was not the only one distressed. In a letter to Father Drouelle, C.S.C., Procurator General of Holy Cross, Pope Pius IX indicated that the confusion, disunion, and disorganization of the congregation that he had approved a mere ten years earlier were of grave concern to him. He went so far as to declare to Drouelle, "Your Motherhouse must disappear. . . ."

Father Drouelle, a contributor in his own right to the financial problems of the community, did manage to convince the Pope of an alternate plan to the dissolution of the congregation, namely, an extraordinary general chapter that would be held in Rome.

In the midst of this major crisis, Brother Leonard Guittoger secured eighteen signatures on a petition by brothers to separate from the priests. The petition charged gross mismanagement of the affairs of the congregation, and also that "capable Josephites are being influenced to become Salvatorists."

In 1868 an extraordinary general chapter was held in Rome. Bishop Dufal resigned as superior general and Edward Sorin, C.S.C. was elected to replace him. The chapter decided to liquidate the assets of the Motherhouse at Sainte-Croix (in LeMans) in order to pay the outstanding debts, move the general administration to Notre Dame du Lac (in Indiana), forbid Josephites to become Salvatorists (a prohibition which remained in effect for over one hundred years, until the 1974 General Chapter and post-Vatican II interim constitutions). The decisions of this chapter addressed the concerns of the "separation petition" by Brother Leonard and other Brothers, and the petition was withdrawn.

PERIOD III: CONGREGATION OF HOLY CROSS: U. S. A.

A. Refoundation

The chapter decision of 1868 to move the general administration to Notre Dame du Lac was no surprise. While a period of breakdown and crisis was occurring in France, the seeds of revitalization had been sown and were growing in

Indiana.

The Brothers sent to the Indiana mission with Father Sorin were primary-school teachers and involved in auxiliary services. They had a clear sense of mission and purpose, and consequently a clear identity. Edward Sorin, C.S.C. became a "father figure" to these Brothers, representing the American frontier spirit, and adaptation to a new land and circumstances. Vocations to Holy Cross from the ranks of new immigrants abounded.

B. Expansion

The Indiana mission expanded rapidly. After Sorin and the six Brothers arrived at Black Oak Ridge, Washington, Indiana in 1841, they immediately opened a novitiate. Moving to Notre Dame du Lac in 1842 gave the small mission group a patrimony of land and location, and by 1845 only three years after the founding of "du Lac," there were 45 Holy Cross personnel there including four priests, four Sisters, 30 Brothers, plus novices and candidates.

By 1854 the Indiana-based mission counted 67 Brothers and 23 priests in 22 United States foundations, including work in primary, secondary and commercial education. This rapid expansion is exemplified by the establishment of six colleges in the twenty-year period between 1856 and 1876 in such places as Susquehanna, Pennsylvania; Watertown, Wisconsin; Cincinnati, Ohio; Galveston, Texas; Brownsville, Texas; Austin, Texas; and Chicago, Illinois.

C. Stabilization

A period of stabilization ensued, largely because from 1860 onwards, most effort in the United States was concentrated at Notre Dame du Lac. Over one hundred foundations were opened between 1842 and 1893, but over sixty of these were closed. The Brothers were involved in most of the foundations as primary, commercial, or college teachers, and a great number in auxiliary services such as prefecting, manual labor and skilled trade enterprises such as farming, carpentry, engineering, construction, etc.

The General Chapter of 1872 established one novitiate for both priests and Brothers, and the General Chapter of 1880 called for a Brother assistant to the priest novice master. The 1865 Chapter decree prohibiting Josephites from becoming Salvatorists was extended to prohibit transfer from one society to another after the level of postulancy.

D. Breakdown

Edward Sorin died in 1893, and we begin to witness the seeds of breakdown again. With the death of their "father figure" the dormant complaints of

Brothers began to surface. Some of these complaints were a reaction to a decline in their own membership and in the number of schools. (At this time in the United States, primary education was being taken over rapidly by the religious Sisters.) Other complaints included no systematic recruitment of teaching Brothers, no re-education of primary-level teaching Brothers for higher levels of education, and low morale among the Brothers.

Fears of extinction again began to threaten the Brothers' Society, and many teachers left the congregation at this time because they could not see what the future held.

In 1901 several Brothers addressed a petition to the superior general, listing these grievances:

- they were losing schools and school personnel;
- there was too much distinction between priests and Brothers and the way they lived community life;
- there was little voice for Brothers in community government, especially on the local level.
- the teaching Brothers were being forced into manual labor for lack of teaching jobs available.

Part of this breakdown was characterized by the fact of no Brothers in formation from 1903 to 1906.

PERIOD IV: TWENTIETH CENTURY, PART I

I consider this period to be one of minimal survival, or an extended critical phase, according to our presentation format. We do find the seeds of revitalization, of course, from our privileged position of hindsight, but for those who lived through this period, this may not have been so clear. For the first time in our history, there was no charismatic leader (like a Dujarie, a Moreau, or a Sorin) on the scene, and I believe that contributes to the minimal maintenance situation of this period for the Brothers.

The 1906 General Chapter responded to some of the problems presented in the 1901 list of grievances by the Brothers. For example, it established Dujarie Institute as a formation house for Brothers destined for secondary-school teaching, and the recruitment of teaching Brothers was intensified. Father Francais was the first to encourage the Brothers to go into this high school teaching because he saw it as one of the greatest needs of the Church. However, in 1907, of over 210 Holy Cross religious, including novices, there are only forty teaching Brothers. (Parenthetically, 1924 is the first year a bachelor's degree from Notre Dame was earned by a teaching Brother.)

The General Chapter of 1906, in further attempting to deal with the 1901 list of grievances of the brothers, also decreed equal voice in provincial and general chapters for the priests and the Brothers, but the local level equality never really took hold. Brothers were given control over their schools or houses if they were exclusively teachers, such as at Holy Trinity in Chicago.

The problems of inequality, however, were still not solved. In 1910, a petition for separation was addressed to Rome by 48 Brothers of the American province, led by Brother Paul the Hermit, an assistant general. The reasons for the petition were these: the American provincial, Father Zahm, had implemented the much-needed 1898 decrees on studies for the American priests but not for the Brothers. He also seems to have assigned teachers to manual labor and to have expended little effort in encouraging Brothers' vocations. In addition, Brothers were being replaced by Sisters very widely in the elementary schools of the country. The chapter of 1906 elected a new provincial and decreed remedies, but Rome did not approve the chapter's decrees until mid-1909. The superior general, Father Francais, permitted the Brothers to discuss and vote on separation but recommended to Rome that their petition be refused. He said that the step would signal further divisions (between provinces, which already largely ignored one another, and between national groups within provinces) and probably ruin the entire congregation. Rome ordered the remedies suggested by the superior general, and the General Chapter of 1912 recognized that the motives underlying the petition no longer existed.

In this critical period, which I have characterized as one of minimal maintenance for our congregation, other problems surfaced. In 1932, three requests for separation were signed by a total of 96 priests of the American province, led by Father Thomas Crumley. The roots of this move go back to 1919, when the constitutions of the congregation were being adapted to the new code of canon law. A number of religious wanted extensive governmental changes introduced before the General Chapter of 1920, and directly petitioned Rome to this effect. They were refused, but certain changes they wanted were partially adopted by the chapter of 1920. For example, delegates to provincial chapters were to vote indiscriminately for priest or Brother delegates instead of only priests voting for priest delegates, and only Brothers for Brother delegates, as the petitioners had asked. In mixed houses, the Brothers usually outnumbered the priests, and in chapters they tended to vote as a block. The priests who ultimately petitioned Rome declared this situation a "domination" of the priests by the Brothers and maintained that it ill befitted the "dignity" of the clerical state. The superior general permitted discussion of the question. Before the General Chapter of

1932, it became clear that, except for some American priests, the congregation was opposed to separation, and the chapter eventually voted in favor of maintaining union (44 for and 7 against, with 2 blank votes). A petition was nevertheless sent to Rome and was rejected. Further attempts on the part of the petitioners in 1937 failed. The chapter had settled the fundamental question of principle: union was to be maintained, but it left to the future a full solution of the causes of the difficulty of 1932.

