

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

#

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, NEW IMMIGRANT GROUPS,
AND DECISION MAKING: A CASE STUDY OF
THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

by

KATHE NEWMAN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Political Science in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York

2001

UMI Number: 3008855

Copyright 2001 by
Newman, Kathe Anne

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3008855

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2001

KATHE ANNE NEWMAN

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Political Science in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 10, 2001
Date

April 10, 2001
Date

Marilyn Gittel
Chair of Examining Committee

W.B. Feltz
Executive Officer

Marilyn Gittel

John Mollenkopf

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

Government and private philanthropy are turning to faith-based institutions to revitalize cities and to provide social services. These institutions assume that faith-based institutions are more responsive and accessible to the poor and to people of color than government. Most faith-based institutions have a presence in neighborhoods. Because of this presence, they are expected to have close connections with the “grassroots.” And since most religious institutions have a commitment to serve the poor, it is expected that religious institutions make this a primary consideration in their operations.

This dissertation looks specifically at the Archdiocese of Chicago at the parish and central administrative levels and explores whether immigrant groups have access to decision making and whether the Church is indeed responsive to new immigrant groups. I contrast the experience the immigrants at the end of the 1800s and early 1900s with Mexicans and Puerto Ricans since the 1950s.

I found that immigrants who came during the first period had access to decision-making processes that allocated Church resources and their parishes facilitated the development of social capital. Latinos, in contrast, make up at least 33 percent of the Archdiocese of Chicago’s members yet they have little access to decision-making that allocates Church resources. And they have had difficulty accessing parishes. Some parishes are accessible and responsive to Latinos. These institutions have turned to government and private philanthropy to support their efforts to revitalize their

communities. They have been unsuccessful in engaging the Church administration in these efforts.

I argue that there are a few overlapping explanations that explain Latino's lack of access. These include the centralization of archdiocesan decision-making, the growth of the Catholic white middle class, suburbanization, race, and the lack of Latino representation in archdiocesan decision-making structures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to my sponsor Marilyn Gittell for providing many opportunities and challenges for me as a student and as a researcher and for challenging me many years ago to think about the Catholic Church as a political institution. Thanks to John Mollenkopf for advising me throughout the process and for helping me to narrow my vision to a more realistically doable project. Many of my colleagues provided feedback in the initial conceptualization of the research problem and with issues along the way. Thanks to: Sarah Gardner, Laura McKenna, Isolda Ortega-Bustamante, Jill Gross, Tracy Steffy, and Francois Pierre-Louis.

I could not have conducted the research without the assistance of many individuals and organizations in Chicago who graciously offered their time, resources, and occasionally file cabinets, especially Mary Heidkamp, Sister Josephine Sferella, Father Charles Dahm, Father Don Headley, and Father Roger Coughlin. Thanks also to the BVM sisters at Holy Name Cathedral who allowed me to stay with them on many of my field research visits and to Monsignor Jack Egan for originally arranging my accommodations.

A special thanks is owed to Ellen Skerrett who provided encouraging words, periodic packages of Chicago area news clippings that proved indispensable, and thoughtful comments on initial drafts of the dissertation. Others working on religion in the Chicago area also offered their time, experience, and direction—Edward Kantowicz,

Dominic Pacyga, and Lowell Livezey.

The staffs of the Hillsborough, New Jersey Public Library, Chicago Public Library, Archdiocese of Chicago archive and the Chicago Historical Society all located historical documents, books, and other materials.

A research training grant in the Social Science Analysis of Religion from the Office of Research for Religion in Society and Culture at Brooklyn College/PARAL introduced me to a diverse network of scholars—sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists, who engage in research on Latinos, cities, and religion. Two training sessions and research materials aided the development of my methodological skills and understanding of the literature on Latinos and religion.

My appreciation to my family, who provided support, encouragement, and occasional baby watching assistance and only rarely asked, “Are you done yet?” And most of all thanks to my daughter, Emma, who was born towards the end of this long process and reminded me why, after the long haul of graduate school, I wanted to finish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
INTRODUCTION	1
FUNDING FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS	5
RESEARCH APPROACH.....	6
THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO	8
I. THE CHURCH AND THE CITY.....	12
RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIC INFRASTRUCTURE	13
ETHNIC DIVISION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT	20
PARISH AND PLACE	21
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IMMIGRANT ADAPTATION.....	25
RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIC INVOLVEMENT	27
<i>Community Activism.....</i>	31
II. CHICAGO'S CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IMMIGRANT GROUPS.....	35
CATHOLIC IMMIGRATION TO CHICAGO 1850-1920s	35
<i>National Parish Networks</i>	43
<i>Mexicans.....</i>	44
LATINOS AND THE CHURCH.....	48
<i>Latino immigration after 1950</i>	50
<i>Puerto Ricans</i>	51
MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE GROWING LATINO POPULATION	58
III. PILSEN	59
18 TH STREET TEAM	64
PILSEN'S PARISHES AND THE CHICANO MOVEMENT.....	65
<i>Leadership Development.....</i>	69
BUILDING COMMUNITY: POLITICS AND RELIGIOUS SYMBOLISM.....	70
FROM ACTIVISM TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	72
CONCLUSION	80
IV. POWER, HIERARCHY, AND ARCHDIOCESAN LEADERSHIP	84
FRAGMENTATION, ETHNICITY, AND DECENTRALIZATION: 1840S TO APPROXIMATELY 1910S	84
CARDINAL MUNDELEIN: CENTRALIZING POWER 1915-1939	86
<i>Reducing the Ethnic Character of the Church</i>	89
<i>Centralizing Parochial Schools.....</i>	90
<i>Centralizing Charity Care</i>	91
CARDINAL STRITCH: ORGANIZING AND ACTIVISM 1939-1958.....	92
VATICAN II: "CONSULTATIVE BODIES"	93
CARDINAL CODY: RE-CENTRALIZING POWER.....	95
<i>Vicariates.....</i>	97
CONCLUSION	99
V. ACCESSING ARCHDIOCESAN DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURES.....	101
CHICAGO'S FIRST ENCUESTRO.....	102

INCREASING RESPONSIVENESS	103
<i>Vengan y Siganme</i>	104
<i>Hispanic Apostolate Task Force</i>	107
<i>Second Encuentro</i>	109
<i>Institutional Change</i>	116
CONCLUSION	119
<i>Community vs. "Downtown"</i>	122
VI. ARCHDIOCESAN PLANNING IN THE 1980S AND 1990S	125
THE CONTEXT	125
ARCHDIOCESAN PLANNING EFFORTS.....	135
<i>Planning and Evaluation 1987</i>	136
<i>Decisions: Archdiocesan Strategic Planning Process, September 1993</i>	138
<i>1996 Special School Task Force on Catholic Schools</i>	140
ACCESSING DECISION-MAKING.....	145
<i>St. Martin de Porres</i>	148
CONCLUSION	150
VII. CONCLUSION	152
ACCESSING ARCHDIOCESAN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES	153
<i>Structural Change: Centralization of Power and Authority</i>	154
<i>Lack of Effective Structures for Participation</i>	155
<i>Lack of Latinos in Archdiocesan Positions of Power</i>	157
<i>Class</i>	160
<i>Movement Politics</i>	161
FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS AND COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION	162
APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	169

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Catholic Parishes in Pilsen	61
Table 2. Archdiocesan Subsidies to Parishes	127
Table 3. Archdiocese of Chicago Parochial Elementary School Enrollment 1970-1999	131
Table 4. City of Chicago Parochial Elementary School Enrollment 1970-1999.....	132

INTRODUCTION

Despite its role as an active urban institution, the Catholic Church has been overlooked in much of the research on city and neighborhood politics. The Catholic Church runs school systems, provides social services, engages in advocacy on issues affecting the homeless, children, and the elderly, and it builds and operates housing. It provides immigration assistance and in some cities welcomes undocumented aliens in parishes that are designated as sanctuaries. Often at the parish level, but also at the diocesan level, the Church has supported community-organizing campaigns on issues such as the living wage, decent and affordable housing, fair banking, and civil rights.

The Catholic Church has played an important role aiding scores of Catholic immigrants in adapting to U.S. society and politics. While Catholic immigrants clung to their native languages and cultures, Catholic parishes facilitated their participation into American life and politics. For early immigrant groups, many have argued that the Church was an escalator of mobility into participation. Early immigrant groups “owned” their own Catholic religious institutions, built social capital in their neighborhood parishes, made connections to the political party, and attended parish parochial schools.

In this dissertation, I examine the relationship of the Archdiocese of Chicago to new immigrant groups and explore the differences between immigrants who came at the end of the 1800s and early 1900s with Mexicans and Puerto Ricans who came after

1960. Latinos currently make up at least 33 percent of the Archdiocese of Chicago's members yet they have little access to decision-making regarding Catholic institutions (Falsani 2001). I argue that there are a few overlapping explanations for the different relationship including the centralization of archdiocesan decision-making, the growth of the Catholic white middle class, suburbanization, and the lack of Latino representation in archdiocesan decision-making structures.

The Catholic Church in Chicago, from 1843 to about the 1920s¹, was a predominantly urban immigrant institution rooted in neighborhoods. Ethnic groups controlled their own local parishes and built associations of parishes that allowed them to control resources and service provision. Immigrants used Catholic parishes to preserve their culture, language, and religion and to pass it on to subsequent generations. The parish and its institutions—schools, parish halls, and social service agencies—provided places for association, worship, and for making political connections.

For Catholic immigrants who have arrived since the 1950s, the Church is a very different institution. During the first few decades of the 20th century, the Archdiocese of Chicago began to centralize decision-making about finances, social services, and education. Like government in which reformers distanced city decision-making from the ethnic character of neighborhood politics as they created “rational” bureaucracies,

¹ There is flexibility to this time frame. The changes that transformed the Church—suburbanization, Americanization, and the movement of Catholics into the working and middle classes began in Chicago in the 1920s.

Between the 1920 and the 1950s, however, suburbanization, Americanization, and the movement of Catholics into the working and middle classes began in Chicago and transformed the Church.

the Catholic Church developed administrative structures that took decision-making power away from communities and ethnic groups and put it in the hands of “professional” elites.

During the time period in which the Church was centralizing authority, the character of the Church was changing. Chicago’s Catholic Church initially was a mostly urban institution dominated by poor immigrants. As its population moved into the working and middle classes and into the suburbs, Church resources needed to be spread over a larger geographic area. In 1950, 77 percent of the Chicago Archdiocese’s Catholic population lived in the city; by 1970, that percentage decreased to 57 percent and in 1996, to 47 percent (Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Research and Planning 1997).

With an increase in Catholic prosperity, the Church became an institution of the “haves” rather than of the “have nots.” Catholics were no longer the poor immigrant minority that Tocqueville observed a century earlier:

Most of the Catholics are poor, and they have no chance of taking a part in the government unless it is open to all the citizens. They constitute a minority, and all rights must be respected in order to ensure to them the free exercise of their own privileges. These two causes induce them, even unconsciously, to adopt political doctrines which they would perhaps support with less zeal if they were rich and preponderant (Tocqueville 1945a, 301).

The change in the character of Catholics is evident in the change of party identification. Once solidly Democratic, Catholics voted increasingly Republican during the second half of the twentieth century. And even though Catholic leadership in the United States moved toward the left during the 1970s, Catholic parishioners moved towards the right (Reichley 1985, 299).

The impact of the change in the character of Catholics is felt in the institution of the Church. Immigrants no longer dominate the leadership of dioceses across the country. Bishops, cardinals, and priests are not from the old country. Those within archdiocesan bureaucracies are separated often by class, race, ethnicity, political identity, and to a certain extent, gender from those in poor new immigrant communities.

Açuna (1996) notes that Germans and Irish dominate Los Angeles's Archdiocese rather than Latinos who are the newer, and increasingly, more numerous immigrant group. Açuna concludes that Catholic Church leaders in Los Angeles have difficulty meeting the needs of new immigrants because of differences in culture and class. He states that "The Catholic Church has offered a minimal contribution to the development of the Latino community, often finding it wisest to side with the Euroamerican elite" (Açuna, 1996). The difference in class is echoed by Joseph Fitzpatrick, who argues that class has been a major dividing factor keeping the Church from becoming a great presence in new immigrant communities in contrast with the role it played in earlier immigrant communities (Fitzpatrick 1988).

FUNDING FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS

It is becoming increasingly important to understand the role of religious institutions in cities and neighborhoods and their relationship to the growing Latino community because, over the last decade, foundations and government have turned to religious institutions to help solve a myriad of urban problems. Advocates for “faith-based” development argue that religious institutions are in an ideal position to revitalize urban communities and build social capital.

These advocates see faith-based institutions as accessible to women, the poor, and people of color who are often excluded from liberal capitalist power structures. The Lilly Foundation has funded faith-based organizations to work on community development and neighborhood issues (Scheie and al 1991). And the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has highlighted the work of religious institutions in urban communities. Their efforts to build housing, engage in community organizing, and provide services, combined with what is viewed as their grassroots base in communities, interests policy makers seeking to encourage this type of work (Cisneros 1996).

Building on the notion that religious institutions understand the populations they serve, government is increasingly using them to provide social services. Stoker labels this shared responsibility between public and private actors “governing.” Governing is no longer done only by government. It is a partnership between actors (Stoker 1997) or what Salamon labels “third-party” government (Salamon 1992). Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago, for example, received more than 75 percent of its 145 million dollars in revenue from public sources in 1998 (The Catholic

Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago 1998a).

Considering that foundations and government support faith-based development, one might expect that there is extensive literature examining the religious institutions as urban actors. While there is a growing body of research that looks at the successes of individual faith-based efforts, there is a lack of a critical body of research that explores the religious institutions as social service providers, political actors, and their relationships to new immigrant populations. Even though the literature on religious institutions as community developers and community organizers is growing, researchers have failed to examine the structure of religious institutions, explore whether community actors have access to these institutions, and evaluate whether they are indeed more responsive than government. Very little research has been done to identify the limitations inherent in funding faith-based institutions—besides those that debate the church and state relationship.

The assumption by government and private philanthropy that religious institutions are grassroots actors in urban neighborhoods that can spur community revitalization as social service providers, community organizers, mediating institutions, and physical neighborhood redevelopers requires further examination. We need to better understand who controls religious institutions, how decisions are made within them, and how these decisions affect poor communities of color.

