

NOTES

POLITICAL ECCLESIOLOGY

In a revolutionary era which places its own unique demands upon the Church, a crisis situation now envelops the institution and its people. At its roots is a challenge being delivered to long-standing habits of thought and action, and its attendant claims on behalf of change. In such an environment the task of managing change and the crises which it provokes calls for responses of entirely new dimensions from the members of the Church, particularly from those who bear the pastoral office.

One such response now clearly emerging within the Church is related to the pedagogical innovations which a new era of thought and action demands. New directions in Catholic theological education have been given a definitive impetus with the issuance of the *Ratio fundamentalis institutionis sacerdotalis* by the Holy See in 1970 and *The Program of Priestly Formation* by the American bishops in 1971.¹ Very innovative approaches to a program in theology are set forth in these documents. To the point here, a clear emphasis upon the integration of the social sciences with the theological discipline emerges from these documents and supports attempts which are currently being made to achieve such an integration of knowledge. The pedagogical proposal set forth in this article represents one such attempt and provides an example of the manner in which such syntheses may develop. As a political scientist, I am convinced that various methods of analysis employed by the social sciences can be used as very effective tools in a study of the Church, that "one interlocked reality which is comprised of a divine and a human element."² Specifically, what is offered herein is a programmatic note describing political ecclesiology, a study of the Church as a political institution, which could complement the systematic theological program in ecclesiology.

THE CHURCH AS A POLITICAL INSTITUTION

The Church remains always a divine institution and for that reason a mystery of God's action among men. However, its humanity is clearly evident in its character as a political institution, a body of people governed by constituted authority towards a common goal. In recent years these people have become very much aware that the Church is, in part at least, a very human decision-making institution with all of the lim-

¹ Both documents are available from the United States Catholic Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

² Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, no. 8.

itations inherent in that fact. They discern, for example, a vast area of decision-making about discipline and the administration of Church affairs over which an aura of mystery, or better, a mystique of secrecy, still hovers. This is becoming more and more a source of intellectual dissatisfaction to the people of the Church. Indeed, the old intellectual disposition to clothe all decisions within the Church in a mantle of divine mystery is giving way before modern man's constant search for a fuller understanding of all the factors which influence the making of human decisions. Many realize the truth of Péguy's statement that all things begin in mystique and end in politics.

Currently, then, efforts are being made to strip away the purely human mystery surrounding the Church's administrative processes of decision-making which constitute its "politics." Fortunately, these efforts can today attain to a greater degree of sophisticated knowledge than might have been possible in an earlier age, for research in the social sciences has provided an abundance of tools to assist investigation into political phenomena.

Such a study of the Church as a political institution appears even more urgent today, because many of its critical problems are specifically political in nature. In the wake of Vatican II, the Church has been struggling with a new paradigm of government, that is, a restructuring of itself as a political institution according to a reordering of its hierarchical and congregational principles of organization. The congregational principles of collegiality and subsidiarity are now being implemented through the establishment of the Synod of Bishops, the various national conferences of bishops, national pastoral councils, priests' senates, diocesan pastoral councils, and parish councils. However, this new paradigm of Church government has been suffering severe birth pains both in its theoretical development and in its practical implementation. The controversy surrounding Cardinal Suenens' championing of the cause of coresponsibility in the Church is a case in point.³ While the theological dimensions of this reordering of principles have begun to make themselves evident in issues arising around the topics of primacy and infallibility, the political dimensions of the new paradigm of Church government have as yet to be given the attention they certainly demand. The time appears opportune for the development of a political ecclesiology as an area both of scholarly investigation and of theological education.

The first task of such a study is to dissect the Church as a political institution into its component elements of political structures, political

³ Jose de Broucker, *The Suenens Dossier: The Case for Collegiality* (Notre Dame, 1970) pp. 7-45.

systems, political cultures, and political groups. This is the format employed in this paper.

From the perspective of political structures the Church can be viewed as a decision-making apparatus on either a macrostructural or a microstructural level. That is, its political structures may be studied on an institution-wide basis or at the level of a particular decision-making body, such as the Roman Curia. In either case what is being sought in such an analysis are the structural principles in the decision-making process which identify the nature of the structure. For example, is it one based on the hierarchical principle, the congregational principle, or a combination of the two? Such identification is essential to an understanding of the more or less fixed elements of Church government.⁴ Within these structures, however, there are dynamic elements which constitute the interacting parts of the decision-making process. Such elements all together make up the political system of the political structure. For example, the systemic characteristics of the political structure known as the Roman Curia, if sufficiently ascertained, could identify it as an open or a closed system. Such knowledge could, in turn, lead to a better understanding of the operative principles embodied in this structure.

To penetrate even more deeply into a political system, however, it is necessary to analyze the specific political attitudes and political behavior characteristic of its membership. Here one must determine the nature of the political culture or cultures which not only form the setting in which decision-makers operate, but also influence the decision-makers in their own political personalities. In this context one finally comes to the various political groups which make up the political society of the Church. Here one finds that the processes of political socialization currently at work within the Church have produced various groups which are distinguishable on the basis of their goals and methods.

What follows, then, is a somewhat fuller examination of each of the above-mentioned component elements of the Church as a political institution. It is intended to indicate the scope of the study and to suggest some of the methods of social-science research which may be integrated with it.

POLITICAL STRUCTURES OF THE CHURCH

Members of the Church today are living in a community beset by many problems of change. To understand some of the problems attending the transformation of the Church's decision-making structures in this

⁴ Cf., Edward Heston, C.S.C., "Present Organizational Design and Structure of the Roman Catholic Church," in James A. Coriden, ed., *We, the People of God: A Study of Constitutional Government for the Church* (Huntington, Ind., 1968).

situation, some insight into history is required. Historically, the Church's present political structures have developed within the framework of an ongoing tension in the Church between the hierarchical and congregational principles of ecclesial organization. Moreover, the various resolutions of this tension in actual political structures have been greatly influenced by nonecclesial factors. A historical analysis of the political structures of the Church over the ages from these perspectives would find not only theological issues concerning, for example, the primacy of jurisdiction, but also issues of a nontheological character such as the formative impact of secular political structures upon the Church's own structures.⁵ It is in this latter fact that the interpenetration of human structures with the hierarchical-congregational elements of Church organization becomes most obvious and raises its own problems. An awareness of the importance of making these distinctions is a beginning towards the solution of some of the Church's urgent political problems today.

The fathers of Vatican II, filling a void left by Vatican I, addressed themselves to the theological imbalance which had developed within the Church in favor of the Church hierarchically organized as opposed to the Church congregationally organized. However, beyond the issue of righting the theological balance, there still remains the problem of righting the political-structural balance of Church organization. In the centuries since the Council of Trent, the political structures of the Church developed with an extreme emphasis upon the hierarchical principle. Indeed, the crises of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries provoked an embattled-fortress concept of the Church which led to the administrative centralization and clerical domination of its political structures. Moreover, the Constantinian and medieval political models were aptly suited to this development and provided the structural framework which cast the pope as a thrice-crowned monarch, the cardinals as princes, the Roman curia as the royal court, the bishops as provincial governors, and the lower clergy and laity as subjects.

Now, however, the congregational principle is being reasserted within ecclesial political structures through the advocacy of collegiality and subsidiarity as principles of organization. Because of this development, there is emerging a new paradigm of Church government which as yet is far from being fully implemented in the Church's political structures and for that reason is a source of many of its current problems. In the solution of these problems the social sciences can provide some helpful insights.⁶

Greater clarity of thought about the nature and operation of political

⁵ Cf. Keith Bridston, *Church Politics* (New York, 1969), esp. chap. 2.

⁶ In this section and the others to follow, only a few of these insights will be presented,

structures would seem to be one of the prime benefits to be gained by an ecclesiologist who turns to the social sciences for assistance in his own study. Two areas of social-science research worthy of his attention are organization theory and the theories of structural functionalism. Each has contributed significantly to a more informed awareness of the principles underlying the structures of society.

On its part, organization theory incorporates research from several areas of the social sciences.⁷ One such illuminating analysis is provided in a comparative study of organizations by Rensis Likert.⁸ In it Likert describes the operational principles of four basic types of organization: the exploitive authoritative, the benevolent authoritative, the consultative, and the participative. In analyzing the structural characteristics of these four types, he describes the organizational behavior which is associated with each one. For example, investigating one such operational characteristic, the organizational level at which decisions are made, Likert in his own terms actually describes the organizational patterns of behavior which are possible within the hierarchical-congregational spectrum of structures.⁹ If we apply his categories to the present character of the Church's political structures, it appears that these structures are of the benevolent authoritative type into which elements of the consultative type are being introduced and from which elements of the exploitive authoritative type are being removed. What is particularly helpful in his analysis is his specification of the organizational behavior characteristic of each type of structure; it elucidates many of the phenomena currently accompanying the transformation of the Church's government. By associating the structural and behavioral options which are possible in this situation, Likert's analysis thus furnishes points of reference for those concerned with this transformation. Since neither the exploitive authoritative (dictatorship) type nor the participative (pure democracy) type is consonant with the Church's theological structures, a knowledge of their structural and behavioral characteristics, as well as those of the other two, clarifies the choices which face the Church as it establishes new political structures.

These structures, both those presently existing and those coming into existence, either serve or are intended to serve definite functions within the Church. Consequently, beyond an analysis of model structures and their operational characteristics, there lies the question of

since this Note is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment but only an indication of the content of a study of political ecclesiology.

⁷ Cf. James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, *Organization* (New York, 1958).

⁸ *New Patterns of Management* (New York, 1961).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

the operational consequences of any political structure. Here also research in the social sciences, particularly in the area of structural-functional analysis, can assist the political ecclesiologist. Two prominent theorists in this field are Talcott Parsons and Robert Merton.¹⁰

In his work Parsons sets forth the requisite functions of any political structure and thereby also defines the constant tasks which the political structures of the Church must accomplish. The Church, like any other institution, "is confronted with (1) adapting itself to an environment; (2) achieving collective goals; (3) maintaining, motivating, and controlling tension within the system; and, (4) integrating the actions of members."¹¹ Simply to specify these tasks is sufficient to identify the areas of political activity which should be of such great concern to the Church today as its political structures are undergoing change.

On his part, Merton has contributed valuable insights into the functions of structures, particularly by his distinction between the manifest and latent functions of structures.¹² His observation that the latent functions of structures are numerous, highly complex, and not easily discernible alerts the researcher to an area of political activity which could escape his attention. For example, the manifest functions of a parish council can be readily identified, but the question should be asked: what are the latent functions which its establishment possibly creates? So often the problem we have in studying any phenomenon is to ask ourselves the right questions about it. This particular study of the latent functions, even the latent structures, of the Church appears to be extremely important in helping us to do precisely that questioning. The political ecclesiologist clearly has his work cut out for him in trying to analyze this aspect of the Church's political structures.

POLITICAL SYSTEMS OF THE CHURCH

Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church distinguished the parts of the People of God who constitute the membership of the Church: the hierarchy and the laity. This doctrinal distinction, however, has not solved the thorny problems which attend the interrelationships of these parts within the decision-making structures of the Church. The

¹⁰ In *Sociological Analysis and Politics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967) William Mitchell pulls Parsons' work together in a useful synthesis. Robert Merton's study of structural functionalism is found in *Social Theory and Social Structure* (rev. ed.; New York, 1957).

¹¹ Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 59. Gabriel Almond has amplified these requisite functions of political structures to include (1) interest articulation, (2) interest aggregation, (3) political socialization, (4) political recruitment, (5) communication, (6) rule-making, (7) rule-application, and (8) rule-adjudication. Cf. Gabriel Almond and James S. Coleman, *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton, 1960) pp. 11-38.

¹² *Op. cit.*, pp. 19-84.

current beginnings of a withdrawal from past patterns of excessive centralization and clerical domination in the administration of Church affairs have indeed served to revitalize to some extent those parts of the Church which exercised only an implementative rather than a participative role in its political structures. Nevertheless, great difficulties have beset this process of decentralization and declericalization, and here also the work of social scientists can be of immense value in understanding these difficulties.

One of the most prominent parts of the Church's political system as it has come into the modern world is the bureaucratic structure which has developed within it, particularly over the past four centuries. However, this bureaucracy is not simply a fact to be fatalistically accepted; it is rather an aspect of the Church as a political institution which requires a realistic assessment. Such an assessment can be assisted by modern studies in bureaucracy.¹³ For example, if a study of the Church included Max Weber's analysis of the routinization of charisma, it would avail itself of a perspective which is essential to a right understanding of the role of the bureaucracy within the Church.¹⁴ The frequency with which the role of the Roman Curia is associated with issues concerning change in the Church indicates the prevailing awareness of that bureaucracy's critical position. Yet, one wonders if this awareness is also accompanied by an adequate understanding of the nature of the bureaucratic society. A careful study of the work of Herbert A. Simon,¹⁵ Robert Presthus,¹⁶ and some other scholars writing on bureaucracy could do much to clarify the real issues which face the Church in regard to its bureaucracy.¹⁷

Moreover, beyond the study of the bureaucracy or any other part of the Church's decision-making structures, there is much to be gained from analyses of macrolevel decision-making systems. The input-output theory of David Easton, for example, offers the student of political ecclesiology a relatively simple model with which to begin a study of decision-making systems.¹⁸ This model places a political system in the context of an environment which feeds supports and demands into the system and receives decisions from it. In addition to the model, some concepts which Easton develops, such as the volume (quantitative) stress and content (qualitative) stress placed upon a

¹³ A representative sampling of such studies is provided by Robert K. Merton (ed.), *Reader in Bureaucracy* (New York, 1952).

¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 92-100.

¹⁵ *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations* (2nd ed.; New York, 1957).

¹⁶ *The Organizational Society* (New York, 1962).

¹⁷ Cf. Giancarlo Zizola, "The Reformed Roman Curia," in Coriden, *op cit.*, pp. 49-77.

¹⁸ *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965).

political system, help to elucidate problems which the Church is encountering in a world of massive change. In brief, both quantitatively and qualitatively, demands are being placed upon the decision-making structures of the Church in a manner unprecedented in its modern history. The extent to which these structures are capable of managing these demands will have a critical impact upon the Church for many years to come, and this capability to manage demands is largely dependent upon the Church's present openness as a political system.

This topic of open and closed political systems has also received ample attention in recent social-science research, particularly in the area of communications theory.¹⁹ Several years ago, Patrick Granfield, O.S.B., applied a communications model to the Church and thereby furnished an example of the usefulness of this analytic approach to the study of the Church.²⁰ In this case Granfield emphasized the role of feedback in an open system and in so doing applied one of the most important concepts of communications theory to the Church's political structures. Yet, the whole range of this theory requires the attention of the political ecclesiologist.²¹ Political scientists such as Karl Deutsch²² have successfully applied communications theory to secular political systems, but political ecclesiologists have yet to produce such sophisticated insights into the political systems of the Church.

The application of these analytical approaches to the Church appears more and more as one of the great tasks which scholars must undertake today. A vast body of theoretical studies is available to those who are able and willing to apply them to the study of ecclesiology. Beyond such theoretical insights, however, there remain the empirical investigations which must flesh out the skeleton of the Church's political structures and systems; this brings us more directly to a study of the People of God in the light of the social sciences.

POLITICAL CULTURES IN THE CHURCH

The deeply human problems attending the present paradigmatic shift of the Church's political structures and systems certainly demand greater understanding than that currently provided in popular literature. While one or another of the personal accounts of alienation from

¹⁹ Cf. Robert C. North, "The Analytical Prospects of Communications Theory," in James C. Charlesworth, ed., *Contemporary Political Analysis* (New York, 1967) pp. 300-316.

²⁰ "Ecclesial Cybernetics," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 29 (1968) 662-78.

²¹ Cf., e.g., Karl Deutsch, "Communication Models and Decision Systems," in Charlesworth, *op. cit.*, pp. 273-99. A basic model may also be consulted in Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana, 1964).

²² *The Nerves of Government* (New York, 1966).

the Church may shed some light on the dilemmas in which some members of the Church find themselves today, such accounts hardly fill the need for a scientific knowledge of contemporary ecclesial problems. On both the theoretical and the practical levels these human problems can be elucidated, however, by the application of analytical tools provided by the social sciences. Reserving the specific aspects of such a study to the next section, we can at this point take up this question in a more general approach dealing with the Church's political culture, or more accurately today, its political cultures.

The whole process by which a political institution begets certain political beliefs and actions within its membership and thereby creates a political culture which forms the base for the political socialization of new members is one with which social scientists are still trying to cope.²³ Nevertheless, there is a sufficient body of knowledge on the interrelationship between societal institutions and human personality to provide a basis for the study of this process within the Church.²⁴ The recent psychological study of priests in the United States offers a good example of the application of such an approach to ecclesial problems.²⁵

The issue of authority in the Church and the members' reaction to it is, of course, a problem of larger scope than its impact upon the lives of priests. On this particular point it is, first of all, evident that a great deal of confusion exists around the nature of the issue itself. For example, the frequent facile identification of protests against authoritarian methods and personalities as attacks upon the divinely established authority of the hierarchy obfuscates the issue at its roots.²⁶ What is called a problem of faith is often in reality a problem of political cultures in conflict, but it is not recognized as such, and perhaps understandably. What we are witnessing today is the emergence of a new political culture within the human Church, and what is new is rarely understood by all. Indeed, the type of political socialization which has been taking place among the members of the Church since Vatican II, as compared with the type which preceded that event, is so different that the image of a culture and counterculture seems an

²³ Cf. "Political Socialization: Its Role in the Political Process," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 361 (Sept., 1965).

²⁴ Cf., e.g., Lewis A. Coser and Bernard Rosenberg, *Sociological Theory* (3rd ed.; New York, 1969), particularly chaps. 1-4.

²⁵ *Loyola Psychological Study of the Ministry and Life of the American Priest* (Washington, D.C., 1971).

²⁶ The issue of authority may indeed be at stake; one of the thornier problems of this case is examined by Joseph A. Bracken, S.J., "Towards a Grammar of Dissent," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 31 (1970) 437-59.

appropriate description of the disparate nature of the two.²⁷ Consequently, to confuse a conflict of political cultures within a political institution with a conflict of beliefs within a community of faith is a trap into which members of the Church must not be allowed to fall.²⁸ A theological education which includes the study of authoritarian and democratic cultures would be one means of avoiding such a trap.

Another area of social-science research which can sharpen perception of the Church's current political problems is the study of the authoritarian and the democratic personalities.²⁹ A knowledge of such personality types is most important to a basic understanding of political conflict in the Church today. For so long the political structures of the Church have had an authoritarian character, and the authoritarian personality has been admirably suited to them. However, as these political structures now begin to assume a more participative character, the authoritarian personality tends to become a dysfunctional element within the system. The salvation of such a situation is a challenge of massive proportions today, and whatever knowledge can be brought to bear upon this problem ought to be brought within the domain of the political ecclesiologist.

One of the major effects of this diversity of political cultures among the members of the Church has been the emergence of a new kind of pluralism within their ranks. The old monolithic unity of political beliefs and actions within the Church's own structures has been replaced by an at times bewildering diversity which may even have the appearance of division. It is in this phenomenon that one most easily views the political conflicts in the Church today.

POLITICAL GROUPS IN THE CHURCH

In a recent article I attempted an analysis of the various political groups into which the members of the Church have now polarized.³⁰ To view the membership of the Church as divided into warring political factions may on the face of the claim appear a gross exaggeration. Yet,

²⁷ I am leaving aside as a consideration here the impact of life in a secular democracy upon Church members, but obviously it is a fact of some consequence.

²⁸ E.g., a political issue such as the recent attempt by some Chicago priests to censure Cardinal Cody and his auxiliaries should not be equated with the theological disputations which have arisen around Hans Küng's *Infallible? An Inquiry*.

²⁹ Cf. Francis W. K. Hsu, ed., *Psychology and Anthropology: Approaches to Culture and Personality* (Homewood, Ill., 1961); also T. W. Adorno et al., *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950).

³⁰ "Current Strategies of Change in the Church," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 71 (Dec., 1970) 184-89.

the fact that a new kind of pluralism has entered into the whole body of the Church is attested to by the emergence of groups which have been simply identified as traditionalist and renewalist. Even within these groups subgroups can be differentiated on the basis of the varying goals and methods which characterize their activity. Then, insofar as these goals and methods have been translated into interest-group activities within the decision-making structures of the Church, they have achieved political significance. As a result of this development, the Church has taken on the appearance of a multipolarized society which at times appears to be on the brink of tearing itself apart over its political differences, not to mention some real theological differences. Whether this factionalism will in fact give rise to actual schisms on a large scale remains to be seen, but that such a possibility is even thinkable indicates the importance of trying to understand this phenomenon in the contemporary Church.³¹

Undoubtedly, there always has been a group basis to some extent in the politics of the Church; today it is simply more obvious and more obstreperous. But because it is so apparent, it is also more amenable to analysis as a fact of Church life. Political scientists such as Earl Latham³² and David Truman³³ have studied this same phenomenon in the realm of secular politics with a special concern for the processes of conflict and adjustment among interest groups. The presence of such conflict and the need for adjustment in the Church today is all too apparent. The uneven distribution of decision-making power within the political structures of the Church and the consequent efforts of groups to retain or gain power and influence is at the basis of much of the ecclesial turmoil we are now experiencing. Indeed, the major problems of the Church today are more precisely political than theological in nature. Consequently, any effort at reconciling groups within the Church must fasten itself upon the political realities of the situation.

Groups bound together within themselves by common interests are, then, an important part of the Church's political universe. As such, they must be studied in a much more coherent manner than they have been heretofore. Such empirical investigations of groups within the Church have thus far been limited to a more or less impressionistic approach.³⁴ I hope that a greater awareness of the critical need for a

³¹ Cf. Karl Rahner, "Schism in the Catholic Church," *Theology Digest* 18 (Spring, 1970) 4-8.

³² *The Group Basis of Politics* (Ithaca, 1952).

³³ *The Governmental Process* (New York, 1964).

³⁴ Cf., e.g., James Hitchcock, *The Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism* (New York, 1971).

study of political ecclesiology will lead to the research which fills this gap in our knowledge.

Once such efforts are begun seriously, the search for effective solutions to the political problems of the Church may also be undertaken. Again the social sciences can be of service. The study of conflict resolution is one of the most vigorous areas of social-science research today. To cite just one effort in this field, the theory of synergetics is being developed as an approach to "the integration of diverse individuals into a problem-stating problem-solving group."³⁵ While it is true that there are no instant solutions in one or another of the theoretical approaches to problem-solving, the accumulation of insights which can result from such studies is itself a solution. Such a fund of knowledge would at least relieve some of the deficiencies of a one-dimensional study of the Church.

THE TEACHING OF ECCLESIOLOGY

This pedagogical note has attempted to outline some of the content of a study of political ecclesiology which might complement the systematic theological study of the Church in a program of theological education. Of course, there is also the possibility that other approaches to the teaching of ecclesiology would be incorporated into the program in order to provide the interdisciplinary framework which is envisioned by the new guidelines.³⁶ A biblical ecclesiology, such as that presented by John L. McKenzie, S.J.,³⁷ offers a perspective on the community of the Church which transcends the political paradigms. A canonical ecclesiology has also recently begun to develop as canonists have addressed themselves to the question of constitutionalism in the Church, particularly in respect to the proposed *Lex fundamentalis* currently under consideration.³⁸ Moreover, the historical approach to ecclesiology is most important to understanding the recurring issues of the Church as an evolving community.³⁹

Such an application of the team-teaching concept would undoubtedly provide an integrated study of one of the most important areas of theological education today. The specific value of a course in political ecclesiology would appear to be rooted in its capacity to help students towards the end of becoming knowledgeable practitioners within the

³⁵ William J. J. Gordon, *Synergetics* (New York, 1963) p. 3.

³⁶ Cf. *The Program of Priestly Formation*, p. 20.

³⁷ *Authority in the Church* (New York, 1966).

³⁸ Cf., e.g., William H. Onclin, "Church and Church Law," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 28 (1967) 733-48.

³⁹ Cf. Manfred Hoffmann, "Church and History in Vatican II's Constitution on the Church," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 29 (1968) 191-214.

Church as a political institution. One of the Church's urgent needs is for people who are capable of managing change, and this is a skill to which people must be educated. Nor can an ancillary benefit in the area of ecumenical endeavors be overlooked. "Perhaps a deeper appreciation for the political dynamics in the life of the Church will provide a whole new ecclesiological perspective for modern Christianity." ⁴⁰

Allentown College, Pa.

BERNARD F. DONAHUE, O.S.F.S.

⁴⁰ Keith Bridston, "The Polity and Politics of Church Unity," in Coriden, *op. cit.*, p. 181.