The General Chapter of 1945 inherited the task of trying to settle these disputes. Father Cousineau, Superior General at that time, appointed a committee to study changes. From among several suggestions, a plan for autonomous organization of both societies at the provincial level was eventually adopted by this chapter.

The General Chapter of 1945, then, restored autonomous government by reorganizing the provinces along societal lines. Provinces were thereafter to be composed exclusively of priests and clerics and exclusively of Brothers. However, some modifications made their way into the decisions of this chapter.

The Sacred Congregation for Religious ordered the establishment of coadjutor Brothers in both priest provinces and in Brother provinces. The juridical definition of a coadjutor Brother, according to the Sacred Congregation for Religious, is this: a lay religious without active or passive voice (may neither vote nor be voted for) in any congregational matters of government, and one engaged in auxiliary services. Therefore, the Sacred Congregation for Religious introduced a category of religious that had never existed in Holy Cross--religious without the right to vote. It further decreed that provinces of Brothers would have coadjutor Brothers and provinces of priests would have coadjutor Brothers.

When the present general administration of Father Thomas Barrosse inquired as to the reason for such a decision, and initiated a search of the archives of the Sacred Congregation, the archives revealed no documentation of the reason for such a modification of the 1945 General Chapter decree--only the record of the modification itself.

The Brothers' Society, given this decree of modification, appealed for an abolition of a class distinction among themselves as teaching Brothers and Brothers engaged in auxiliary services, and this appeal of the Brothers' Society was granted. Therefore, coadjutor Brothers existed in the priests' Society only.

This brought the circumstance within the congregation (which in 1946 had 376 finally professed Brothers and 387 priests) in which the Brothers engaged in manual labor had to choose to remain in a Brothers' province, or to choose to

transfer to a priests' province. The record of these changes is as follows:

U.S.A.: 107 remained in the Brothers' province
59 transferred to a priests' province
3 teaching Brothers requested transfers
Canada: 57 remained in the Brothers' province
59 transferred to a priests' province
5 teaching Brothers requested transfers
France: Could not be implemented immediately.

In 1947 the Sacred Congregation for Religious upheld the prohibition of transfer between societies, and decreed that members of the Brothers' Society were forbidden to join the Priests' Society, even after receiving a dispensation from their vows and re-applying! The 1950 Constitutions provided that coadjutor Brothers perform auxiliary services in priests' provinces; auxiliary services were understood by the provincials to exclude teaching. The General Chapters of 1951 and 1968, continuing the prohibition of transfers, decreed that a novice for the Brothers' Society could not later become a member of the Priests' Society.

PERIOD V: TWENTIETH CENTURY, PART II

A. Refoundation

After the lengthy critical phase characteristic of the first part of this century, and which I have indicated as a maintenance period, Holy Cross entered a new phase of revitalization. This phase occurred in the period immediately following the establishment of autonomous provinces, and was concurrent with the huge upswing of priestly and religious vocations to the Church that followed World War II.

The autonomous provinces went their independent ways as per our Holy Cross traditions of very strong provinces. (We had been going our independent ways as provinces since Sorin went to Indiana. . . Why should that have changed?) The mission and identity were very clear as autonomous provinces. The priests were identified as educators, chaplains, parish ministers, and itinerant preachers; the coadjutor Brothers, as lay religious who performed auxiliary services in apostolates of the priests; and the Brothers' Society Brothers, as teachers, with some also performing auxiliary services in apostolates under the Brothers' direction.

As a Brothers' Society, all our manpower and resources were directed to our schools and our institutions. Secondary education was identified as our primary apostolate, and we opened schools and other educational enterprises (for example, child-care facilities) around the country. This was a definite response

to the needs of the Church of that time, especially in light of the elaborate systems of Catholic education being launched, the baby boom contributing to large numbers of Catholic children in need of education, and the Roman Catholic Church's "coming of age" in American society.

Brother Ephrem O'Dwyer, the first Brother provincial in Holy Cross, was a shrewd and charismatic leader, who knew how to motivate people and develop a system of Holy Cross education. Our governance as a province was very mechanical and efficient. . . a "step-into-line-and-move-ahead" format that proved very appropriate for the times.

Our organization was highly centralized, too. There was an elaborate school system, common financial procedures, and other common practices in our schools. There was a unified sense of school government and resources (common curricula, discipline procedures, dress codes); and power flowed from Notre Dame and, obviously, Brother Ephrem. We had "our schools." We no longer had to work for the diocese (and that might also have meant "priests.")

B. Expansion

Expansion occurred almost immediately. Overflow crowds of people joined us to become Brothers. In 1958, we split into three American Brothers' provinces, that move having been preceded by a vice-province structure initiated by the East and South-West in 1956. We opened new houses of studies (Austin and North Easton), and another novitiate (Valatie). There was a heavy emphasis on preparing to teach, and also a heavy sacrifice demanded of the group: financial debts were shared equally around the country, and many Brothers started their teaching careers without their bachelor's degree, expecting to complete this work during the summer months or at night school along the way. This was an acceptable practice because of the great needs in the apostolate for the teaching Brothers.

A cultural transformation of sorts took place in our religious identity as we became concerned with professionalism. We had a vigorous apostolic experience as teaching Brothers, enjoyed a high visibility, and a deep sense of unity (and even uniformity) in "making it on our own" (which may be read: "without the perceived domination of the priests!"). Our identity was also enhanced by the 1950 Constitutions which were very clear and specific regarding our role in education, and specifying our community structures and common life practices.

Our vigorous apostolic spirit and the call of the Church to "tithe" personnel for the overseas missions led to the establishment of new foundations in Brazil (1951), Ghana (1957), Liberia (1962), Uganda (1959), and Tanzania, as well as the bolstering of our long-term presence in Bangladesh. Our houses of formation in the 1950's and early 1960's were bursting with novices and scholastics.

C. Stabilization

A stabilization period became evident in the 1960's; we were committed to preserving and passing on our traditions of quality service to God's people, especially in our institutional apostolates. Province properties accumulated, with provincial houses, novitiates, scholasticates, a Brothers' infirmary, and a Brothers' Center being constructed. The "ends" of the congregation, so clearly stated in our 1950 Constitutions as ecclesiastical ministry, Christian instruction and education, foreign missions, and auxiliary services, were easily recognized as the definable ministries of the overwhelming majority of Holy Cross members, especially in the Brothers' Society.

The world about us was beginning to experience a cultural transformation, however, and that transformation was brought home to us rather quickly by Vatican Council II. The College of Bishops called the Church to look beyond our "ghetto mentality"; it called the Church to be inserted into the modern world, and to respond to the needs and longings of that world. This new vision of the Church as the People of God demanded a radical renewal of religious life, and enfranchisement of the laity, and required a quantum leap in the vision of all Catholics. We in Holy Cross entered this period with our characteristic vigor, and the General Chapter of 1968 approved an interim constitution conformable to the vision and reforms instituted by Vatican II.

D. Breakdown

There was a price to be paid for such rapid and all-encompassing reforms, however, and that price was reflected in an "Identity Crisis." Who were we as Holy Cross, as religious, and as religious Brothers in this new Church? Such questions were prompted by the almost instantaneous loss of symbols that were associated with our special life: the common dress, specific and legalistic constitutions, and common prayers specific to Holy Cross. Apostolic activity became diversified in response to a broader vision of needs, and the phenomena of individual apostolates, small community living, and living apart from community residences were no longer rare exceptions. There was a drastic drop in the number of candidates and novices entering Holy Cross, and a large number of professed religious departed from the community ranks.

The cultural transformations which affected our life as Catholics, as Holy Cross religious, and as religious Brothers in Holy Cross can be easily traced. Sacrosanctam Concilium (1963), the Vatican II decree calling for a vast restoration of liturgical practice, had an immediate and traumatic effect on all Catholics. Perfectae Caritatis (1965) decreed the renewal of religious life in the Church, with a special emphasis on returning to the spirit and charism of the

Founder. Renovationis Causam (1969) outlined a renewal of religious formation in communities, and vastly transformed the root experiences characteristic of our initiation into religious life. Some of our numbers welcomed the reforms with open arms; others felt that their world, Church, and spirituality fell apart, and all were forced to question our religious identity.

Concurrent phenomena in the Society and the congregation affected our vision of ourselves. The 1960's saw the end of the Colonial Era in the developing countries, and a consequent rise in nationalism. Foreign missionaries were often caught in the crossfire of resentment between the indigenous and colonials, often finding themselves ranked with the colonials. Nationalization of the hierarchies and Church institutions abruptly transformed our role in the missions to one of support and cooperation with inexperienced indigenous leadership. Governmental instability and corruption in the newly independent nations compounded the situation for the long-term missionaries who had known and experienced other ways. The Church's entire mission effort was called into question, and our Holy Cross life and contribution to the missions were similarly affected.

In 1960 there were four novitiate houses in the United States: Jordan, Minnesota, and Bennington, Vermont, for the Priests' Society novices (seminarians and coadjutor Brothers); Rolling Prairie, Indiana, and Valatie, New York, for Brothers' Society novices. Ten years later, in 1970, there was a single United States novitiate for both (Priests' Society and Brothers' Society novices) at Bennington. This change reflected two major circumstances, one practical and one philosophical: (1) the drastic decrease in numbers of novices in both societies; and (2) a clarity of understanding that we as Holy Cross members are, first of all, called as religious, and then secondarily, as cleric or lay. Hence, a common initiation into the religious life and the Holy Cross constitutions was philosophically and theologically sound. One might ask whether the bulk of the membership of Holy Cross, formed in separate single-society novitiates attached to the homogeneous provinces, appreciated or understood the second philosophical reason, given the first logistical reason. Nevertheless, such a root transformation in our initiation experience in Holy Cross again raised the question of our identity.

A further radical/root transformation in our life as Holy Cross religious occurred when the General Chapter of 1974 revised Statute 133 to read as follows:

Anyone admitted to the novitiate as a candidate for one of the two societies may not later become a member of the other society without the agreement of both interested provincials, with the consent of their councilors, and the permission of the superior general, with the consent of the general assistants.

This decree, while in theory allowing the transfer from one society to

the other in either direction, had the primary effect of allowing Brothers in the Brothers' Society to seek priestly ordination and still remain in the Congregation of Holy Cross. This overturned a prohibition in effect for 106 years, since the General Chapter of 1868. A number of Brothers sought a transfer in view of ordination. (Furthermore, a "Gentleman's Agreement" was reached among the provincials that there would be no further recruitment of coadjutor Brothers.) The General Chapter of 1980 in an appendix addressed difficulties arising from the implementation of Statute 133 by recommending "Procedures for a Change of Societies."

The first situation (revising Statute 133) evoked questions about the "stability" of the Brother's vocation. The second situation (the "Gentlemen's Agreement") remained unpublished, although not unknown, and may have been greatly influenced by the following developments: (1) the evolution of the apostolate of the coadjutor Brothers, and (2) the evolution of the governing and voting rights of lay members of religious institutes.

With the call of Vatican II for the development of lay ministries in the Church, the role of lay religious (Sisters and Brothers) likewise expanded to ministries beyond the more traditional apostolates. For Brothers engaged in auxiliary services, for example, opportunities to pursue ministries other than those traditional services were allowed. Therefore, a number of Brothers, previously engaged in auxiliary services, commenced training for apostolates in teaching, counseling, drama, administration, nursing, pastoral ministry, etc.

This phenomenon was observed among the coadjutor Brothers, too. However, coadjutor Brothers in Holy Cross, as indicated by the 1950 Constitutions (Const. V), were to engage in auxiliary services in the apostolates of the Priests' Society, and this was understood by the provincials to exclude teaching. Now, several coadjutor Brothers were engaged in teaching, school administration, pastoral ministry, etc., and the opportunity to move into new apostolates, and to receive the training required, was open to coadjutor Brothers. Our post-Vatican II understandings would consider this situation to be a natural evolution in concept and practice, yet this evolution brings on another question of identity, namely: "What, again, is the difference between Brothers of the Brothers' Society and Brothers of the Priests' Society in Holy Cross?"

The decree on the Adaptation and Renewal of Religious Life (Perfectae Caritatis, 1965), among its many recommendations, contains in paragraph 15 a directive that, in my opinion, profoundly affected the identity of the religious Brothers in Holy Cross. I quote:

. . . That all the members be more closely knit by the bond of brotherly love, those who are called lay-Brothers, assistants (coadjutors), or some similar name should be drawn closely into the life and work of the community. . . .

Monasteries of men and communities which are not exclusively lay can, according to their nature and constitutions, admit clerics and lay persons on an equal footing and with equal rights and obligations; excepting those which flow from sacred orders.

Implementing this directive, the General Chapter of 1974 enfranchised the coadjutor Brothers in the Priests' Society, allowing active voice and limited passive voice (in the Priests' Society, superiors must be priests, Statute 90), and specified that, on the General Level, the First Assistant General would be a Brother (Statute 71, Statute 68). This chapter also directed the provincial chapters to "examine and give their opinion on a revision of Statute 68 so as to make Brothers as well as priests eligible for the office of superior general" (Decrees of the General Chapter of 1974, #3). In light of that consultation, the General Chapter of 1980 decreed that:

The office of superior general is to be opened to all finally professed members of the congregation by revising Statute 68. The chapter mandates the general administration to seek a way to do this before the general chapter of 1986, requesting a dispensation if necessary, without prejudice to the rights the congregation enjoys at present in the areas of formation and jurisdiction. . . . (Decrees of the General Chapter of 1980, #4).

The Revised Code of Canon Law of 1983 retained the classification of religious communities as either clerical or lay (Canon 588), and Holy Cross stands classified as a clerical institute. The general administration has, therefore, petitioned for a dispensation from the requirement that eligibility for the office of Supreme Moderator (Superior General) of our clerical institute be reserved to priests of Holy Cross. As of this writing, the request is still pending.

With the evolution of the apostolate of the coadjutor Brothers, the enfranchisement of the coadjutor Brothers and the declaration that the office of superior general be open to all finally professed religious, and the lifting of the prohibition of Brothers' Society members transferring to the Priests' Society in view of ordination, one might ask again: What is the identity of the religious Brother in Holy Cross? And further, what now is the actual difference between Brothers who are members of the Brothers' Society and Brothers who are members of the Priests' Society? Are the Brother members of one society more or less Holy Cross Brothers than the Brothers who are members of the other society?

That the juridical question needed to be addressed was no new development; the General Chapter of 1974, in Decree #3, stated:

The council of the congregation is to evaluate the status and evolution of the coadjutor brothers as these relate to the rights and status of the two societies and their union and collaboration (Decrees of the General Chapter of 1974, #3).

The General Chapter of 1980 repeated the above decree word for word (Decrees of the General Chapter of 1980, #3).

E. Critical Period

According to the classifications I have chosen in presenting this paper, it would appear that we have reached another critical phase in our history as a congregation, and in the evolution of our religious identity as Brothers of Holy Cross. As of January 1, 1985, we had 1822 members in Holy Cross: 1002 in the Priests' Society (including about 90 coadjutor Brothers), and 820 in the Brothers' Society. . . or, to a point where we are in numbers half clerics and half Brothers. And, as in the times that have preceded the present day, I feel we are being called to respond to a situation not unlike those of our past: Moreau restructuring of the Brothers of Saint Joseph, or the 1857 approval of our constitutions fusing the men's governments and separating the Sisters, or the selling of the Motherhouse, or the death of Father Sorin, or the establishment of homogeneous provinces, or Vatican II. The situation to which I refer is the definitive approval of our post-Vatican II constitution.

The Council of the Congregation has proposed that the General Chapter of 1986 deal primarily with the approval of our constitution as its agenda, and that any related issues be dealt with in that context. One of the related issues, of course, is what we call the "coadjutor question," more properly called "the identity of the religious Brother in Holy Cross." How we as a congregation define ourselves, and how we as a congregation live out that definition, will determine at this critical phase whether we become extinct, we minimally survive, or we experience another revitalization.

That there are differing opinions on the matter is public knowledge. Here are two contrasting recommendations forwarded to the general chapter from specific provincial chapters.

From the South-West Brothers' Province:

The Provincial is asked to forward the following statement to the Superior General as input for the General Chapter of 1986.

Father Dujarie founded the Brothers of St. Joseph to work in union with priests and sisters. Father Moreau joined the auxiliary priests and the Brothers of St. Joseph in founding a single congregation. Until the General Chapter of 1945, initiating autonomous provinces, all brother-candidates were incorporated into the Brothers' Society. After the General Chapter of 1945, the Congregation of Religious intervened, initiating membership of brothers in the Priests' Society.

Because this structure seems to confuse the public identity of the brothers in either society as well as act as an obstacle to full collaboration between the societies, the South-West Provincial Chapter encourages the General Chapter of 1986 to work toward integration of the two groups of brothers in Holy Cross.

Respecting the personal history of the individual coadjutor brothers, this chapter recommends that, in any such integration, although these brothers may continue in the Priests' Society, all future brother-candidates would be incorporated into the Brothers' Society.

From the Eastern Priests' Province:

The chapter endorses the vocation of the brother in the Priests' Society.

The chapter endorses resuming acceptance of brother candidates in the Priests' Society.

The chapter endorses our continuing collaboration with the Brothers' Society.

It is the competence of the general chapter to submit a definitive constitution to the Holy See for approval. In doing so, this chapter must reconcile somehow those contrasting opinions as to the identity of the religious Brother in Holy Cross, and thus our identity as a congregation. Each of us, as Holy Cross religious, must also search his heart, beg the guidance of the Spirit, and search for indications of God's Will (i.e., the demands of the Gospel) in this matter.

I close this historical reflection with the words of Father Barrosse in his Circular Letter No. 24; may it guide our thinking and discussion on the very nature of our congregation and on its future development.

It seems to me that we must keep certain points in mind. (1) It is imperative to remain open to change. (2) It is important to recognize that any changes we make will be followed by still further changes in the future. (3) It is fundamental that we appreciate our distinctive vocation as religious of Holy Cross. It is this that we want to put more effectively at the service of the Church and the world. (4) It is indispensable that we approach the future in a spirit of discernment.

The future is God's. It is for us to recognize the signs he gives of the direction he wishes us to take. Discernment is the process by which we attempt to do so. It means reading the signs of the times in the light of the gospel. But true discernment is possible only if certain conditions are satisfied. (a) Those engaged in it must be really open to whatever the outcome of the discernment may be, whether it accords with their earlier preferences or not. Without this detachment from our own feelings and preconceived positions, an authentic discernment is unthinkable: we are not really seeking God's will but our own. (b) They must inform themselves as completely as possible on the question. (c) They must really listen to the others engaged in the same discernment and try to hear what this may indicate of God's will (that is, of the demands of the gospel) in the matter. I pray that both before the general chapter and during its sessions it will be the sincere desire of all of us involved to engage in a true discernment of God's designs on our future and I urge all of you to pray for that intention (Father Barrosse, Circular Letter No. 24, p. 19).