RESEARCH APPROACH

To explore these issues, I conducted a case study of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Robert Yin suggests that a case study is the most appropriate methodology when one

is asking how and why questions, does not have experimental control over the research topic, and is focused on contemporary events. A single case study provides an opportunity to develop theory based on the specific findings of the Chicago experience, which can then be tested in other locations (Yin 1989).

Multiple research strategies can be used to conduct a case study, including reviewing documents, conducting interviews, and direct observation (Yin 1989). To understand the role of the Church in the city, I conducted historical research, analyzed archdiocesan documents, compiled archdiocesan data on schools, parishes, and planning processes, and conducted 43 interviews with archdiocesan staff and community leaders in the archdiocesan Pastoral Center, Catholic Charities, neighborhood parishes, community organizations, and universities (see Appendix A for a detailed outline of the research design and a list of interviewees).

I chose to focus on a single case study rather than several because of the depth required in the research. Existing studies of the Catholic Church in Los Angeles and New York provide a contrast to the experiences in Chicago (Açuna, 1996; Diaz-Stevens 1993). I selected Chicago because its geographic service area includes urban and suburban areas, it has a vast institutional presence, it is one of the most historically ethnically diverse dioceses, it has a tradition of activism on the part of lay and religious men and women, and it has supported community organizing

Religious institutions are often referred to as though they are monoliths but religious institutions, especially the Catholic Church, are complex institutions. Even though the Catholic Church is hierarchically structured, there is no one institutional Catholic

Church. The Catholic Church is a world church, but the practices and institutional structures of the religion vary locally. The United States “brand” of Catholicism differs from that of Europe or Latin America. The structure and focus also varies at the diocesan and parish levels. It is both a centrally controlled and geographically dispersed institution that is very much influenced by local political culture, history, and politics. Diaz-Stevens notes that there is tension inherent in merging the history of the church’s organization with democratic values. “The church is not a democracy; it maintains a power structure based on a feudal and medieval monarchy even while it faces the challenge of adapting to the political values of the United States” (Diaz-Stevens 1993, 118).

THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

The Archdiocese of Chicago is organized as a metropolitan unit that serves Cook and Lake Counties as well as Chicago and many smaller cities. This is a large geographical area. Cook County includes Chicago and its suburbs; Lake County extends north of Cook County along Lake Michigan. The Archdiocese is administered centrally by the Pastoral Center, which is headed by the Archbishop. The Pastoral Center is responsible for planning and resource distribution and includes many administrative departments including ethnic ministry offices.

Because of the Archdiocese’s size, it is divided into 6 smaller areas called vicariates, headed by Episcopal Vicars. Vicariates are divided into 25 deaneries, headed by parish priests from within the deaneries. Even though clergy and laity created the vicariate and deanery structures to improve communication and increase participation, vicars and deanery heads have little actual decision-making power or authority (Dahm

1981). The structure has in some cases improved communication, but Diaz-Stevens' observation about the cardinal's power in New York applies well to Chicago: "the decision of the cardinal archbishop still remained the single most important factor in determining church policy" (Diaz-Stevens 1993, 119).

Despite the hierarchical and centralized decision-making structure, entrepreneurs, most frequently parish priests, but also laity have emerged as independent power centers. These entrepreneurs spurred the Archdiocese to act on urban issues such as fair housing, civil rights, and an equitable distribution of Church resources. However, the ability of these entrepreneurs to act depends greatly on the receptivity of each archbishop.

The Archdiocese of Chicago maintains a vast institutional presence in the Chicago metropolitan region. While its service area is not coterminous with what one might label the Chicago metropolitan area, it covers both urban and suburban communities. Its 388 parishes serve 2,358,000 Catholics, who make up 42 percent of the total population of the two counties it covers. Chicago contains 210 parishes; 178 are in the suburbs (Archdiocese Pastoral Center 2000). Its institutions provide worship, counseling, education, social services, housing construction, community organizing, and public policy advocacy. The Archdiocese operates the largest Catholic School system in the United States with 128,846 students in 45 high schools, 267 elementary schools, 6 schools for the developmentally disabled, and a seminary system (Archdiocese Pastoral Center 2000). The 6 Catholic colleges and universities along with 3 nursing schools and the Catholic Hospital System are administratively and legally separate entities from the Archdiocese of Chicago but all fall under the

ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the archbishop.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago is the Archdiocese's social service agency. Legally it is separate from the Archdiocese; however, the Catholic Charities Administration falls under the direction of the Catholic Bishop of Chicago (The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago no date).

As of May 1998, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago provided 343 programs at 156 sites. These include 43 basic human needs programs, 108 children's programs, 82 elderly programs, and 110 family programs (The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago 1998b). The programs provide food for low-income women who are pregnant and/or nursing, for children, and for the elderly and food, clothing, and other assistance for people in emergency situations. They provide housing for the elderly, transitional housing for those in need, and homes for pregnant women and women with children. Women Infant and Children Centers are run by Catholic Charities, as is a job-training program. The elderly receive Catholic Home Care; children receive foster care, adoption services, Head Start, and daycare. And refugee resettlement programs assist refugees (The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago 1999).

In chapter one I explore the literature on religious organizations and urban communities. Chapter two examines the relationship of early white immigrant groups to their neighborhood parishes and what role those parish communities played in social capital development and how that compared with more recent Latino immigrants. A detailed analysis of Pilsen, a Latino community on Chicago's lower

West Side, and the role of its neighborhood parishes is in chapter III. In chapter IV, I outline the centralization of decision-making in the Archdiocese showing how it has removed power from neighborhoods and immigrant groups. Chapter V explores the response of the Archdiocese to efforts to increase Latino representation in the Pastoral Center and to engage Latinos in archdiocesan decision-making. Chapter VI explores the lack of Latino participation in archdiocesan planning efforts in the 1980s and 1990s. And chapter VII suggests that funding faith-based efforts to revitalize urban neighborhoods should take into consideration that religious institutions may not be any more responsive than public institutions.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE CITY

Research on the role of religious institutions in neighborhood and city politics has not been extensive. This is likely a result of the secular orientation of most academics. As Herberg notes, Americans presume to live in a secular world even though we maintain close ties to religion (Herberg 1960c, 1983). Wald notes the obvious presence of religious institutions in politics as interest groups, as organizations that influence political views, as voluntary organizations, and as social service providers. He suggests that secularization need not remove religion from politics, which he calls naive secularization, but rather focus on religious change, which allows that religious institutions affect politics. Religious association in the United States is strong despite modernization, the opposite of what we might expect if we believe the naive definition of secularization which should encourage academics to look critically at religious institutions and politics (Wald 1997).

Even though religious institutions are not expressly political, they affect politics and the public. They adapt to urban change and shape it. Chicago's Catholic Church has shaped immigrant adaptation, neighborhood change, social capital development, community organizing, and civic involvement. Despite the Church's extensive involvement as an urban institution, urban politics research has largely ignored this phenomenon.

Regime analyses focus primarily on city level actors. Often these analyses find the

presence of progrowth coalitions or what Imbroscio calls the “dominant urban form” (Imbroscio 1997). In these progrowth regimes, analysts focus on the roles of business and government. By so doing, they leave an entire dimension of the urban experience unexplored. As Ramsay notes, “students of urban politics have continued to focus on political and economic institutions from a top-down perspective while underestimating the importance of community, culture, and neighborhood institutions, especially the church” (Ramsay 1998, 620). Despite the fact that McGoldrick criticized Sayre and Kaufman’s *Governing New York* four decades ago, for overlooking the significant role of religious institutions, urban politics research has not responded to his admonition (McGoldrick 1960).

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Political scientists traditionally study institutions such as the state, congress, the courts, and the presidency, as well as the norms and rules of electoral behavior, and the relationship of state and market (March and Olsen 1989). Generally, they have not acknowledged that religious institutions also play public roles.

Tocqueville pointed out the importance of voluntary associations to democracy in America. Contrary to fears that association would promote revolution, Tocqueville argued that association strengthened democracy (Tocqueville 1945b). Social capital theorists have examined how associations strengthen civic life. It is association and participation in local level associations that social capital theorists identify as important to developing relationships that can lead to civic action. As Smidt suggests, “while much of associational life may not be explicitly political in nature, it is inherently political given its possible ramifications for fostering democratic life”

(Smidt 1998, 1).

Researchers who look at social capital development have begun to acknowledge that religious institutions are part of the civic infrastructure. *American Behavioral Scientist* devoted a special issue in 1997 to exploring the relationship of religious institutions to social capital development (1997).

Livezey's edited volume, *Public Religion and Urban Transformation*, is the first work to look systematically at the public role of religion (Livezey 2000). The researchers, who were part of the Religion and Urban American Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, examined immigrant communities and religion in the Chicago metropolitan area. They expected that they would find that social action was the most significant public role of religion in the city. Instead, they found that the development of cultural material that enables groups of people to build social capital is its most important role. (Livezey 2000, 20). They conclude that:

churches, temples, synagogues, and mosques produce the cultural material that enables their members and adherents to locate themselves with respect to the places and time in which they currently live, to identify with others, to find their moral bearings, and to achieve some measure of efficacy with respect to their own needs and aspirations. Mainly through worship, education, and social activities, these congregations appropriate symbols and generate new ones, claim and revise

traditions, defend and bridge social boundaries,
 articulate and invent meanings by which to make sense
 of changing circumstances (Livezey 2000, 21).

An essential public role of religion has been to help people create communities. Scholars of religion point to this as an important antidote to what they see as increasing individualism since the 1960s (Warner 2000).²

Putnam defined social capital as networks, norms, and trust that allow people to work together to achieve common ends. Social capital is created when there is trust among individuals or organizations and relationships are developed through horizontal rather than hierarchical social networks according to norms of reciprocity (Putnam 1993). As Wood points out, this is not an individual enterprise. Social capital is based in the networks between individuals and organizations (Wood no date, 3). Putnam found, as did Tocqueville before him, that participation in any type of civic organization, including choral societies and soccer clubs, was beneficial to the creation of social capital. Even in bird-watching and choral associations we can learn “skills of cooperation” and a “sense of shared responsibility for collective endeavors,” he concluded (Putnam 1993, 90).

Religious institutions seem ideally suited for the development of social capital. They often are based, at least at the community level, on trust, norms of reciprocity, and

²Warner (2000) in his epilogue to this work, suggests that the researchers may have found more evidence of social action type efforts if they had selected different case studies.

horizontal networks. The trust established within religious communities was observed early in the U.S. Weber noted that church affiliation was a necessary element for business relations in the early United States. Belonging to a particular religious community gave one the credentials to be “trusted” by others. “Neighborly contact, Sunday School, and so on, were said to be indispensable to the newcomer, but above all association with ‘morally’ reliable neighbors” (Weber 1946c, 306).

Tocqueville pointed out how participation in religious institutions acted as a limit on rampant individualism. It pulled one back to reflect on common issues rather than only those that would increase self worth (Tocqueville 1945b). Ramsay adds that religious institutions hold “individuals responsible to and for one another and...ground(s) its members in a supportive, moral community, regardless of how far away they’ve fallen, and provide(s) them with personal mentoring and citizenship and leadership training” (Ramsay 1998, 620). Suttles made a similar observation of the use of religious affiliation in community relations in Chicago in the 1960s. Religious affiliation is “a public guarantee of one’s amenability to group concerns, whether one happens to be “moral” or not” (Suttles 1968, 41).

For new immigrant groups, religious institutions foster horizontal relationships. Kurien found that in new immigrant communities, religious institutions provide points of association. They draw people together to provide resources for one another. Indian American Hindus use their religious associations to provide access to health care providers, assistance with immigration matters, and personal support for one another (Kurien 1998). Ellison and George found that those who attend religious services regularly have contact with a larger group of people creating what

Granovetter called weak ties (Granovetter 1973). Attending religious services provides people with an opportunity to develop relationships with people beyond their own family. People who attend religious services regularly have more non kin relationships than those who attend religious services less frequently or not at all, have more contact with people over the phone and in person, and they receive more supportive services (Ellison and George 1994).

Even though Putnam argued that participation in voluntary associations was an important contributor to the creation of social capital, he found that the Italian Catholic Church did not contribute to social capital development because its hierarchical structure does not enable it to contribute to the development of horizontal relations. “Good government in Italy is a by-product of singing groups and soccer clubs, not prayer” (Putnam 1993, 176).

In the U.S., Catholic urban parishes have historically been centers of associational life especially for new immigrant communities. Catholic parishes were often composed of individual ethnic groups and contributed to the development of trust, norms, and horizontal relations. It was in the parish that one might find and join the singing group or soccer club, make a connection to get a job, make a link to the local political party, or receive social services—even those that were publicly funded.

Religion and neighborhood are closely connected for urban Catholics. Unlike Protestant churches or Jewish synagogues, most Catholic parishes are territorial—they are rooted to a specific place rather than a specific people. Catholic leaders believed that a Catholic neighborhood was necessary to learn Catholic traditions; it provided

education, social services, a cultural center, and links to other local institutions and to the political party (McGreevy 1996; Morris 1997). As Morris describes,

The Catholic instinct is to wrap a completely Catholic cocoon around the buzz of transactions of daily life—not just weddings and baptisms or Sunday services, but also social clubs, schools, hospitals, charitable organizations, professional societies for Catholic doctors and lawyers, Catholic chapters within trade unions, Catholic veterans' organizations (Morris 1997).

The neighborhood Catholic parish influenced how new immigrant groups organized, how immigrant enclaves developed, and how immigrants related with one another, preserved their culture, and engaged with their communities, each other and the political system.

Neighborhoods were the focal points of immigrants' lives from the mid-1800s to the first few decades of the 1900s. Immigrants lived, shopped, worshiped, and socialized in their neighborhoods. "The city remained an abstraction, the neighborhood was a reality. It was the neighborhood, not the city, which provided immigrants with their identity, security, and stimulation" (Golab as cited in Katznelson, 1981, 68). Greeley suggests that the neighborhood was an:

institution of Americanization from which immigrants could begin to find their way into the political,

economic, social, and educational life of the new country, not as isolated individuals but as members of a strong, supportive community, strongly committed...to the pluralistic notion that anyone could become American, and it was not necessary to give up one's traditional loyalties, heritage, family, or church in the process (Greeley 1977).

Since the Irish immigrated earlier than other immigrant groups and they spoke English, they often dominated territorial parishes and diocesan administration. Chicago's Archdiocese was controlled by Irish bishops from 1844 to 1915³ with the exception of a Belgian between 1848 and 1853. Other ethnic groups requested their own parishes with their own priests so that they could practice their religion with their own traditions and language.

Ethnic or "national" parishes were created to serve a particular group of people based on their language rather than a specific geographical place. National Catholic parishes provided a space for immigrants to join together as a group, to preserve their culture and language, to maintain ties to the homeland, to provide a space for entertainment and association—both political and social, and to facilitate ties to the political party (Dolan 1975; Fitzpatrick 1988; Gleason 1987; Skerrett, Kantowicz, and Avella 1993).

In Chicago, many national parishes were often located within the boundaries of a

³Only one of the five Irish bishops during that period was born in the United States rather than in Ireland.

particular territorial parish, which created a number of small parish communities within the one territorial parish. Suttles' study of the Hull House neighborhood and Kornblum's study of the South Side found that Catholic parishes defined neighborhood physical space and shaped the interactions of those who lived within them (Kornblum 1974; Suttles 1968).

From the 1840s through to the 1920s or so, Chicago's Catholic parishes were particularly important because the nativism present during this period shut off many avenues for Catholic immigrants. Being able to own their local parish institutions was an important way for immigrants to provide the services they needed, maintain their group ties, begin the process of becoming hyphenated Americans on their own terms, and have an institution that they could use as the voice of their ethnic group.

ETHNIC DIVISION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

The separation of ethnic groups into their own parishes has led some to suspect that Catholic parishes contributed to ethnic divisions and delayed Catholic immigrants from becoming American. Even though Suttles found that the local institutions, the schools, businesses, recreational arrangements, and churches kept ethnic groups separate within communities, he argues that the separate parish institutions had positive affects. "All of the local ethnic groups assume that members within one minority group have exceptional claim on each other's trust, help, association, and understanding" (Suttles 1968, 59). "In the absence of any other groups for trust, they rely upon ethnic and residential unities" (Suttles 1968, 60). The ethnic enclave defined, in part, by the Catholic parish, was critical to the development of social capital.

Urban Catholic immigrants who belonged to these parishes frequently had multiple overlapping relationships because they lived in the same neighborhood, belonged to the same parish, were likely to be of similar ethnic heritage, their children attended the parish school, their social functions were held at the parish hall, and their associations were organized through the parish. Novelist James Farrell vividly describes these overlapping relationships in his trilogy about Studs Lonigan and his neighborhood (Farrell 1932 (reissue 1993)).

Gluckman called these overlapping relationships multiplex relations. Children develop relationships because they attend school together. These relationships are strengthened because they live in the same neighborhood and their parents meet socially (Gluckman 1967 as cited in Coleman 1988). This creates multiple opportunities to develop the networks, norms, and trust--the elements of social capital. Coleman concluded that it was a result of the intergenerational closure as a result of overlapping relationships that fewer children dropped out of Catholic schools than other private or public schools (Coleman 1988).

PARISH AND PLACE

Two recent works examine the relationship between religious institutions and neighborhood change (Gamm 1999; McGreevy 1996). Gamm argues that the Catholic and Jewish religious institutions in Roxbury and Dorchester in Boston played a significant role in neighborhood change, in shaping the urban exodus of whites (Gamm 1999). Gamm examines a number of variables that are usually used to explain neighborhood change--education, income, culture, home ownership, and

discrimination in accessing funding. These are not sufficient though, he argues, to explain the situation in Boston nor are they sufficient to explain why some neighborhoods remain white. Gamm concludes that neighborhood stability is in part determined by their institutional structure. Catholics stayed in neighborhoods longer; Jews left. “Institutions play a profound and independent role in the capacity of a neighborhood to resist change, and, when change comes, to deal with it in orderly fashion” (Gamm 1999, 19).

In these two neighborhoods, the religious institutions play a significant and different role because of their institutional rules. Gamm states “Ancient rules binding churches and synagogues have shaped the twentieth-century urban battle of race and housing” (Gamm 1999, 17). He found that the rules that govern these religious institutions determine how they respond to changing neighborhood demographics. Gamm identifies three types of rules: membership, rootedness, and authority. In the two neighborhoods he examined, the affect of the rules meant that the Jewish population was able to leave the neighborhood with few exit costs whereas the Catholics in the region faced high exit costs directly related to their religious associations.

According to Gamm, Catholic parishes have a particularly strong attachment to physical place because of structural and geographical rootedness. The Church itself “is a permanent structure, consecrated to God and built around a permanent altar, and the territorial parish’s relationship to its neighborhood is inalienable” (Gamm 1999, 18). The structural relationship of the physical church to place is complemented by the rule (which was only changed recently) that Catholics must live within a parish’s geographical service area to be members of the parish and receive the sacraments.

This rule imposed high exit costs on Catholics who sought to leave their old urban neighborhoods. Not only were they leaving their parish behind, but also they were removing themselves from their associations within the parish (Gamm 1999, 117).

Jews in contrast faced fewer exit costs. Those who moved away were still welcome to participate in their old Temple and they were free to create a new Temple in their new neighborhoods.

Zorbaugh, many years before Gamm's study, also noted the importance of rootedness. In his study of Chicago's Gold Coast and Little Sicily in the 1920s, he found that, with the exception of the Catholic Church, as neighborhoods changed, churches grew away from the community and they ceased to be neighborhood institutions. For the Catholic Church, the reality was different. The Catholic Church retained some of its connection to the neighborhood because of its requirement that parishioners live in the parish. Zorbaugh observed: "the traditional relationship of Sicilian village life to the church still persists. Family celebrations and village festivals have at least a nominal relationship to the church" (Zorbaugh 1929, 185). Unlike the other neighborhood churches where population had either dwindled or people moved and just returned to the parish to attend services, the Italian church remained rooted in the community because its parishioners were still community residents. Zorbaugh adds that the relationship was weakening for second generation Italians (Zorbaugh 1929).

Another important rule Gamm identifies is authority. Catholic parishes are part of a larger hierarchical structure. Catholic parishes remained in the Dorchester and Roxbury neighborhoods. Initially their revenues, while they were booming parishes, were used to support the development of parishes in growing suburban communities.

Once the Dorchester and Roxbury neighborhoods changed, becoming home to fewer Catholics and people with lower incomes, the Catholic hierarchy used its structure to provide resources for these poorer urban parishes (Gamm 1999).

Sanders shows the extent to which parish priests went to secure their neighborhoods. When a growing Polish population surrounded a German parish, the German priest attempted to keep the Germans from moving out.

First, the strongly nationalistic German pastor tried “every promising means,” to keep his own people clustered around the church. His efforts included successful lobbying for newly paved streets, sewer installation, and even the 10-acre Eckert Park. Meanwhile, he spoke publicly against the Poles, snubbed them in the streets, and made them generally unwelcome in parish and school (Sanders 1977, 49).

Currently, the Archdiocese of St. Louis is running a Catholic homesteading program to draw people back into urban neighborhoods (Belluck 1999).

By placing institutions at the forefront, Gamm emphasizes the much-overlooked role of local religious institutions. Gamm limited his analysis to territorial parishes. In Chicago, the story is much more complex as neighborhoods contained many parishes with overlapping service areas because of the many national parishes.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IMMIGRANT ADAPTATION

Wood adds that a missing element of Putnam's social capital thesis can be found in the literature on organizational culture. People are bound not just by the networks, trust, and reciprocity but also by "shared cultural elements" such as symbols, meanings, and assumptions. "The symbolic elements shared among members of religious communities help stabilize and institutionalize communities and the organizing efforts they sponsor" (Wood 1997, 603). And these symbols, meanings and assumptions, according to Wood, affect how people deal with conflict and civic engagement. Ethnic groups used Catholic parishes to establish new ethnic identities in the United States, often based on language, religion, and culture. Herberg points out that as each ethnic group created a parish in the U.S., "A new identity began to emerge, a unity defined primarily by language, a unity largely unknown in the Old World but quick to become their very identity in the New. The immigrant church was the primary expression of this unity" (Herberg 1960c, 1983, 11).

Religion is one of the ways that immigrant groups maintain their sense of identity and organization upon their arrival in the U.S. (Warner and Wittner 1998). For many Catholic immigrants, the Catholic parish was one of the first institutions they confronted upon arriving in the U.S. As Maloney notes, the Church "influences the atmosphere in which immigrants seek to integrate into, or acclimate themselves to, American society, and eventually to participate in significant ways in the culture and politics of the United States" (Maloney 1994, 1).

For new immigrant groups, religion acts as a mediator between the old society and the new (Herberg 1960c, 1983; Kurien 1998; Warner and Wittner 1998; Williams 1988).

Religious institutions, Maloney suggests, provide “a religious sanctuary with familiar spiritual supports in the midst of a new and different world. It can also provide a social setting for preserving one’s native culture and at the same time a platform for the economic and political foray into American life” (Maloney 1994, 3). Some ethnic groups intentionally use their religious institutions to preserve culture. Kurien’s study of Indian Americans found that adults valued their religious practices because they believed that they helped to pass their culture along to their children (Kurien 1998).

Liberal Irish Catholic Church leaders in the mid-1800s decided that the Church should Americanize Catholic immigrants. As Liberals, these Catholic leaders valued republican principles of government and supported the idea that immigrants should quickly adopt democratic values. They were also sensitive to nativist claims that Catholic immigrants were not American. According to Gleason, Catholicism “became the focal point of what it meant to be an American” (Gleason 1992, 155). Echoing this fear, the “Chicago Tribune took the lead in denouncing the increasing influence of the Irish in local politics and its editorials warned that the Catholic Church sought political and religious supremacy in America” (Skerrett 1987, 26). Church leaders knew that by reducing the ethnic character of the Church, they could legitimize the Church in the eyes of Americans and build its power. The process of Americanizing happened differently in different parts of the country and many ethnic groups continue to maintain a close relationship between ethnicity and religion.

Latinos immigrated/migrated to the United States in large numbers after this Americanization policy was well established. Lawrence aptly states that the Americanization policy “has often placed the Church hierarchy at odds with the

spiritual and ethnic aspirations of newcomer Hispanics, and has bred conflict, disaffection and outright defection on the one hand and repeated attempt at dialogue, accommodation and innovation on the other” (Lawrence 1998, 50). Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo describe the initial reaction of the Catholic Church to Latinos as pious colonialism. The United States Catholic Church imposed a new style of Catholic worship on Latinos already living in the United States and on Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Latinos responded to this policy asserting that they did not wish to be Americanized. Latino Catholicism is different and they intend to preserve their traditions, language, and culture.

At the community level, Latinos have used Catholic parishes and their shared cultural religious traditions to build community. And Catholic churches can play and are playing an important role in establishing a common Latino identity. “Religion is a particularly powerful wellspring of Latino identity, cultural cohesiveness, and social organization” (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998). As Wood suggests, the symbols and cultural religious tradition are used extensively to further engage Latinos in public life.

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIC INVOLVEMENT

As Coleman pointed out, social capital is productive. It leads to something. And the norms, networks, and trust created in Catholic parishes have been used to engage in politics. Early white ethnics used their local parishes to connect to the political party, to learn about civic education, to register to vote, and as physical places in which they could discuss politics. More recently, parishes have been used as organizational bases to launch community organizing and development efforts.

Religious institutions have been important actors in generating civic involvement but there is no body of literature exploring their neighborhood role as places of discussion and networking. And there is no formal analysis of the role that they have played in neighborhood machine politics despite the close connection between Irish Catholics and machine party politics. The evidence of the relationship between the two is found scattered in research on machine politics, in church histories, and occasionally in sociological ethnographies. The Church is often mentioned incidentally; its role in ward politics has never been fully explored.

Katznelson includes the Catholic parish in his analysis of politics in Washington Heights, New York City in the 1960s. According to Katznelson, the Catholic parish reinforced the structure of city trenches that separated work and residence and rooted politics in ethnically defined and territorially separated places. The result was, as Katznelson puts it, to define “the realities of politics as being about ethnicity and territoriality rather than about capital and class, and it reproduced and reinforced the segmented-ward principle of political organization” (Katznelson 1981, 113).

There was also a close connection between the party and Catholic parishes in Chicago. Local parishes and parish associations were training grounds for neighborhood leaders. As one Irish politician said, “Your political training is in the parish. There’s more politics in the parish than in the city. Someone is always vying for some position, although there’s no money in it” (as cited in Levine, 1966, 131). The Democratic Party acknowledged the importance of the Church and used Catholic parishes to recruit ward politicians.

Participation in the parish provided a wealth of contacts and networks. Catholic parishes provided an organized base that the machine could tap into. Gosnell describes the parish in Chicago:

The church furnishes a place for the party worker to make contacts and to gain respectability. In some communities the church plays a very important role in the social life of the inhabitants. A South Chicago Polish neighborhood was run almost completely by the Catholic priest, who carried on all the social service activities that in some other sections would be in the hands of the party workers (Gosnell 1969 c1937, 64).

According to Funchion, Chicago Irish and Irish Americans became involved in politics when they were young, using the connections made through the local parish, saloon, and Irish organization (Funchion 1987). Between 1890 and 1910, nearly a third of Chicago's aldermen were Irish or Irish American and 33 of 50 ward committeemen were Irish. 12 of 50 aldermen were Irish American in 1962 and 21 of 50 ward committeemen were Irish (Levine 1966). Levine notes that "Irish priests had an interest in the welfare of the party apart from their ethnoreligious preferences. Every intercession they made on behalf of their parishioners strengthened the ties of politics, parish, and religion, the bonds of Irish solidarity and identity" (Levine 1966, 131). Attendance in parochial schools, especially high schools like De La Salle aided the mobility of immigrants into machine party politics.

Guterbock suggests that Catholics deal with politics through “personal channels.” In his study of who accesses ward organizations, he found that Catholics used ward services more than non-Catholics and Catholics were even more likely to use precinct services. This led him to conclude that Catholics participate in politics through the personal channels. Guterbock suggests that the explanation for this lies in the fact that the Church is similar to the political party. They are both organized hierarchically and rooted in local institutions—the parish and the ward. Guterbock suggests that Catholics use precinct and ward services more than other groups because they are predisposed to accepting community assistance, in contrast with Protestants who are focused on individual responsibility (Guterbock 1980).

Guterbock doesn’t explore the Catholic connection to community even though he found that the strongest indicator of who used the party’s services was attachment to community, which he measured as homeowners, participants in neighborhood voluntary associations, long-time residents, those who read the community press, or people of middle age (Guterbock 1980). For Catholics, ethnicity and neighborhood are tightly wedded to the Catholic parish.

The Church used relationships with the political machine to build political power for itself. Diaz-Stevens relates how New York’s Catholic leadership opposed sending Catholics to the Midwest and West for fear that it would dilute the power of the Catholic Church in New York. For the bishop of New York:

the city was the one battleground in the United States

where Catholicism had achieved a measure of success.

The reluctance of these prelates to abandon Catholic schools, the Democratic Party machine, opulent urban church buildings, and power politics was neither a theological nor ideological issue; it was a structural necessity that brought upon Catholics a long-lasting criticism (Diaz-Stevens 1993, 69).

Community Activism

Religious institutions are viewed as alternative institutions for low-income people, women, and people of color to gain civic skills and to gain power to make change locally (Ammerman 1997; Maloney 1994; Smidt 1998, 1; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Wood no date, 1). Existing research often lumps religious institutions together, taking positive aspects of each denomination and or organizing effort to support the use of religious institutions as community based developers and organizers. Not much of the research explores the limitations of individual denominations or organizing efforts. And the institutional limitations of religious structures, such as the effect of archdiocesan policy on parish efforts have not been fully explored.

With the decline of ward-based politics since the 1970s-1980s, community residents have looked for alternative ways to organize locally to influence politics. Religious institutions and other community organizations and institutions may provide a way for those who have not reaped the rewards of the liberal capitalist system to build power through local religious organizations. Berger and Neuhaus describe religious

institutions, along with neighborhood, family, and voluntary associations, as mediating structures which they define as “those institutions standing between the individual in his private life and the large institutions of public life” (Berger and Neuhaus 1977, 2). They argue that these structures are necessary to preserve democracy because the megastructures, by which they mean the state, have become separated from people as a result of modernity. It is through mediating structures that people find their place in life and develop their sense of community. They are the generators and keepers of values; “they are the principal expressions of the real values and the real needs of people in our society” (Berger and Neuhaus 1977, 7). The upper class can find ways to influence and react to the state, but the poor rely on these mediating institutions to access it (Berger and Neuhaus 1977).

Ramsay makes a similar argument that modernity, in the form of liberal market capitalism, has benefited some industrial and postindustrial capitalists but has left out the “the vast majority—especially women, minorities, the poor, and those whose national origins are in what is called ‘the periphery’” (Ramsay 1998, 600-601). She argues that those left out have turned to religious institutions with the result that there has been a surge of religious activism (Berger and Neuhaus 1977).

A walk through many low-income neighborhoods across the country bears out the fact that many religious institutions are engaging in community development and community organizing. Even small churches with few resources can be found developing housing or participating in Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) organizing campaigns. Organizing networks such as the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), the Pacific Institute for Community Organization (PICO) and Gamaliel have found that

using religious institutions as organizing bases has been a successful strategy ultimately giving these groups more political power (Wood no date).

The Catholic Church has sponsored organizing efforts in different parts of the country at different times. Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) in San Antonio, United Neighborhoods Organization (UNO) in Los Angeles, United Power for Action and Justice and The Woodlawn Organization (TWO) both in Chicago have all been funded by the Catholic Church or supported institutionally by it at one point in time (Lawrence 1998).

Advocates argue that religious institutions are successful community organizers and developers because they are physically present in low-income neighborhoods, based on faith, maintain institutional leaders, have institutional resources, a comprehensive view of urban problems, and are accessible to the poor, women, and people of color (Cisneros 1996; Ramsay 1998; Thomas and Reynard N. Blake 1996). Ramsay, in her analysis of faith-based institutions concludes that “the church has a unique capability to act as a catalyst for transforming distressed urban communities and renewing the cultural, moral, economic, and political life of the cities” (Ramsay 1998, 598).

Ramsay’s suggestion that religious institutions have the capacity to revitalize cities resembles the ideas put forth by Harvey Cox 35 years ago (Cox 1965). Cox identifies Christian churches as healing the wounds of the city. To operationalize wounds, Cox uses the cleavages identified by Banfield and Wilson: “center-city versus suburbs; haves versus have-nots; ethnic and racial tensions, especially white versus Negro; the competition between political parties” (Cox 1965, 133). Cox notes that the problems

faced by cities require metropolitan, society wide solutions, that confront the “powerlessness of oppressed peoples” (Cox 1965, 134). It is a function of religious institutions to deal with the problems of urban communities by creating metropolitan solutions. Religious institutions can and, Cox asserts, should draw together suburban and urban residents. They should support political action that would result in public policy changes to increase equity for those in low-income areas. Policies benefit people in the suburbs disproportionately and religious institutions should press them to engage with those in urban communities to create a more equitable system (Cox 1965).

The following chapters explore the extent to which the Catholic Church has contributed to the development of social capital and how that has differed for different groups of immigrants. It looks in particular at the reaction of the Archdiocese centrally and at the neighborhood level to the growth of Latino immigration, suburbanization, and the changing demographics of the city of Chicago.

II. CHICAGO'S CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IMMIGRANT GROUPS

CATHOLIC IMMIGRATION TO CHICAGO 1850-1920S

Chicago's Catholic Church during this period was distinguished by the sheer diversity of ethnic groups. From the creation of the diocese in the 1840s through the 1920s and, to a lesser extent into the 1940s, the Archdiocese was dominated by a diversity of white immigrants including Germans, Irish, Poles, Lithuanians, Bohemians, Slovenes, Slovaks, and Italians. Mexicans began to immigrate to Chicago after 1910.

Chicago's Catholic ethnic groups quickly made demands on the Archdiocese. They forced the creation of national parishes to serve them. These national parishes, in many cases, became important community centers and places that fostered the development of social capital and ethnic identity. Chicago's Catholic ethnic groups demanded that the bishops create national parishes and secure priests from the home country to staff them. Priest appointments are a bishop's job and Chicago's ethnic groups demanded that they have some input in deciding who ran their parishes. Germans immediately began to show the strength of Chicago's ethnic groups that would continue through the mid-1900s, constantly challenging Irish control over Chicago's Church. German immigrants found it unacceptable to attend Chicago's first Catholic parish, St. Patrick's, built for the Irish in 1846 and requested the creation of German national parishes. They wanted institutions that were separate from the Irish controlled territorial parishes (Dolan 1975; Olson 1987). For Germans, language and

culture were so closely tied with religion that they were inseparable (Gleason 1987).

As Walch notes, “In effect, both German parishes rejected the authority of the bishop to decide unilaterally on parish appointments. Since pastors ministered to clearly defined communities, the Germans thought those communities should have a voice in the decision-making process” (Walch 1988, 79).

The strength of ethnic groups to influence staffing is evident.

99 percent of the Irish clergy engaged in parish work were assigned to territorial, English-speaking parishes” and “100 percent of the Polish and Slovak priests, 92% of the Lithuanian priests, 86% of the Italian priests, and 82% of the Bohemian priests labored within parishes of their own ethnic league” and the Germans “retained 90% of their priests in German parishes” (Kantowicz 1995, 584).

It is important to note that many of the priests serving national parishes were religious order priests rather than diocesan priests. This limited the authority of the diocese.

The creation of national parishes affected and, in many cases, dictated the spatial separation and organization of Chicago’s ethnic groups. Chicago neighborhoods like Bridgeport and Pilsen were home to many Catholic parishes, some just a few blocks from one another. In the Back of the Yards, eleven different Catholic parishes were built between 1879 and 1910. “Three were for Poles, and there was one each for

Germans, Bohemians, Slovaks, Lithuanians, Russians, and Ukrainians” (Jablonsky 1993, 32). Ethnic communities often grew around a national parish and advertisements for new houses and apartments frequently listed their Catholic parish. The connection between new immigrant communities and Catholic parish formation is so close that Abbott, in her study of Chicago tenements, used parish construction dates to date the start of new immigrant enclaves (Abbott reprint 1970, 103).

National parishes were used for religious and cultural celebrations, to preserve immigrant group language and culture, and to maintain ties with immigrants’ home countries as they adapted to U.S. society and politics (Dolan 1992; Gleason 1987; McGreevy 1996; Skerrett 1987; Skerrett, Kantowicz, and Avella 1993). For Poles,

It is a well-known and certain thing that....wherever there is a priest, a church, wherever a parish is being created, there Polish life grows vigorously, there our number multiplies, for from all sides people come willingly, feeling better among their own and with their own, feeling safer under the protective wings of the parish and with their own shepherd... (Published in Thomas and Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant*, V, 68, cited in Abbott, reprint 1970, 103).

Other ethnic groups created their own national parishes, which often became social, ethnic, and religious centers for their ethnic communities. Jablonsky, for example, identified the Catholic parish, Saints Cyril and Methodius, as the most important

ethnic center for Bohemians in the Back of the Yards (Jablonsky 1993).

For Poles, the Catholic parish was a re-creation of the community in Poland. “In its institutional organization it performs the functions which in Poland are fulfilled by both the Parish and commune” (Znaniecki 212 as cited in Schafer 1929). Jablonsky describes the national parish experience of the Poles:

There were daily classes in Polish grammar, speech, and history. Religious instruction was in Polish. Although mathematics and social studies were taught in English, the nuns used Polish in their classroom conversation, and when a parish priest visited the classroom, all exchanges had to be in Polish. Failure to exhibit complete loyalty to one’s ancestral traditions was met with severe disapproval. Nuns and priests sternly admonished their charges never to enter a Catholic church other than “their own” except as part of the Holy Thursday liturgy, when, as a body, they visited a total of nine churches (Jablonsky 1993, 105).

St. Stanislaus Kostka, Chicago’s Polish cathedral, alone was home to 74 organizations (Schafer 1929). And its school included four meeting halls and an auditorium (Koenig 1980). The Polish Roman Catholic Union and parishes including Immaculate Conception, St. Adalbert, St. Stanislaus Kostka established libraries and reading rooms and The Polish Roman Catholic Union had its own paper, Dziennik

Zjednoczenia (Pacyga 1998). Poles in Pilsen, on Chicago's lower West Side, built St. Adalbert in 1873 to serve 3,000 families; 2,614 children attended school, about 70 children attended a day care center, and 57 societies were related to the parish (Archdiocese of Chicago).⁴

Parish halls were important to the "creation of a Polish identity in Chicago" (Pacyga 1998, 229). The use of these private spaces for ethnic events was particularly important because the use of public spaces was regulated. The city used public parks created during the progressive movement to support assimilation (Jablonsky 1993). Their use was strictly controlled. Protests and demonstrations were broken up, meetings of cultural and ethnic groups were curtailed, and planned events were designed to support the Americanization of immigrants (Pacyga 1998). Reformers built Pulaski Park in 1914 directly across the street from St. Stanislaus Kostka, at the heart of Chicago's Polonia (Pacyga 1998). Poles in turn created the Polish Catholic Settlement House, near the location of the University of Chicago Settlement. "The Polish Settlement House or *ochronka*, which literally meant shelter, provided a rallying center for the Polish community during the 1919 Race Riot. It was an ethnic public space that allowed the discussion of particularly Polish views during that crisis" (Pacyga 1998, 234).

Ethnic groups used their parishes to raise money to send home or to organize around political issues in their homeland. Tocqueville observed a meeting of Poles led by a

⁴ Despite the creation of these strong Polish institutions, there were divisions among Poles, one of which resulted in the creation of the Polish National Catholic Church—an institution separate from the Roman Catholic Church.

priest that gathered resources to send back to Poland and to pray for Polish independence. He reported that the priest said: “”Almighty God! The God of armies! Thou who didst strengthen the hearts and guide the arms of our fathers when they were fighting for the sacred rights of their national independence!” (Tocqueville 1945a, 302).

St. Procopius, built in 1876, on Chicago’s lower West Side in Pilsen, was an important Bohemian national parish. Bohemians expanded the parish many times, rebuilding churches and schools to meet the needs of their growing community. They built a high school and elementary school that included classroom and meeting space for parish societies. The Benedictine Fathers who ran the parish created a press to publish literature for children and adults to counteract the anti-Catholic Bohemian press. The parish bought land to keep it from becoming a factory and installed a playground. They established a home for the elderly and homeless girls, and built St. Joseph Bohemian Orphanage.

St. Michael Archangel Church was the center for Slovaks. Located in the stockyards, it was dedicated in 1909. Children were taught Slovak for one hour a day at the parish school. St. Michael’s was home to a number of organizations including the First Catholic Slovak Union, National Catholic Society, and Catholic Sokols.

The club room beneath St. Michael’s school is a convenient meeting place for the Catholic Slovaks and here they come together for business and social affairs. On Sundays a movie is given for the adults, the children

having their show on Friday afternoon (Zahrobsky 1924, 39).

Parishioners created a club to share information to become citizens and the pastor was often involved in leading the classes (Abbott reprint 1970, 135). Slovaks opened their own cemetery, Our Lady of Sorrows, which provided income to sponsor their activities.

Chicago's Archdiocese did not reign in displays of nationalism. According to McMahon, Chicago's Bishop Feehan did not quash Irish nationalism during the 1880s and 1890s as dioceses did on the East Coast. "In Chicago...Archbishop Patrick A Feehan sided with the "liberal" elements in the Church that thought it best not to antagonize Catholics who were essentially loyal church members but who were attracted to nationalist organizations" (McMahon 1995, 10). The Church allowed nationalist organizations like the Clan-na-Gael, that wanted to free Ireland, to continue its association with the Church and to hold their meetings in parish buildings. Some Irish parish priests were actively involved in the liberation movement and the nationalism reinforced Catholic and Irish identities (Skerrett 1987). The Clan-na-Gael was also entrenched in machine politics in Chicago and ran what Funchion labels a mini-machine (Funchion 1987).

Even though there were no official national Irish parishes, there were many parishes that were Irish. According to Skerrett, the Catholic parish was important for Irish immigrants even more so than for other Catholic immigrants because the Irish settled throughout the city rather than in enclaves like the Germans and Poles. The parish

was the associational center that drew the Irish together. The Irish parish “accelerated the integration of immigrants and their children into American life” (Skerrett 1987, 22).

The Italian experience was different from that of these other immigrant groups. Italian immigration did not surge until the 1890s, decades later than Germans and Irish. For Irish and Polish Catholics, nationality and religion were intertwined; nationalism strengthened religion and vice versa. For Italian Catholics, religion and nationalism were “opposing forces” (Nelli 1970, 188). Additionally, Italians had few financial resources, few Italian priests, and many planned to return to Italy (Nelli 1970; Skerrett 1993). As a result, there was little Italian support for the construction of Italian parishes or schools. “With every other Catholic group, ecclesiastical authorities struggled to keep enthusiasm for the national parish within reasonable bounds. But with the Italians, the struggle went into providing churches and schools they would not build for themselves” (Sanders 1977, 67).

Servites founded Chicago’s first Italian parish, Assumption, in 1874. The present church on Illinois Street was dedicated in 1886 and Mother Francis Xavier Cabrini opened the parish school in 1899. St. Anthony was located on the far South Side of Chicago in a neighborhood with many ethnic parishes and schools and the lack of support for the Italian school was evident in contrast with the other ethnic groups.

Since the Archdiocese believed it was necessary to provide Italians with national parishes as well as schools, it subsidized the founding of eight of the nine national Italian parishes that were in existence in 1906. The Archdiocese gave another

\$65,000 for a school at St. Philip Benizi parish after the pastor pleaded for a school (Sanders 1977, 69). And Cardinal Mundelein (1915-1939) encouraged other ethnic groups to help new Italian immigrants build schools for 10 of their 11 parishes (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983). Ultimately Mundelein complained that the Italian parishes were only surviving because they received archdiocesan support and he reduced aid to them (Sanders 1977, 70).

National Parish Networks

Each of the ethnic groups, with the exception of the Italians, organized their national parishes into informal networks. Ethnic groups used the informal networks to develop institutions to serve their ethnic communities. They used revenue from various sources such as ethnic cemeteries and parish taxes to build social services agencies, orphanages, new national parishes, and schools.

The Poles were the largest and most organized group with 44 parishes and about 230,000 members (Kantowicz 1983). “The Polish pastors...frequently met to set policy for the Polish cemeteries and orphanages and to assess all the Polish parishes for joint building projects. Individual pastors commonly made loans to pastors of new parishes...” (Kantowicz 1983, 72). St. Stanislaus Kostka’s pastor created a bank for parishioners; he used parishioners’ deposits to build new Polish churches and to subsidize Polish orphanages so that Polish children did not have to go to the Irish controlled diocesan orphanages (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983).

Five German parishes opened the Angel Guardian Orphanage in 1865, which served 700 children. The county funded it in addition to profits from German Catholic

cemeteries and donations (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983; Kantowicz 1983, 130).

Slovenians and Bohemians operated on a smaller scale, reflecting their smaller populations. Bohemians were somewhat different from other Catholic groups. Fewer Bohemians belonged to Catholic churches compared with their total number in the population and they came from an anti-clerical, freethinking culture. Even so, in 1877, Bohemian Catholics created their own cemetery and used the funds to support schools, a library and an old age home (Sclair 1995, 618).

Mexicans

Mexicans began to immigrate to Chicago in the beginning of the 20th century. Fewer than 2,000 Mexicans lived in Chicago in 1910; by the 1920s, Chicago was home to 25,000 Mexicans (Dahm 2001). Three national parishes were created for Mexicans: Our Lady of Guadalupe (1924), in South Chicago, St. Francis of Assisi (1927), in the Hull House neighborhood, and Heart of Mary Vicariate. Since there were few Mexican priests in the United States or in Mexico, a Spanish order of priests, Claretians, took over many Mexican parishes.

Our Lady of Guadalupe was located near the steel mills on the far south side. Some sources suggest that U.S. Steel donated \$12,000 to construct the church (Badillo 1994; Felter 1941, 36; Kerr 1976. According to another source, steelworkers gave the money to build the parish (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios). The Church's school, opened in 1948, was run by Cordi-Marian Missionary Congregation of Mexican nuns (Felter 1941,37).

Kerr suggests that South Chicago Mexican Catholics were better able to preserve their

culture and traditions and to make the changeover to American society because they were geographically separated and confined to their parish. “Even into the 1930’s Mexicans in South Chicago were still prohibited from attending other Catholic ethnic parishes than their own Our Lady of Guadalupe; they were still unofficially restricted from moving east of Commercial Avenue” (Kerr 1976, 101-102). And,

Residentially restricted, they achieved stability sooner than was possible on the Near West Side. Densely concentrated, they were more aware of and more willing to participate in Mexican social activities. With the largest and most vigorous of the Mexican Catholic churches, they found it easier to maintain the language and religion they had brought with them (Kerr 1976 103).

According to a priest at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, “The Church was seen as a continuation of their [Mexicans] lifestyle, not only religiously but culturally. It was a social gathering place as well as a place to get help finding jobs” cited in (Casuso and Camacho 1995, 356).

St. Francis of Assisi, known as Chicago’s Hispanic Cathedral, was not a traditional neighborhood parish. Originally a German parish, then an Italian parish, Claretians transformed it in 1927 to a Mexican parish. It served neighborhood residents, mostly Mexican immigrants who worked in the rail yards. It also drew parishioners from throughout Chicago, neighboring counties and surrounding states (Badillo 1994;

Kelliher 1993). Mexican Cordi-Marian women religious began the parish's school.

Even though the parish was not a typical neighborhood parish, it was a center of organizational activity. In 1928, 60 people belonged to the women's association and 25 to the children's organization (Jones 1928). The parade for Mexican independence was organized in the parish and the parish offered a Novena to Our Lady of Guadalupe (Kelliher 1993).

St. Francis of Assisi's community was affected by the creation of the University of Illinois Chicago Circle campus in the 1960s that displaced many residents. Despite the disruption to the neighborhood, the parish remained as an important cultural and religious institution for Latino Catholics in the Chicago metropolitan area (Koenig 1980). Ignoring its important institutional role as a cultural and religious symbol, the Archdiocese closed the parish in the 1990s, and consolidated it with Holy Family. Holy Family was in better physical condition and since it was located only a few blocks West on Roosevelt Road, the Archdiocese concluded that using its physical plant was a more cost effective solution than repairing St. Francis.

Latinos were angered by the Archdiocese's action and demanded that St. Francis be reopened. Latinos emphasized that the Archdiocese made no effort to talk with groups of priests serving Latino communities, with archdiocesan staff in Hispanic ministry, with lay Latino leaders, or with parishioners. The decision to close the parish was based on financial considerations that reflected the Archdiocese's lack of understanding of the Latino community and what that parish meant to them. One priest reflected. "I couldn't believe they wanted to do it [close it]. It was very symbolic" (Interview with priest 1999).

The third Mexican national parish, Heart of Mary Vicariate, was created in the Back of the Yards. Even though Mexicans lived in the Back of the Yards for several years, many did not have access to a national parish. Their only option was to travel to St. Francis of Assisi or to another parish that offered Spanish masses and was open to Latinos. Worship began informally when Mexican women started a Guadalupe Society in 1931. "The association had a monthly mass. Members often had makeshift altars at home, wore a medal of Our Lady of Guadalupe, or had an image of the Virgin at their workplace" (Kelliher 1993).

In the fall of 1939, a young Mexican woman, Mary Louise Garibay, began a small Catholic mission in a store building at 4330 South Ashland Avenue. She is a resident of the area and a volunteer club leader at the University of Chicago Settlement. The store was small, but Miss Garibay decorated it with considerable ingenuity and used an ice box for an altar. Nuns from Our Lady of Guadalupe came to carry on the program. During the fall of 1940 the program became more active. The nuns and some of the lay people began to hand out cards to Mexicans whom they met on the street on Sunday morning and ask them to come to mass. The Protestants in the area protested that the Catholics were using unfair tactics because some of the cards had on them the phrase, *Vivo Christo Rey*, which had been

used by the Catholic rebels in Mexican and which was highly regarded by the Mexicans (Felter 1941,45).

It wasn't until 1947 that Claretians built a Catholic mission, Immaculate Heart Of Mary Vicariate, administered by St. Francis of Assisi (Badillo 1994).

The lack of Mexican priests in national Mexican parishes posed a difficulty for Mexicans. Mexicans did not develop many native priests and so had few to bring with them to Chicago (Badillo 1994). Previous ethnic groups fought to have priests from their own countries. The priest ensured that the close connection between religion, ethnicity, and culture would be preserved. But Mexican national parishes were run by Claretians. Unlike the German or Polish priest for whom religion, language, and culture were all intertwined, Claretians were from Spain and though they spoke Spanish, they did not have the same attachment to Mexican culture as a Mexican priest. In fact, some Claretians believed that parishes should be used for Americanizing immigrants, a significant departure from the role white national parishes played in preserving language, culture, and national ties (Badillo 1994).

LATINOS AND THE CHURCH

The Church operated similar to the way in which U.S. political and economic institutions operated with respect to Latinos. It marginalized Latinos. Latino religious culture and traditions were superseded by United States traditions in what Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo call pious colonialism (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998). The United States Catholic Church treated Puerto Ricans and Mexicans like immigrants and imposed a United States version of Catholicism on them. This was

closely tied to the relationship of Latinos to U.S. politics. “At times unwittingly and at other times deliberately, the newly imported Catholic clergy told Latinos that they should imitate an immigrant’s gratitude for opportunity in a new home rather than nurture resentment against an invading U.S. imperialism” (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 106).

Latinos responded by organizing and creating what Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo call the Latino Religious Resurgence. The Latino Religious Resurgence emerged at the end of the 1970s and was “characterized by the rapid and thoroughgoing diffusion of leadership roles. The democratization within the churches for pastoral initiative was rapidly imparted to the laity in local parishes and congregations” (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 129). Latinos demanded representation in the Church and a change in Church policy (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998).

The Latino Religious Resurgence coincided with efforts underway in cities, especially Chicago, that supported lay involvement, the development of democratic Church structures, and support for community organizing as a strategy to increase lay leadership development. The Resurgence used Catholic parishes as a place to develop a cultural identity and Latinos used local parishes as centers for community organization and social action (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 124). Religion became an integral part of Latino activism in the United States.

The Church responded to the Latino resurgence using two approaches—pastoral and liberation. The pastoral approach “emphasizes the administration of sacraments, church attendance, and piety; the other views the church’s mission in terms of aid in

matters like housing, health services, job opportunity, and social organization” (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 117). The liberation approach emphasizes involvement in social action. At times the Church has favored one approach over the other; often there is a debate within the Church about which approach should be used. Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo point out that often two agencies within the Church pursue both of these strategies. In Chicago, it is important to point out that the two strategies may be interrelated. Efforts at pastoral care may contribute to the development of social capital that can be used by liberationists concerned with social action (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998).

Latino immigration after 1950

Since the 1950s, Latinos have been the Archdiocese of Chicago’s fastest growing Catholic population. The largest groups are Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. Chicago’s Puerto Rican community grew from 32,371 in 1960 to 78,963 in 1970 and 120,000 in 1990 (Casuso and Camacho 1995, 347; Padilla 1987). Chicago’s Mexican population has grown even faster. In 1950, 24,000 Mexicans lived in Chicago, in 1960, 55,597, in 1980, 368,981, and in 1990, 352,000 (Casuso and Camacho 1995, 347; Dahm 2001).

Latinos have found it difficult to access national parishes that were controlled by white immigrant groups. Many of the earlier white ethnic groups were not interested in sharing their national parishes with a new ethnic group. Despite Mundelein’s efforts to reduce the ethnic character of the Church beginning in the 1910s, many ethnic groups, or what remained of them, hold on tightly to their national parishes. The close tie between parish and ethnicity that contributed to the development of

ethnic identity and social capital became a problem for new immigrant groups that needed to share parish space (Jablonsky 1993). Latinos were given second class status in many Catholic parishes. Latinos were often relegated to church basements for mass since parish priests did not want to add a Spanish mass in the main chapels (Interviews 1997-1998)(Arroyo 1980). Issues over the use of space and the availability of parish space for Latinos continue. As one Chicago priest related, on Easter in 1997, in one of Chicago's parishes, the priest did not open the balcony for the Latino mass. In response, "Hispanics took over the pulpit. The priest turned off the lights and walked out of the church. Now they have priests up there who speak Spanish" (Interview with parish priest 1998).

Puerto Ricans

The Archdiocese did not create Puerto Rican national parishes. But the Archdiocese did invest time and money to support community organizing in Puerto Rican communities. The Archdiocese funded a community organization in Woodlawn in the 1950s to engage members of the small Puerto Rican community. Father Leo Mahon of Woodlawn's Holy Cross parish gathered Young Christian workers along with Lestur Hunt and Nicholas von Hoffman, who became Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) organizers, to do community organizing in the neighborhood (Avella 1992, 224). This group worked with the IAF to train community residents as community organizers (Headley no date).

This effort reflects a few different things going on at the time. Some parish priests and some within the archdiocesan administration were interested in meeting the needs of Chicago's growing Puerto Rican population. At the same time, Archdiocesan

priests and administrators were interested in supporting social justice efforts, using community organizing as a primary strategy.

The IAF training and organizing effort in Woodlawn led to the creation of the Caballeros de San Juan (The Knights of St. John) in the early 1950s. The organization engaged in advocacy and political organizing; it provided links to social services, and it served as a social and recreational club. Membership in a Catholic parish was a prerequisite for membership in the organization.

Like Catholic associations of the earlier white ethnic groups, Los Caballeros was an important institution for preserving language, culture, and national identity. Padilla describes the significance of the organization for Puerto Ricans:

Los Caballeros presented the primary means by which Puerto Ricans began to structure a self-conscious community for ethnic advancement and betterment. The church service became a symbolic rite of affirmation of one's ethnic association and a vehicle for preserving the ethnic language and cultural traditions. The embryo of what was to later become a diverse Puerto Rican community had its inception in the growth of Los Caballeros (Padilla 1987).

The organization held voting drives and brought Puerto Ricans together to discuss issues. Los Caballeros started what became Chicago's Puerto Rican Day parade. The

goal of the parade initially was to present “to the city... a “Puerto Rican community that seemed to be organized by its Catholic components into a real political, social, and religious force” (Headley not dated).

Perhaps most importantly, Los Caballeros was a training ground for Puerto Rican leaders. IAF organizers trained many of those involved in Los Caballeros and these leaders later became active in Chicago politics. “In fact, this “elite”, the founders and leaders of the organization, went on to dominate Puerto Rican life well into the 1960s; they ran the social affairs, organized the civic ventures, and acted as spokesmen for Chicago’s Puerto Ricans in matters of group concern” (Padilla 1987, 131). Though initially Los Caballeros supported leadership development, it quickly became outdated as Puerto Ricans became more political. Los Caballeros’s leadership was criticized for being too accommodating to the white Chicago power structure. The organization declined in the mid to late 1960s.

Los Caballeros’ leaders were criticized for not directly confronting problems like racism. Race has been an issue for the Church. Padilla points out that the Church has not confronted the issues of institutional racism:

The church hierarchy saw the discrimination against Puerto Ricans, but it did not condemn it as part of American society. Instead, it sought to do charity by trying to alleviate suffering by serving as a buffer without attacking institutionalized racism. The Church could not, due to its own relationship with American

society, help the Puerto Ricans resist the violation of their culture and personal identity (Padilla 1987, 137).

By the time Latinos immigrated in large numbers, the Church was a product of the majority society and in many cases it has resisted taking on that society.

After the Puerto Rican riot of 1966 in Westtown, it was evident that some of the older leaders of Los Caballeros were not speaking for the entire Puerto Rican community.

A new group of leaders emerged, drawing together some of the older unsatisfied leaders with younger leaders. This new group challenged institutions directly and they received support from government programs such as the Community Action Program (CAP), not the Church. As Padilla notes, the CAP did what the Church did not:

Several of the Community Action Programs established in the Division Street area during this period were transformed from community service agencies into local political structures; they were used to politicize inactive barrio residents, i.e., welfare mothers, gangs, unemployed, school dropouts, and the like (Padilla 1987, 158).

It is important to note that Puerto Ricans, because they are United States citizens, have the right to vote. When the Church did not address the issues that were important to them, they did not need to go through the Church. They went directly into politics.

Cardinal's Committee for the Spanish Speaking

Coordination of what began as the IAF effort in Woodlawn, in 1956, became the first archdiocesan office to work with Latinos (mainly Puerto Ricans)—the Cardinal's Committee for the Spanish Speaking, located at 1300 South Wabash and often referred to by that address (D'Agostino 2000; Headley no date). Father Don Headley, once the director of the office described its activities: "This office dedicated itself to Latino community organization, lay ministerial formation, the opening of parishes to a Latino presence, the development of base community dialogues, and the training of religious and priests in language, pastoral method and Latino-indigenous culture" (Headley no date, 5).

One of the most significant aspects of the 1300 South Wabash Office was the focus on developing lay leaders and connecting that development to community organizing and activism. The office maintained a close connection with Saul Alinsky and the IAF. According to Don Headley, Father Jack Egan made sure that Saul Alinsky knew the office staff and said that "we could call him anytime we wanted" (Interview with Don Headley May 10, 1999). The Cardinal's Committee was not the only tenant at 1300 South Wabash. Also present were "offices for Cesar Chavez' union, the resettlement of Cuban refugees, the labor organization of the Mexican community, sports' leagues, [and] an office for immigration concerns and work training" (Headley not dated, 5).

The Archdiocese launched other programs and organizations to involve Latinos in parish life. *Los Hermanos En La Familia De Dios* was an attempt to involve Latino men at the parish level; women were already involved. "The Family of God dialogues were actually the first historical attempt to build small local Church communities out

of the concerns and faith of the people. The approximately 400 “Hermanos” were trained to use the dialogues in the community’s homes and to make massive parish visits in order to help pastors and local people organize their faith communities” (Headley not dated, 3).

After a few years, the activist character of this office changed. Some of these changes occurred because of a change in administration. The person hired to run the Archdiocese’s Latin American Committee was “only sparsely committed to the principles of lay involvement that had been so much a part of the tradition developed during the sixties and early seventies” (Headley not dated, 6). Headley and others suggest that two changes to the Archdiocese’s Latin American Committee altered its approach: government programs for job training and the creation of the permanent deaconate. The office developed a job-training program that received War on Poverty funding. The focus of the program shifted to providing job training and decreased its activist character.

The creation of the deaconate in 1970s altered the Office’s broad lay leadership/community organizing training program. The Archdiocese’s goal was to train Latinos to become deacons and they trained the largest number of Latino deacon’s in the country (Dahm 2001). The creation of the deaconate training program put an emphasis on men—originally both men and women laity were trained as organizers and community leaders.⁵ And it changed the focus of training from an activist program to a more formal program. Initially the goal of the office was to

⁵Only men can become Deacons.

develop and train lay leaders who could work in their communities on religion and social justice. Headley suggests that the permanent deacons began to embody some of the clericalism that they were trying to get beyond (Interview with Don Headley May 10, 1999). The office was absorbed into Catholic Charities in the 1970s and renamed the Department of Immigration, Citizenship, and Refugees (Dahm 2001).

Lay Latino Involvement

In addition to the leadership activities supported by the Archdiocese, the *Cursillo* is an important lay movement. “In pre-Vatican II Council Catholicism, the *Cursillo* provided for liturgies in Spanish, influenced by folk music and cultural traditions. The Cursillistas provided sermons and instruction themselves. They spoke in the Spanish of the people and based their preaching on daily experiences” (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 134). A small number of priests participated in these efforts but they never received much notice from the Archdiocese. Badillo points out that “Midwestern migrants...remained largely invisible for much of the 1960s, despite their activism within and outside the Catholic Church” (Badillo 1994, 305).

Chicago’s *Cursillo* movement began in the 1960s. The *Cursillo* is a Latino lay effort that brings people together to participate in courses on Christianity and follow-up meetings. The *Cursillo* has provided opportunities for lay leadership development and for creating a Latino identity within the Church. People who were very much aware of Vatican II changes, that called for the inclusion of lay leaders in Church decision-making, led Chicago’s *Cursillo*. The call for increased collegiality gave lay groups the push to organize with the belief that they would be involved in making change in the Church. “The *Cursillo* in Chicago became a tool for telling people that

they could participate in the group that was taking charge in the Church” (Badillo 1994, 304; Headley not dated, 4).

MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE GROWING LATINO POPULATION

Ministering to the Latino community has put increasing pressure on the Archdiocese. There is a lack of priests who speak Spanish and an overall shortage of priests. In Puerto Rico and Mexico, where there are few priests, lay leaders take on greater leadership roles. In Chicago, lay people can be parish administrators but they are not allowed to direct pastoral ministry. One Latino lay leader noted, “This is extremely difficult for the hierarchy to accept. It’s tolerated but not accepted” (Interview 1998). Cardinal George has taken steps to remedy this shortage by bringing priests to Chicago from outside of the United States.

Latinos find it difficult to make inroads into some parishes; some priests do not recognize their presence, refuse to learn Spanish, or argue that they do not have the resources to offer separate masses and other services. The number of Spanish masses has been increasing steadily, illustrating some responsiveness to Latinos, but the Archdiocese is having a difficult time keeping up with the growing Latino community. In 1962, 21 Chicago area parishes offered Spanish sermons ” (Badillo 1994, 291). In 1983, Spanish masses were offered in 73 Chicago parishes (Kelliher 1993). By 2000, 80 Chicago parishes (38%) and 37 suburban parishes (21%) offer at least one Sunday Spanish mass (Archdiocese Pastoral Center 2000 Official Directory...).

III. PILSEN

Pilsen has long been a Catholic community and it provides a contrast for the experiences of early immigrant groups and more recent Latino immigrant groups and the Church. It also provides an opportunity to look closely at community level parish efforts towards Latinos and contrast them with archdiocesan efforts.

Pilsen has been home to a number of innovative Church efforts, including team ministry, worker priests, community development, community organizing, *Cursillo*, and Christian base communities. Pilsen's leaders have used their parishes and religious symbolism to build social capital and to organize Pilsen's residents to engage in civic affairs. Despite the often-innovative local efforts by priests, women religious and the laity, Pilsen's leaders have found that they often receive little support from the Archdiocese and that they have a difficult time accessing and influencing archdiocesan decision-making and resource allocation.

Pilsen has been home to a diverse group of Catholic immigrants. Germans and Irish initially settled in Pilsen. Eastern European immigrants settled in Pilsen after 1871 because Pilsen was west of the fire line that prohibited the construction of wood frame houses in a perimeter around downtown (Chicago Fact Book Consortium 1980). Bohemians dominated Pilsen from 1905 to 1910 and were joined by Croatians and Slovaks (Abbott reprint 1970, 83). Pilsen was also home to Poles, Lithuanians, a small community of Italians from Tuscany, and Slovenes (Chicago Fact Book

Consortium 1980).

The diversity of immigrant groups is reflected in the large number of national Catholic parishes in Pilsen. There were two Bohemian national parishes, two Polish, two Lithuanian, and one national parish each for Croatians, Germans, Italians, Slovaks, and Slovenes. St. Pius V is the neighborhood's territorial parish and originally served Irish immigrants. Sacred Heart was also territorial but it was destroyed in a fire in the middle of the 20th century. All of Pilsen's parishes were built between 1874 and 1914, the majority around the turn of the century (See Table 1). Pilsen's population peaked at 85,680 in 1920. In 1970, Pilsen's population was less than 45,000.

Table 1. Catholic Parishes in Pilsen

PARISH	NATIONAL OR TERRITORIAL AT FOUNDING	FOUNDING DATE	PARISH STATUS 2000	MASSES OFFERED 2000	REGISTERED FAMILIES 2000*
St. Adalbert	Polish	1874	Open	1 Polish 2 Spanish 1 English	600 officially, unofficially more
St. Ann	Polish	1903	Open	1 Polish 2 Spanish 1 English	900
Holy Trinity	Croatian	1914	Open	1 Croatian 1 Spanish 1 English	392
Sacred Heart		-1959	Destroyed by Fire	None	None
St. Joseph	Slovak	1906-1968	Closed: Buildings owned by Catholic Charities—now is El Centro de la Causa	None	None
St. Michael Archangel	Italian	1903	Open	1 Spanish	301
Our Lady of Vilna	Lithuanian	1906-1987	Closed	None	None
St. Paul	German	1876	Open	3 Spanish 2 English	500
St. Pius V	Territorial	1874	Open	4 Spanish 2 English	1600
St. Procopius	Bohemian	1875	Open	4 Spanish 2 English	1300
Providence of God	Lithuanian	1900	Open	2 Spanish 1 English	250
St. Stephen	Slovene	1898-1996	Shrine	2 Slovenian	About 200
St. Vitus	Bohemian	1888-1990	Closed: Now home of The Resurrection Project, a CDC	None	None

*Registration numbers are difficult to use because many Latino families do not register.

Sources: (Koenig 1980), (Archdiocese Pastoral Center 2000), interviews, and field work.

Towards the end of the 1950s, Pilsen became the primary first stop community for Mexican immigrants to Chicago. Other first stop communities were eliminated by the construction of the Eisenhower Expressway and University of Illinois Chicago circle campus on the near West Side (Kerr 1976). By 1970, more than 40 percent of

Chicago's Mexican population lived in the Pilsen and Little Village neighborhoods⁶.

Over the past few decades, Pilsen has experienced the most ethnic homogeneity in its history. In 1990, 88 percent of Pilsen's residents were Latino and half were foreign born. Pilsen's population has been increasing; in 1990 it was 45,654 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1990).

Pilsen is a poor community. It is included in the city's Federal Empowerment Zone; 26 percent of Pilsen's families had incomes below the poverty line in 1990; unemployment was 12.8% just slightly higher than the 11% for the city as a whole (Gittell et al. 1998a; Gittell et al. 1998b; United States Bureau of the Census 1990). Many of Pilsen's residents are underemployed; they work multiple jobs for little pay.

Catholic parishes have been important community institutions for Pilsen's Mexican community, just as they were for the earlier white ethnic groups. But not all of Pilsen's parishes eagerly accepted Mexican parishioners; in fact, initially, none did. Since most of Pilsen's parishes were national parishes, they were more interested in serving their particular ethnic group than Mexicans. As a result, initially Mexicans who moved to Pilsen traveled to parishes outside of Pilsen for mass (Kelliher 1993). Even once national parishes provided masses for Latinos, they were frequently held in church basements (Interviews 1997-1999)(Kelliher 1993). As illustrated in table 1, some of these national parishes retain a close ethnic identity, 40 years after the neighborhood's demographics changed. Four of the parishes still offer mass in

⁶Little Village lies west of Pilsen in what was formerly known as South Lawndale. It is a slightly higher income community. Pilsen has been a first stop for immigrants, many of whom move on to Little Village.

languages other than Spanish and English. And “St. Stephen, a Slovenian parish, refused to schedule a Sunday Mass in Spanish as late as 1997 when 97 percent of the students in its parish school were Mexican” (Dahm 2001, 6).

Kelliher suggests that the parishes that have survived are those that have best managed to transform themselves to meet the needs of Pilsen’s majority population. St. Pius V, St. Procopius, St. Adalbert, St. Vitus (now closed), and Providence of God adapted more quickly and serve mostly Mexican communities. Other parishes adapted more slowly but today all have welcomed Latinos to a degree. St. Pius V, in particular, the territorial parish, adapted quickly. St. Pius is staffed by the Dominican order of priests and as early as the 1960s it ministered to Pilsen’s Latinos (Kelliher 1993). The first Spanish mass at St. Pius V was in August 1963 (Interview 2000).

The Catholic urban ethnic parish has long been a neighborhood institution. But Pilsen’s pastors are learning that many Sunday parishioners are not community residents⁷. Recognizing this, three of Pilsen’s pastors asked parishioners, during mass, to raise their hands if they were not residents. They found that about 50 percent of their parishioners were not neighborhood residents. One of those priests noted: “They come back here. They moved and they come back here to go home. They go to church and maybe go shopping. We have 1800 people in the church and maybe 900 are from outside” (Interview with a pastor 1999). Another important reason for their return is that they are not welcomed in parishes where they live (Interview 2000).

⁷Based on interviews that I’ve conducted in these neighborhoods, I think it is somewhat safe to conclude though that national parishes in Chicago’s neighborhoods have been facing this same issue for generations even though not much is written about it.

Additionally, Janise Hurtig points out that there is a sizable portion of Pilsen's community that does not reside solely in the United States, instead choosing to come and go between Mexico and Chicago (Hurtig 2000).

18TH STREET TEAM

Even though the Archdiocese was not expending significant effort to work in Mexican communities, some parish level actors were developing innovative ways of engaging Mexicans. At the end of the 1960s, men and women religious who were welcomed by St. Vitus' pastor, began a new effort called the 18th Street Team. "Instead of each parish meeting the needs of the newcomers, the team ministry wanted to coordinate the activities of Catholic churches. Several of the fifteen parishes within the area of the 18th Street Team participated" (Kelliher 1993, 25). The Team was created on June 20, 1969 and it started with 11 priests, 11 women religious, and one lay person (Kelliher 1993). They focused initially on improving Latino ministry such as having mass in Spanish (Stark 1981).

Not all of the parishes were interested in participating in the team approach. There was some disagreement over what effort should be made towards Mexicans.

Priests were ideologically divided over the appropriate pastoral strategies for the Mexican community and the vestigial Slavic community. Ecclesiastically liberal and proMexican clergy ran the cluster during the later years, while the more conservative priests stayed home. The more traditional clergyman were always less interested

than were liberal clergymen in participating in structures beyond the parish (Dahm 1981, 114).

The team fell apart by the early 1970s. Father Charles Dahm, pastor of St. Pius V, explains that there were a number of problems that caused the team to disintegrate so quickly. The team developed at the same time as Vatican II changes were being felt which lead some religious to question their vocations. Eight of the nine women religious (sisters) left the ministry and six of the eleven priests left the clergy. The Team covered too large an area—there are two large communities. Additionally, there was little effort to draw in lay people (Dahm 1990).

PILSEN'S PARISHES AND THE CHICANO MOVEMENT

Pilsen and its Catholic parishes and community organizations were important players in Chicago's Chicano movement. It was not until the early 1970s that the Chicano movement emerged in Chicago—later than in California and the Southwest. A number of Mexican and Mexican American leaders emerged during this period. The condition of their communities spurred their political involvement. They:

were influenced by the Chicano, Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam War movement of the 1960s. For the most part, however, this new political generation matured as a result of local conditions. The poor quality of education, housing, services, and discrimination in employment, in Pilsen, and in other neighborhoods, produced a new generation of leaders who had lost

confidence in the older and conservative Mexican organizations and their assimilationist approach to politics (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios, 29).

These leaders built organizations that celebrated their Mexican heritage. Mexicans were excluded from Chicago's white dominated political machine so they created their own community organizations some of which were decidedly political including *Centro de la Causa*, *Casa Aztlan*, *Asociacion Pro Derechos Obreros*, *Mujeres Latinas en Accion*, Latino Youth, and CASA (Gittell et al. 1999; Taller de Estudios Comunitarios). Mexicans gradually took over the leadership of Pilsen's community organization, Pilsen Neighbors Community Council (PNCC), in the 1970s. Community leaders organized around a variety of issues including high school overcrowding, the rights of undocumented workers, increasing political representation, and library services (Kerr 1976; Taller de Estudios Comunitarios). Community leaders ultimately used these organizations to bypass the political machine and in 1983 they became part of the community organization network that helped elect Harold Washington, Chicago's first Black mayor.

Some of Pilsen's Catholic parishes had close connections to Pilsen's community organizations. According to Stark:

Parish facilities were used for many small fiestas and for most of Pilsen's major celebrations as well as for the neighborhood-wide meetings including the community conventions. Parishes were also very visible on the

boards of many Pilsen community organizations. Pilsen churches also directly and indirectly funded many of the key community organizations. For example, the Catholic Church heavily funded El Centro de la Causa, Casa Atzlan, and Pilsen Neighbors Community Council (Stark 1981).

And despite ideological differences, some of Pilsen's parishes worked closely with Marxist organizations like CASA that supported workers' rights (Stark 1981).

Some of Pilsen's parishes were used directly as sanctuaries for undocumented aliens. One priest involved with St. Vitus at that time reflected:

The parish was always known to be totally off limits. The immigration officials could never go into the parish. These parishes in this neighborhood actually did declare a sanctuary far before the sanctuary movement ever got started in this country, in 1975 or 1976 at the latest. All the parishes in the Pilsen neighborhood area signed a document declaring themselves sanctuary against the Immigration. (Interview with Robert Stark in (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios, 105-106)).

Stark relates that there was a fear of immigration officials in the 1970s. People did not leave their basements and they did not go to certain places. According to Stark:

The immigration officials used to show up outside of churches and wait for people to go outside. These people got so upset that the priest who was in charge told them to go outside the church at sermon time because somebody came in and said the Immigration officials had gone in somebody's house. The people just left the church and surrounded the Immigration cars and wouldn't let them go and forced the Immigration people to leave without taking them. So the church was very militantly [against] the way the Immigration Department would make raids in the community and would violently harass and terrorize people. (Interview with Robert Stark in (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios, 106)).

Asociacion ProDerechos Obreros (the Association for Workers' Rights or APO), Stark notes, worked out of St. Vitus. James Colleran, a priest at St. Vitus worked at a local gas station and was closely involved with APO's workers' rights efforts. One of the bigger issues they addressed was increasing the number of Latino workers in the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA). In 1971-1972, people from Pilsen stopped CTA buses to make their point. "They literally walked out of the church one day, people walked out of the church and some other people gathered and walked over to 18th and Ashland and stopped buses. Women sat down in front of buses and the drivers [got] out" (interview with Carlos Arango in (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios, 109)).

APO's efforts were successful; the percentage of Latinos at the CTA was increased from 1% to 15% (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios).

Leadership Development

At the same time that the Chicano movement was emerging, some of Pilsen's Catholic parishes initiated efforts to develop lay leaders. Verba et al's work on participation and religious skills concludes that Latinos, who are predominantly Catholic, joined the wrong Church. They draw this conclusion because of what they see as few opportunities for Catholic parishioners to learn the skills of democratic participation. This analysis is based on certain forms of participation, which are present in Protestant churches more so than in Catholic parishes such as opportunities to participate in decision-making about the way the religious institutions are run (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995).

As the following examples show, there were and are a number of opportunities for Latinos to participate in some of Pilsen's Catholic parishes. Moreover, the development of lay leaders is one of the goals of the liberationist theology practiced in some of Pilsen's parishes. St. Vitus actively involved its parishioners in a parish team or *equipo pastoral* which made decisions about liturgy, education, and fundraising (Stark 1981, 185).

The development of this intra-parish democratic organization is part of what Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo call the Latino Religious Resurgence. Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo point out how individual parishes support participatory decision-making structures:

Catholicism is not the autocratic monolith it is sometimes perceived to be. There was considerable variation from parish to parish as individual clerics could be more or less interested in developing lay participation in the running of the parish. Thus, for instance, the national parishes and Spanish language chapels usually conferred considerable status upon the local lay leaders of the various *cofradías*, *mutualistas*, and community organizations (Díaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 133).

BUILDING COMMUNITY: POLITICS AND RELIGIOUS SYMBOLISM

Pilsen's leaders have used religious symbols to build communities, link religious and cultural traditions, practices, and celebrations to political events, and develop local leaders. Their goal is to build community using ethnicity and religion. Parishes, particularly St. Pius V, St. Adalbert, Providence of God, and St. Procopius celebrate religious cultural traditions such as the novena to the Virgin of Guadalupe, *quinceañera*⁸, *posadas* (nine days of community celebrations in homes before Christmas), and the *Via Crucis* (Stations of the Cross) on Good Friday.

St. Vitus started the *Via Crucis* to involve people in the celebration of their faith. The celebration's leaders directly linked the religious symbolism to the struggles of

⁸*Quinceañeras* are a coming of age celebration for young women.

Pilsen's Mexican community:

The stations were symbols for struggles...The struggle for Harrison Park is where Jesus is crucified and it was against the factory, the old Pilsen beer factory, and the buildings where the children had been burned to death. The prayer at that station would be for children and being crucified on the cross of discrimination. One of the reasons the kids died in these fires was that there were no Latino firemen, there was nobody who spoke Spanish so they gave the wrong orders to the people. They were yelling at the people to get on the floor, and instead the people tried to get down and they were killed by the gas, by the smoke (Taller de Estudios Comunitarios, 114).

In 1999, the *Via Crucis* drew 7,000 people to Pilsen (Dahm 1999). Despite the fact that the 1999 *Via Crucis* took place more than ten years after the height of the Chicano movement, Hurtig notes that the *Via Crucis* and other local celebrations continue to be conducted with political content:

these elements of Mexican religious life become more than performative symbols of Mexican American identity; they are also deployed as vehicles of community formation and empowerment. As one of the

parish's religious staff commented, 'We seek to empower our parishioners *through* their traditions' (Hurtig 2000, 40).

Pilsen's parishes also hold street masses. In 1997, St. Pius V held 18 summer street masses. Street masses draw people in, involve people in the preparation of the event and more closely link the religious celebration to community needs and issues

FROM ACTIVISM TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Activism in Pilsen declined in the beginning of the 1980s and activism within St. Vitus ended around 1982-1983 (Stark 1981). As this period of activism was winding down, a focus on community development was gearing up. And a group of Pilsen's parishes organized the Pilsen Cluster, which began in the mid-1960s (Stark 1981). Unlike the Team Ministry approach, the Cluster has been a successful structure for Pilsen's parishes in terms of working on neighborhood issues and responding to archdiocesan policy.

Community organizations and community leaders recognize that they can organize in Catholic parishes since they draw many people together. Janise Hurtig, in her study of Pilsen's churches notes that:

Many secular community organizations and agencies also cooperate with the Pilsen parishes, in part because of the sizable population base the parishes represent and can mobilize. Cooperation is also fostered by the

politically progressive orientation of the parishes and Cluster and by the recognition that the local parishes are advocates for the Mexican community. This is often expressed through their appeals to the middle-class, Anglo Archdiocese of Chicago, which much of the Hispanic Catholic community perceives [the archdiocese] as having only a token interest in its [Pilsen's] large but poor Hispanic constituency and as unwilling to promote Hispanic leadership (Hurtig 2000, 38).

The Cluster's greatest success has been the creation of The Resurrection Project, an extremely successful and highly regarded community development corporation. The Cluster created the organization in 1988 after breaking from Pilsen Neighbors Community Council (PNCC). Six Pilsen Cluster parishes contributed 5,000 dollars to hire a community organizer, Mike Loftin, who worked out of St. Procopius and interviewed community leaders within Pilsen's parishes to identify their needs and community issues (Vasquez 2000). A byproduct of this effort was that as he interviewed people, he networked leaders who identified and began to work together on common issues such as illegal dumping.

Loftin recommended to the Cluster that they create a new lay led community organization. But "the Cluster rejected his proposal because it feared that such a structure could easily deteriorate into an organization like PNCC, i.e., one that would be spiritually disconnected from the parishes and politically and financially

unaccountable to the parishes” (Dahm 1996, 2). The Cluster agreed to form a committee, Pilsen Catholic Community (PCC), which was rooted in the six Cluster parishes: St. Adalbert, St. Pius V, St. Procopius, Holy Trinity, Providence of God, and St. Vitus. Each parish named 3 representatives to serve on PCC (Dahm 1996).

Community leaders held one-on-one house meetings with neighborhood residents to establish the organization’s agenda. They found that community members were most concerned about housing, streets, sanitation, and gangs, violence, drugs and youth (Gittell et al. 1999). The PCC created a committee to work on housing, which quickly evolved into the parishes’ organization, The Pilsen Resurrection Development Corporation.

Housing

To increase access to housing, the Pilsen Resurrection Development Corporation created Pilsen Housing Coalition in 1989 which included itself, Neighborhood Housing Services, Eighteenth Street Development Corporation⁹, and the Pilsen Development Corporation¹⁰ (Dahm 1996). Janise Hurtig, in her analysis of the Catholic Church in Pilsen, observed that:

the unidirectional vision of immigrant incorporation
implicit in Resurrection Project’s efforts to empower

⁹Eighteenth Street Development Corporation is now more focused on commercial economic development than on housing.

¹⁰Pilsen Development Corporation was separated from PNCC by those who wanted to focus on developing housing in 1987 (Dahm 1996).

Mexican immigrants by facilitating settlement is entirely in keeping with the long-standing policy of the Catholic leadership to promote home ownership as a strategy for building and sustaining the parish community (Hurtig 2000, 37).

According to Father Charles Dahm's history of TRP, home ownership was an important issue to Pilsen's Catholic parishes. Home ownership, parish leaders believe, contributes to neighborhood stability by giving people a sense of ownership of their communities. "It meant that Pilsen residents see themselves as owners of Pilsen—that they can shape, control, take pride in, and take responsibility for Pilsen's streets, schools, churches, parks, workplaces, and housing" (Dahm 1996, 4). This reasoning is the same given by foundations and government who provide funding for housing construction. Catholic priests have supported home ownership in communities for decades to create stable communities (McGreevy 1996).

Pilsen Resurrection Development Corporation later formed The Resurrection Project (TRP). The organization was founded in part with money that it received from the city of Chicago's New Homes Program. TRP organized in the parishes to draw people out to support the appeal to the city for funding from the New Homes program. They got about 800 people to a meeting at St. Procopius. Father Dahm describes the meeting:

Mayor Richard M. Daley and his commissioner of housing attended the event which included prayer and a baptismal service in which the Mayor and other

principal participants submerged various tools in water as a symbol in action of giving new life in Christ to the community through the construction of new homes.

The Mayor promised the assembly that he would not sell city lots to developers in Pilsen but rather give them to the community for their development (Dahm 1996).

TRP has received considerable funding from the city for its housing efforts. It has produced 118 affordable homes, 77 rental apartments and in 1995 it opened *Centro Familiar Guadalupano* (Guadalupano Family Center), which provides day care for 208 children (Vasquez 2000).

TRP has expanded into the adjacent neighborhoods of Back of the Yards and Little Village; it now includes fourteen Catholic parishes in those communities. Each of the new communities is getting a day care center. TRP has opened two shelters for homeless women and they are converting the old St. Vitus church building into a community arts center. And they are renovating the plaza outside their current offices (the old St. Vitus parish) to function like a plaza in Mexico (Vasquez 2000).

Community Organizing

Even with the creation of TRP, Loftin believed, as did others in the neighborhood, that there should be a lay run organization. In 1991, PCC created Interfaith Community Organization (ICO), still rooted in the 6 parishes but run by the laity

rather than by parish priests¹¹. ICO worked on community policing issues and on turning people out for meetings to support things like TRP's appeal for city funding from the New Homes program. ICO supported leadership training for community residents, mostly board members at first locally and later at PICO, an organizer training institute, training sessions. Loftin left the organization in 1992. When the parishes had difficulty finding an adequate replacement for him, ICO merged with Pilsen Resurrection Development Corporation in 1994 to form TRP (Dahm 1996)(Interviews 1997-1999).

Without a strong community organizer on staff, community organizing took a back seat to physical redevelopment projects. Recently, TRP has strengthened their community organizing efforts. Since 1995, TRP staff and board members have been active participants in IAF's metropolitan organizing effort. Raul Raymundo directs TRP and is one of the cochairs of the IAF metropolitan organizing effort. Since their involvement in 1995, TRP's director and some board and staff members have attended IAF's training session (Dahm 1996, 24). St. Pius V also participates in the IAF effort; 170 of their parishioners participated in the kick off meeting for United Power for Action and Justice on October 19, 1997. Parishioners learn skills to hold one-on-one meetings in their neighborhoods and to participate in Christian base communities (Dahm 1997, 7).

TRP maintains a connection to the community through its block club network and through Christian Base Communities (CBCs) in two of Pilsen's parishes. As of

¹¹Membership later expanded to include St. Paul, St. Ann, St. Matthew, a Lutheran church and a community organization (Dahm 1996).

January 2001, St. Adalbert has two CBCs and St. Pius has fourteen. Some have likened base communities to block groups with a spiritual and social action focus. Base communities meet weekly in people's homes; members talk about a variety of issues including "Church, cultural traditions, violence on the street and in the home, marriage, family, service to others, neighborhood problems" (Reilly 1998, 4). CBCs bring neighbors together to develop relationships and to discuss issues of common concern. The theology behind CBCs supports their use for social action. They are intended to increase relations among people and to use those relations—that social capital—for civic action.

CBCs take their origination from liberation theology. In the 1960s, the Archdiocese was home to a number of innovative efforts. One of those was Cardinal Meyer's 1963 creation of San Miguelito mission in Panama. One of the benefits of this experience was the creation of base communities. As one priest involved with the effort noted, "The mission at San Miguelito became the training ground of what we now recognize as Comunidades Eclesias de Base" (Headley no date, 6). One of the goals of the mission was to help Chicago's Archdiocese prepare for the growing diversity of the Archdiocese. But Cardinal Cody (1965-1982) who followed Meyer (1958-1965) was not interested in this type of effort.

Even though Chicago's archdiocesan administration was unwilling to learn lessons from the Panama mission experience, others were not. The Latin American Bishops at the Medellin, Columbia meeting in 1968, supported Christian Base Communities. "The bishops declared a preferential option for the poor, and devised a plan to create small communities of neighbors who would meet frequently to discuss the scripture

and relate it to their daily lives” (D’Antonio 1995, 247). Despite the work that went on in Chicago thinking about base communities, there was no administrative plan for implementing base communities in Chicago. The Hispanic Caucus, an association of priests, women religious, and laity who work in Latino communities, took this up as an issue and organized meetings for those interested in promoting them in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Dahm 1990). The Caucus provided trainings, materials, and organized conferences in the Chicago region to promote CBC development. The Archdiocesan administration has consistently not supported the development of CBCs (Dahm 2001).

Pilsen’s CBCs develop social capital at the block level. CBCs focus on issues including drugs, sanitation, and broken sidewalks—which are an important issue in Pilsen because the sidewalks were raised eight to ten feet in 1875. They successfully closed an apartment building on South Loomis that was a center for gangs that subjected the community to drugs, guns, and other criminal activities (Alexander and Cervantes 1999). Even though CBCs are not yet engaging fully in social action, they are “effective in promoting communication, developing trust, and thus building community among parishioners” (Hurtig 2000, 44). In other words, they are contributing to the development of social capital in Pilsen.

Many of the priests active in the community have been religious order priests—not diocesan priests. A few priests involved in PNCC in the 1960s were Jesuits as are the priests who took over St. Procopius and created the innovative new high school Cristo Rey in 1996. Jesuits made a commitment to Pilsen. The school has 400 students. All of the students are subsidized, in part by a unique arrangement in which students

attend school four days a week and work at a job the fifth day. Five students share each job and the salary is used to pay part of their tuition. Tuition in 2000 was \$2,200. Jesuits felt it was necessary to provide a school because they have been in the business of education but found that many low-income students could not afford to attend their high schools. Pilsen's public high school is severely over crowded and the drop out rate in the Pilsen and Little Village area was 65%. The attendance rate at Cristo Rey is 97% and 70% of the students of the first two graduating classes are attending college (2000a).

The Church—through these local parishes—is a dominant actor in Pilsen. It is difficult for anyone to act without going through the parishes. And not all Mexicans are Catholic. This may form a closed system. It is important to note that some of Pilsen's Catholic priests, who are not Latino, play a significant role in these organizations. Some residents question the role played by these priests. They prefer that the Church stay out of community matters leaving them to community residents. They cannot separate the local parish priest who may be a liberationist from the institutional Church. They do not see the leadership positions as true independent leaders—rather they are under the watch of White male parish priests. In the 1970s there were only two Latino priests of the twenty or so priests working in Pilsen at the time. Four of the five Deacons were Latino but Stark notes that they played a subservient role to priests (Stark 1981).

CONCLUSION

Pilsen has been a predominantly Mexican community for more than 30 years. The

community's activism is reflected in the high number of community organizations, community leaders, coalitions, and in its Catholic parishes. Some of Pilsen's Catholic parishes have organized to create a structure that is based on liberationist theology to build community, use cultural religious traditions to build power, train local leaders, and engage people politically in social action efforts. Developing and supporting Christian Base Communities, supporting cultural religious traditions, building local community organizations like TRP, and engaging in community organizing activities as part of IAF's metropolitan organization, United Power for Action and Justice are all integral elements that are part of the theology espoused by this cluster of parishes.

The experiences in Pilsen are similar to those in other Latino communities. Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo describe this process:

Parishes and congregations became the core membership, and meeting rooms at the local church became the assembly points for many neighborhood organizations and agencies, many of which received government funds. These new political roles were matched by effective—and sometimes spectacular—ritual celebration in Latino cultural idioms (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998, 122).

Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo suggest that when liberationists could not make headway within diocesan structures, they turned instead to community level action, often creating community organizations. Through these community organizations,

parish liberationists could get private foundation funding as well as public funding (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998). This was precisely what Pilsen's Cluster parishes did by creating TRP.

All of these efforts to develop local leaders and to make networks between individuals, parishes, community organizations, and community institutions have contributed to the development of social capital within the neighborhood. However, it is important to note that Pilsen has an activist tradition and there are many organizations. Pilsen's parishes are not the sole cause of the development of social capital in Pilsen; they are contributing agents.

Pilsen's parishes through TRP have been extremely effective in developing what Gittel and Vidal label as the bridging type of social capital (Gittel and Vidal 1998). Bridging capital is developed when organizations reach outside of their local communities to access financial, technical, or political resources. Pilsen's parishes and TRP have been successful at developing all three of these resources. By using its base of power in the parishes and their technical expertise, TRP has secured funding and political support from City Hall. TRP's positive response from city government is no doubt aided by the high degree of political support Mayor Daley has received from Latino voters. TRP has also successfully developed relationships with Chicago area technical assistance providers, foundations, banks, and financial intermediaries including the Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

The role of the Archdiocese, or lack thereof, is an important element in this community. Neighborhood parish institutions have done much of this work without

the support, understanding, and only occasionally—usually after a success—the acknowledgment of the Archdiocese. The Archdiocese provides little support for these activities but takes some credit for achievements. A pastor involved with the cluster effort noted that “most of the things we do we do ourselves. All of what we’ve done—like TRP. They [the administration] like to take credit for it.” (Interview with a parish priest 1999).

IV. POWER, HIERARCHY, AND ARCHDIOCESAN LEADERSHIP

The institutional structure of the Archdiocese of Chicago developed over the last 150 years. The Archdiocese evolved from a fragmented decentralized institution to a hierarchical organization with a highly developed administrative bureaucracy that transferred power from parishes, ethnic groups, and pastors to bishops and their staff. Centralization included control over personnel appointments, ownership of church property, decline in the construction of national parishes, control over the use of parish property through taxes, bank accounts and projects, and control of Catholic schools, cemeteries, and social services.

FRAGMENTATION, ETHNICITY, AND DECENTRALIZATION: 1840S TO APPROXIMATELY 1910S

At the end of the 19th century, Chicago's Catholic Church had not yet established an extensive administrative structure or hierarchy. Parishes, priests, and women religious were considerably more independent than they are today. Bishops of the period had difficulty establishing control (Gleason 1987). The priests who came to Chicago resulted in a "motley collection with divergent loyalties. Some were renegades from other dioceses, others were missionaries with allegiances only to their religious orders" (Gleason 1987; Walch 1988, 78).

Bishop William Quarter (1844-1848) established the corporation sole in 1861 to

centralize power and control in the hands of the bishop. The corporation sole is a legal designation that means that all Church property is held in the name of the bishop as a corporation and is passed down to each subsequent bishop (Kantowicz 1983).

The Vatican supported a structure that gave partial ownership to lay leaders but American bishops preferred the corporation sole model that gave them sole control of diocesan institutions (Kantowicz 1983; Tangney 1935). Prior to the existence of the corporation sole, lay trustees could legally hold church property, a more common model in Europe. Bishops feared that property might be stolen or individual groups might keep Church property as their own, excluding other groups. Trustees also had power. Since they controlled parish revenue and owned parish institutions, trustees could accept or reject decisions made by the bishops (Gleason 1987).

Since Chicago's Catholic immigrant groups often built their own parishes, ownership and control of parish property became a contentious issue especially because the Archdiocese was controlled by the Irish for much of the 19th century and into the 20th century. The most famous instance involved Chicago's Polish community. The archbishop demanded the deed to Polish Church property but Polish leaders were reluctant to turn it over to the Irish controlled Archdiocese. They struck a deal. In exchange for the deed to Polish church property, the Polish Resurrection order of priests would control Polish ethnic parishes for 99 years (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983; Gleason 1987; Kantowicz 1983, 80; Morris 1997).

Despite efforts by archdiocesan leaders to centralize power, ethnic groups maintained a certain amount of autonomy and demanded that religious institutions reflect their cultural differences. The strength of ethnic groups is reflected in the difficulty bishops

faced in trying to meet their needs. Bishop O'Regan (1854-1858) resigned. Bishop James Duggan (1859-1869) attempted to resign because of difficulty involved with locating priests to meet the demands of the ethnic groups. The subsequent bishop tried to commit suicide twice after fights with parish priests and frustrations with the laity (Walch 1988).

CARDINAL MUNDELEIN: CENTRALIZING POWER 1915-1939

Cardinal Mundelein (1915-1939) began a process of centralizing Church decision-making, mirroring changes in business and government. The new administrative structure centralized the bishop's power and reduced the power of parishes and ethnic groups. Mundelein centralized and streamlined education, charities, administration, finances, and set standards for the liturgy. He "...set up a central banking system, established elaborate regulations to be followed before a church could be built, placed limits on the debt a parish could incur, and issued bonds, one as large as 5.5 million dollars, to raise money for the diocese" (Dolan 1992, 354-355). Mundelein hired priests as advisors to head special agencies beginning a new move that would take priests out of parish work to become administrators (Kantowicz 1983). This was the start of the archdiocesan bureaucracy and the beginning of a dependence on staff decision-making. By centralizing these functions, Mundelein "acquired greater control over pastors, and parishes became considerably less autonomous" (Dolan 1992, 355).

In the early 1900s, parish pastors controlled most parish finances; the chancery collected 5 percent of parish revenue to support the chancery, seminary, and orphans. Mundelein centralized loans and developed processes to limit parish debt. He

established an elaborate parish construction approval process. Before engaging in a building project, pastors had to secure approval of their architect, parish finances, and a review of bills involved with the building projects.

Mundelein required parishes to invest surplus income in Catholic Bishops Bonds. The bonds were the Archdiocese's first attempt at redistributing parish resources. Even though some Polish pastors chose to invest in Republic of Poland bonds, in 1926, Mundelein successfully got more than half of the Archdiocese's parishes to invest their additional revenue in Catholic Bishops bonds (Kantowicz 1983). And Mundelein placed emergency taxes on parishes to support various projects including Catholic Charities.

Mundelein's efforts were similar to those of other U.S. bishops who were labeled as "consolidating bishops" for their efforts to centralize power and authority. Bishops wanted to reign in independent priests and women religious, reduce the ethnic character of the Church, meet the administrative needs of a growing Church, and increase and centralize power. Dolan likens the centralization of power and authority in the Church leadership to "boss rule:"

The emergence of boss rule in the church was a phenomenon fostered by the urbanization of Catholicism. The variety of national groups demanded a degree of control to prevent schism in the church; at the same time the rapid expansion of the city required a "new mode of government" to consolidate church

affairs. Boss rule effectively met these needs (Dolan 1975, 165).

Archdioceses across the country were forced to keep up as their populations expanded from the urban core. Bishops were often labeled as brick and mortar bishops or bricklayer priests because of the vast number of churches and support buildings they constructed to meet the needs the Catholic population as it spread out across cities and into suburbs (Dolan 1992). Chicago's Cardinal Mundelein authorized the construction of 63 parishes between 1920 and 1939 (Avella 1992).

Kantowicz suggests that the Catholic Church during this period wanted to be a first class institution which meant, "above all, cultivating a businesslike image" (Kantowicz 1983, 3). But mirroring progressive reforms had a political dimension. Chicago business leaders sought to make government more rational and in the process, they believed, more efficient. Reformers in Chicago created the Bureau of Public Efficiency in 1910. The poor and working classes had access to and a certain amount of control over city politics through the ward-based structure of the political machine. By rationalizing government—ie divorcing it from its neighborhood base—business leaders and the upper class effectively took control away from the lower classes and at the same time argued that they were increasing efficiency. "When reformers attacked the "machine" as the most visible institutional element of the ward system, they attacked the entire ward form of political organization and the political power of lower and middle-income groups which lay behind it" (Hays 1992 (1964c), 217). Reformers thought that the lower and working classes were not sophisticated enough to be trusted with managing government (Hays 1992 (1964c)). Like the

administrative changes that progressives developed for urban government, changes to the Archdiocese were designed to transfer power over resources from ethnic groups rooted in communities to professional bureaucratic staff.

Reducing the Ethnic Character of the Church

Mundelein sought to reduce the ethnic character of the Church. He argued that the Church was a stronger American Church without ethnic divisions and he believed that there would be less of a need for national parishes as the numbers of first generation immigrants declined. Mundelein created only 15 national parishes out of the total 81 parishes constructed during his tenure (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983, 197).

The power held by the ethnic groups did not dissolve over night. