Abstract: The traditional structure of the Roman Catholic parish is destined for major change as a result of the confluence of many significant challenges concurrently facing dioceses in various parts of the world. Some dioceses have begun or are beginning to address the future with various experiments to face these challenges. Four types of change are presented in this paper as well as focus on the “Renew My Church” initiative in the Archdiocese of Chicago. Significant change in traditional parish life disrupts the familiar pattern of faith life for many church going Catholics, often leading to a loss of hope, resignation, and depression among many parishioners. How might Religious Educators develop programs to help alleviate the pain of losing familiar parish structures and provide hope for the future as dioceses reconfigure parish structures?

Title: Religious Education for a Roman Catholic Diocese’s Structural Reorganization

Despite the myriad challenges facing Catholic parish life, Pope Francis is hopeful and visionary about the Catholic parish.

The parish is not an outdated institution; precisely because it possesses great flexibility, it can assume quite different contours depending on the openness and missionary creativity of the pastor and the community. While certainly not the only institution which evangelizes, if the parish proves capable of self-renewal and constant adaptivity, it continues to be ‘the Church living in the midst of the homes of her sons and daughters.’ This presumes that it really is in contact with the homes and the lives of its people, and does not become a useless structure out of touch with people or a self-absorbed group made up of a chosen few.” (Evangelii Gaudium, 28)

Consider for a moment some of the myriad cultural, financial, demographic, and administrative challenges of church structures today. In the past two decades there has been a precipitous decline of the number of people who attend church regularly. They no longer financially support the church. Many Catholic immigrant groups from round the world who are church goers, often live on the economic margins of American life. They do not have the financial capability to support the church.

Financial settlements for sexual abuse have been costly for most all involved dioceses. Some dioceses have declared bankruptcy as a result of these settlements. Another financial drain are the great number of parishes that no longer have many Catholic church-going
households. Particularly in urban settings, many of these parishes are saddled with impressive but costly cathedral-sized church edifices built in the late 19th and early 20th century, now needing ongoing expensive maintenance, and today serving a chapel-sized congregation.

The reality of more parishes than priests to pastor them is a fact in some dioceses, and will become the norm in the not too distant future in many more dioceses. An increasing number of priests now pastor more than a single parish.

Clearly, institutional Catholicism is in media res with these complex and interrelated problems. An epic sized leadership solution is needed rather than a managerial quick fix. Diocesan-wide master plans that involve the clergy, both priests and permanent deacons, lay ministers, religious, educators, parishioners, and members of the civic communities are called for to find a relevant and sustainable future for Catholicism.

This paper explores the question: How might Religious Educators contribute to this ongoing process that will facilitate hope rather than despair as the church works its way past this set of significant challenges to a sustainable and faith-filled future? Might a curriculum be developed that: (1) provides comparative information about ongoing realignments in various dioceses, both nationally and internationally; (2) eases the anxiety of faithful people who are immersed in a significant time of change; and (3) facilitates a transformation of ecclesial consciousness among all stakeholders in the life of faith?

This paper focuses primarily on the first point – useful information about ongoing experiments aimed at creating and sustaining a viable future for Catholic Church parish life. Four significant experiments of reconfiguration of parishes and parish life are presented. The newly launched, “Renew My Church” initiative of Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago as well as some history and tradition of that archdiocese give a substantial though not exclusive context for understanding and exploration of the epic task at hand. This paper concludes by exploring what might Religious Educators have to offer this ongoing tectonic shift of parish life.

TRACING SOCIAL AND PERSONAL CHICAGO CATHOLIC HISTORY AND CULTURE

“What parish are you from?”

At one time this was quintessentially Chicago-Speak. Answering this question in the latter part of the nineteenth century when parishes were organized by nationalities, identified one’s ethnicity. As parishes began to be organized by geographical boundaries rather than ethnic identity in the twentieth century, answering this question revealed the particular city
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1 This inquiry into the restructuring of the Archdiocese of Chicago is both personal and professional. I am a product of this archdiocese. I also have studied and taught courses in pastoral leadership, written a book titled, The Emerging Pastor which documented and reflected on the emergence of non-ordained people who pastored Catholic parishes that no longer had resident priests, a phenomenon begun in the early 1980s in rural dioceses in America, and has been adopted as a pastoral model for some parishes in mid-size and urban dioceses since that time.
neighborhood or suburb where one resided. Even some non-Catholics in Chicagoland used Catholic parish identification as a means of telling people where they lived.

I lived in St. Philip Neri parish through my third grade education, including kindergarten, at the parish school. The Adrian, Michigan Dominicans ran the grammar school and a Catholic high school for women, St. Thomas Aquinas, also on the parish grounds. The church was mammoth, the pastor, a monsignor with the added honorific Protonotarius Apostolicus (P.A) which gave the pastor the right to wear a miter and process with a crozier, the usual artifacts of a bishop. “I’m from St. Philip Neri” as that time meant living in a heavily Jewish neighborhood as part of a strong Irish subculture.

My parents moved to St. Cajetan’s parish the summer after third grade, and I went to that parish school for grades four through eight. “I’m from St. Cajetan’s” meant living at the edge of the city, more suburban than urban, with many newly built houses as a result of the GI Bill of Rights amidst the older area of Morgan Park, and far away from the block by block racially changing neighborhoods endemic to the south and west sides of Chicago. Racial prejudice was baked into the DNA of the area, many homeowners having fled their changing neighborhoods to what they considered a “safe” area of the city, not so much in terms of crime, but in terms of maintaining their property values.

This particular Chicago-Speak communicated far more than ethnic identity and/or neighborhood affiliation. It also echoed a triumphal pride about being Catholic in an American Midwest city grown muscular through immigrant settlement from Europe. This pride was incarnated primarily in specific parishes serving the needs of Catholic immigrants and their succeeding generations. Sunday masses, baptisms, first communions, confirmations, weddings, and funerals were the liturgical bulwark of the parish experience. Novenas, missions, Stations of the Cross, First Fridays, Benediction, and other para-liturgical devotions further buttressed parishioners to parish. Church basements and school halls were the epicenter of parish/neighborhood social life hosting a myriad of activities and clubs. One parish, St. Alphonsus, built a huge activity center known as The Athenaeum housing a gymnasium, theatre, bowling alleys, and meeting rooms. (Koenig, 56)

The vast Catholic school system of the Archdiocese of Chicago, once the third largest school system -- public or private -- in the United States, further anchored children and their parents to their parish. More often than not, building the parish grammar school predated the construction of the church. At the time of the Great Chicago Fire in October, 1871, there were more Catholic schools than public schools in Chicago. The title of the monograph, The Church that was a School well captures premier place of Catholic education in 19th and 20th century parish life.

TODAY’S CATHOLIC REALITIES

Today, the above portrait of Chicago Catholicism is largely a gone world. “After a century and a half of steady expansion, Catholic parishes in the United States have entered an era of restructuring and consolidation.” (Clark p. 93.) To be sure, there are stand-alone vibrant
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Catholic parishes, both in the city and suburbs, but most all do have a homogeneous ethic population from a surrounding, insular neighborhood. Parishes are no longer the still point of the turning world for most all urban Catholics in America today. Nor do many parishes today have their own schools, and those that do have very high tuition rates in comparison to the time when parish schools were staffed almost exclusively by female religious orders who received minimal stipends for their extraordinary dedicated service.

There is yet another significant change in Catholic parish life the last quarter century. Increasingly, Catholics, particularly in urban areas, choose what parish to attend rather than their geographical parish. The 1917 Code of Canon Law assigned Catholics to their geographical parish (Canon 216). The 1983 Code of Canon Law no longer holds geography as the sole determinant of parish participation (Canon 518). “Destination parishes” are on the rise in contemporary Catholic culture. So too are “intentional parishes,” officially designated parishes to serve a particular group of people, e.g., young adults, particular immigrant groups, or Tridentine mass enthusiasts.

The reasons more church going Catholics choose a parish are many, among them: some follow a particular priest to another parish when he is transferred; some search for high quality of music; some are attracted by powerful homilies that touch their lives; some feel called to social justice actions embodied in a particular parish; some go to the parish where their children attend Catholic school.

Parish allegiance according to choice rather than geography is one of the major realignments in contemporary Catholicism. This ever increasing reality acknowledges that all parish are not alike, cannot be alike, and should not be alike. The ever growing diversity within Catholicism is manifested by an array of parish styles. The massive cultural shift from “pray, pay, and obey” to active, participatory membership in church, from, “father knows best” to personal formation of conscience, particularly in sexual matters, e.g., birth control (the 1968 encyclical, *Humanae Vitae* has been widely ignored) irregular marriages, and LGBTQ issues, has led close to 50% of church going Catholics in urban areas to choose their faith community rather than be assigned to a parish through their geographical residence. (Wedam) Parish allegiance therefore becomes transitory.

This phenomenon of attending “destination parishes” reflects a larger trend in society.

One engaging alternative may be the “ecclesial movement:” a fluid, open-ended, temporary, choice-driven set of relationships and activities where entry and exit are easy and frequent. Such “loose connections” in sociologist Robert Wuthnow’s pointed phrase, increasingly describe the ties among citizens of late modernity they are people who voluntarily choose the relationships they enter rather than be compelled by obligations or ascriptive (intrinsic) bonds. (Wedam)

**THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO**

In November, 2014, the long serving Francis Cardinal George was replaced with Archbishop Blase Cupich. This cosmic shift of leadership within the Archdiocese of Chicago mirrors the shift of emphasis, style, and content brought about with the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI and the election of Pope Francis in 2013. Archbishop Cupich has set about to restructure the entire archdiocese in a way that is fiscally responsible while at the same time
prioritizing the mission of the church rooted in the Gospel, with special concern for evangelization, social justice, and pastoral services. What has been announced as perhaps a decade long process given the name, *Renew My Church* appears to be a holistic enterprise with wide-ranging input from all stakeholders within the archdiocese: clergy, i.e., priests and deacons, lay ministers, people in the pews. Information from other dioceses facing similar situations will be collected and considered. An extensive archdiocesan parishioner survey was conducted in 2015 to begin this process.

Twenty vicariate meetings were subsequently held for parish staffs and parish lay leaders across the archdiocese. The Priests’ Day held on June 7, 2016 focused on an update on the *Renew My Church* progress and process. A Power Point presentation viewed by the priests in attendance marked, “- CONFIDENTIAL FOR PRIESTS -” seemed to compromise the initial announcements of wide ranging participation for all stakeholders. The fact that some stakeholders, i.e., priests, are more privileged to information than other stakeholders unfortunately belies the outreach to all stakeholders as full and equal participants in this ongoing process, and promotes an unhealthy clerical culture.

The Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago has to its advantage several experiments ongoing in dioceses in this country and around the world. It also has to its advantage an Archbishop who is willing to confront the present untenable situation in a long term, holistic manner, avoiding a quite fix that favors substitution and management over ministry and sacramental community. Among the ongoing experimentations are: (1) parish mergers; (2) multi-cultural parishes; (3) diocesan-wide reconfiguration abandoning the traditional parish led by a priest pastor; (4) non-ordained people pastoring parishes. Each of these experiments, or variations of each, that reorganizes traditional parish structures into new modes of delivery sustainable for the future is beneficial information for all stakeholders to know.

From a Religious Education perspective, it is the first step in the traditional stages of religious education: (1) information; (2) formation; and (3) transformation. While this first stage – informational – is the substantial focus of the remainder of this paper, the other two stages, ultimately, are critical to role Religious Education can play in the restructuring of American Catholicism.

PARISH MERGING

The first model, the merged parish, combines two or more parishes into a single entity. Merged parishes, according to William Clark, S.J. “are fraught with now-familiar problems including community identity and loyalties, turf battles, staff redundancies, and changing clerical leadership roles, the very sorts of problems that can encourage suspicion and even the direct undermining of collaborative efforts.” (Clark, forthcoming) The style by which parishes are merged into a single entity is crucially important both to the short term and long term health of the merged parish. Clark has identified two styles of merger: (1) administrative and (2) communal.

An administrative style favors efficiency, cost effectiveness, and the availability of priests as the central authority, i.e., the diocese acts, usually with dispatch, to create the new parish structure. One notable example of this administrative style was the 2005 restructuring of the Diocese of Essen, Germany. Overnight, the number of parishes was reduced from 270 to 43! (Henkelmann and Sonntage)
A community style, in contrast to the administrative style, view the involved parishes as those who best understand their own strengths and weaknesses, and rely on their input to eventually shape an ultimate strategy for merger. This latter style takes much more time to unfold organically than does the administrative style of mergers.

William Clark, S.J. has identified four salient benchmarks for parish mergers: (1) process; (2) pastoral leadership; (3) community identity; and (4) social ministry. These four benchmarks are carried out in contrasting behaviors in the administrative and the community style.

Clark concludes his observations on his detailed study of merged parishes:

To put it very starkly, a combinations of too little regard for the communities and staffs and too great regard for the clerical leadership cannot result in a happy situation for the leader, nor for the staffs, nor for the communities. A successful merger cannot result from a process that unfolds as if the very existence of the communities and staffs were already something of an inconvenience, or as if any ordained person could effectively lead any combination of communities by virtue of his ordination alone.

When, on the other hand, the whole leadership recognizes the special character of each sub-community, and the ways they are inter-related, and makes efforts to acknowledge, reverence, and nurture those sub-communities, all sorts of creative solutions became possible. (Clark, 125)

THE MULTI-CULTURAL PARISH

The second model, the multi-cultural parish, reflects the reality of the United States’ change of immigration law in the mid-1960s which admitted many more peoples from around the world rather than heavily favoring European populations. Catholic immigrant populations who settle in urban areas like Chicago frequently become parishioners of already existing Anglo parishes. Their particular styles of practicing Catholicism, different not only in language, but also in devotional pieties, are not served well by parishes exclusively oriented toward an Anglo congregation. Immigrant groups often feel as outsiders in Anglo parishes. Some Anglos fear that as their parish becomes multi-cultural, their needs will no longer be met.

A parish moving from a single culture of Catholicism to serving two or sometimes more cultures of Catholicism is increasingly a challenging demographic of urban Catholicism. Likewise, parish mergers might combine parishes with more than one ethnic population creating a similar situation.

Studies of multi-cultural parishes, whether created by immigrant groups moving into a specific parish boundary, or by merging parishes, reflect various ways of proceeding, from top-down authoritarian decision making to bottom up consensus building. Brett Hoover, author of the 2014 book The Shared Parish: Latinos and the future of U.S. Catholicism has made several observations about multi-cultural parishes. He claims that because of the task orientation of American culture, clerical leadership often reflects this value that favors top down authoritarian management. However, successful leaders of multi-cultural parishes, “…understood their leadership as primarily about shaping the corporate identity and culture of the parish.” (Hoover, forthcoming) This is best accomplished through bottom up consensus building. Furthermore,
since many multi-cultural parishes serve working class or poor populations who do not have the educational qualifications to be employed as lay ecclesial ministers, they rely on volunteers, most all of whom are women, to staff the religious education and sacramental preparation programs. Apostolic movements frequently serve as schools of lay leadership and spirituality for immigrant populations in multi-cultural parishes rather than graduate programs in ministry at universities and seminaries.

Brett Hoover sees the multi-cultural parish as a difficult venue for welcoming everyone equally, and eventually coalescing varying cultures into a single, mature faith community. “In my experience as a researcher, only a few parishes manage to balance the real pastoral need for worship and ministry in distinct languages or for different cultural groups with a coherent common sense of parish and Church.” (forthcoming)

NON-ORDAINED PASTORS, aka PASTORAL ADMINISTRATORS

In the early 1980s some bishops in rural dioceses of the United States, rather than closing and/or merging long existing parishes, decided to appoint non-ordained personnel to administer parishes no longer having resident priests. Eventually this movement spread to certain mid-size and large dioceses also. Initially many parishioners in these parishes who were the recipients of non-ordained pastors feared it was the first step of their diocese to close or merge their parish, and were hesitant to accept or approve of non-ordained leadership. However, the repeated behavior pattern in these parishes is that once the parishioners realized ministry continued, sometimes more effectively than past performances of some priest-pastors, most all embraced this model. (Gilmour)

This model of parish leadership continues to grow throughout the United States, but with two caveats. First, a change of bishops in a diocese might well mean a change in policy regarding the appointment of non-ordained pastors. Secondly, there has been a decided shift from religious women and lay people functioning in this role to permanent deacons functioning in this role. Most all of the early appointments of non-ordained pastors were religious women who were familiar with consensus oriented decision making in their respective religious orders, and employed this style of leadership in their newly found role as non-ordained pastors. Thirdly, though “non-ordained pastors” is the most highly descriptive and communicative phrase that captures the reality of their presence and ministry, the term, “pastoral administrators” is now commonly used to identify people who function in this role.

This experiment advantages the already existing parish by maintaining its singular heritage and identity, its church building along with other physical structures, and its pastoral services and programs, except for the daily celebration of the Eucharist on weekdays and sometimes funeral and nuptial masses. Most Sundays a visiting priest or an officially assigned sacramental minister leads the Eucharist. But in the future that could become less frequent depending on the number of priests who are available to carry out the Sunday Eucharist.

DIOCESAN RECONFIGUREMENT

A far reaching reconfiguration of a diocese has been an ongoing experiment in the Archdiocese of Poitiers, France, located about 200 miles southwest of Paris, since the 1980s. Instead of replacing priests with religious women, deacons, or lay ministers, the diocese inaugurated a remarkably participative synodal process that embraced Canon 516.2 which allows
a bishop to develop other ways of serving the faithful when traditional parish structures no longer work. The archdiocese was reconfigured into “pastoral sectors,” each with a pastoral council responsible for the proclamation of the gospel, prayer, and service, in addition to the financial management of the sector. Additionally, they are responsible for renewing membership of the sector’s pastoral council newly elected members every third year.

This model challenges the viability of traditional parishes, and the long entrenched clerical model of leadership. “One world is being erased another is emerging, without there being any pre-determined model for its construction” wrote the French Bishops in their 1996 letter. In the diocese of Poitiers, France centralization and reproductive change were abandoned for a new way of doing things, i.e., decentralization and productive change. The bishop is the pastor of every sector. This experiment, launched a quarter century ago, is still considered to be in an early stage of development even though other dioceses have emulated parts of this plan.

The reconfiguration of the Archdiocese of Poitiers is similar to what Marshall McLuhan calls a break-boundary, and classically trained Latinists would call a caesura. The previous way of doing things, i.e., the traditional parish, cannot be a useful template for this new way of organizing pastoral presence and services across a diocese.

THE CONTRIBUTION RELIGIOUS EDUCATORS MIGHT FACILITATE TO THE RECONFIGURATION OF CATHOLIC PARISH LIFE

The above four models of diocesan reconfiguration, even though they are very much ongoing experiments, have a better chance of succeeding with a long term approach that relies on widespread, bottom up consultation. Religious educators can play a significant leadership role in a long term, highly consultative process to reconfigure diocesan structures. Should a diocese opt for a short term, top down managerial fix, the voice of the religious educator, as well as other stake holders, becomes mute. The following comments and reflections are predicated on a long term and widespread consultative model for diocesan reconfiguration.

If religious educators are to bring their professional competencies to this major challenge facing dioceses and parishes, they must, first educate themselves about the many and varied experiments already in progress in various dioceses around the world. Subsequently, they need to focus on the adult population of church going Catholics, especially older adults who have a strong memory of and satisfaction with the traditional ways of parish life.

The four brief, thumbnail sketches of ongoing experiments presented above are examples of what needs first to be investigated, probed, reflected upon, and evaluated by Religious Educators, and subsequently develop programs that will present information about these ongoing experiments in diocesan and parish restructuring to parishioners.

Religious Educators need to keep in mind that many of their parishioners will be in the grieving process for a parish that no longer can independently sustain itself as they had known it and treasured it. Many parishioners will be working their way through the classic five stages of grief -- denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance -- but each at their own pace in their own way. Not only must Religious Educators keep in mind this grieving process, realizing that individual parishioners will be in different stages of grieve simultaneously, but also build an educational program which recognizes and honors everyone’s process of grieving.
Whatever educational programs Religious Educators might develop to help move the
church of the present into the church of the future, long term processes need to be incorporated,
not short term solutions. The problems facing the structures of Catholicism did not appear
overnight and cannot be solved overnight. Short term management must be eschewed in favor of
long term leadership. Any program that suggests a quick fix solution is not doing anyone any
favors.

All of the above models, or various combinations, are dependent upon a vision and
practice of leadership that is widely participatory and consultative. “The health of our church
communities calls for collaborative approaches that engage and sustain contributions from across
the rich spectrum of the Church’s membership. Such approaches can only be developed through
experimentation, continual practice, research, and reflection which themselves include careful
listening and cooperation.” (Clark/Gast)

Canon Law regulating the internal management of the Roman Catholic Church is a
remarkably tensile body of laws. It is not a rigid rule book applicable in the same manner to
each and every situation in the thousands of dioceses in the world. Therefore one cannot look
exclusively to Canon Law as holding the solution or acting as arbiter of differing experiments
aimed at securing a viable future for the church.

Rather, Canon Law often codifies what has already been established as custom in local
church practice. Edward Schillebeeckx makes this point in his book, Ministry:

If we are to evaluate the possible theological significance of present-day new
alternatives and forms of ministry which often deviate from the established order
of the church, and are on the increase everywhere, we must steep ourselves in the
facts of the history of the church: in antiquity, in the Middle Ages and in modern
times. It will then also become clear that authoritative documents (the authority
of which the Catholic theologian accepts, albeit not always to the same degree)
are always prepared for by new practices which arise from the grassroots. (3)

Once codification of custom occurs in Canon Law, poly-variant interpretations emerge.
One reason for varied interpretation is that Canon Law is filled with provisional language. For
example Canon 517 begins, “When circumstances so require”. But there is no explanation of
these circumstances. Canon 526 reads, “A parish priest is to have the parochial care of one
parish only. However, because of a shortage of priests or other circumstances, the care of a
number of neighbouring parishes can be entrusted to the one parish priest.” What the “other
circumstances” are and what might be the maximum number of parishes one priest is allowed to
pastor is not delineated.

Interpretation and application of Canon Law differ widely among dioceses. Here in the
United States, one diocese might apply certain canons quite differently from another diocese.
Some bishops allow non-ordained people and permanent deacons to pastor parishes; other
bishops do not. In the dioceses that employ non-ordained pastors, what they are allowed to do
also varies. Some bishops allow non-ordained pastors who are not permanent deacons1 to
baptize and witness marriages. Other bishops do not. Some bishops allow non-ordained pastors
who are not permanent deacons to deliver the homily at mass which is permitted by Canon 766.
Other bishops do not.
Another facet of interpretation of Canon Law is which canons are employed and which canons are not acted upon in particular situations. Canon 517.2 which allows for non-priests to be appointed for the pastoral care of parishes, has been widespread in many dioceses both in the United States and elsewhere. However, canon 516.2 which reads, “When certain communities cannot be erected as parishes or quasi-parishes, the diocesan bishop is to provide for their pastoral care in another way” has not been acted upon in American dioceses. This canon was a guiding principle, not a recipe for the restructuring of the Archdiocese of Poitiers, France as mentioned above.

The ecclesiological context is crucial to framing the processes by which the future will be brought about. Clearly, one size doesn’t fit all, and never did. Rather than looking at worldwide uniformity as a strength or goal, the ever increasing diversity of the world and church becomes its strength. Karl Rahner offers insight into this style of church. According to Rahner, World Church is the third major epoch in the history of Christianity, and began with Vatican II. The first epoch, Jewish Christianity, understood the church as a sect of Judaism. Gentile converts needed first to become Jewish in order to embrace Christianity. The second epoch, Euro-centric Christianity, Rahner describes as

…the actual concrete activity of the Church in its relation to the world outside of Europe was in fact (if you will pardon the expression) the activity of an export firm which exported a European religion as a commodity it did not really want to change but sent throughout the world together with the rest of the culture and civilization it considered superior. (717)

This present epoch we now find ourselves living, World Church, is characterized by a church “inculturated throughout the world”. (Rahner, 718) This shift away from a Euro-centric church to a World Church, now in its nascent stage, is as radically boundary breaking as was the shift from Jewish Christianity to Euro-centric Christianity.

The celebration of the Eucharist, the heart and soul of Roman Catholicism, runs the risk of being less available to church going Catholics as long as its practice is totally dependent upon ordained, male, celibate priests. The change of church discipline opening the ranks of the ordained to wider groups of people, e.g. women and married men, would preserve the centrality of the celebration of the Eucharist. Such a move would not only serve the managerial dimensions of substitution and management in a future configuration of church, but also the theological aspects of ministry and sacramental community in a church of the future. It would fulfill the psalmist's dream:

I wash my hands in innocence
And join the procession round your altar,
Singing a hymn of thanksgiving,
Proclaiming all your wonders.
I love the house where you live,
The place where your glory makes its home.
I bless you, Yahweh, at the Assemblies. (Psalm 26, 6-8, 12)

Until such a time when wider groups of people become eligible for ordination, the celebration of the Eucharist will become more and more infrequent, and the psalmist’s poetry
mute. Who will be our priests is, in many ways, is a foundation question for future structures of
parishes and their pastoral practices.

Other foundational questions center on parishioners themselves, the laity, whose active
participation in the pastoral life of the parish is crucial to the future structures of church. Will
the church eventually move from a clerically-centered church to a laity-centered church? Will a
new culture of priesthood emerge that is not clerical, i.e., authoritarian, in charge, and
answerable only to their bishop?

The stakes are extraordinarily high in the future reconfiguration of church structures.
Religious Educators have significant gifts to offer local churches as they find a way forward that
is holistic, sustainable, and touches hearts. It is important that Religious Educators see
themselves as significant leaders in this ongoing enterprise of experimentation to bring about, in
Rahner’s terminology, World Church, or, in the rhetoric of this convention, “in a globalized
world”.
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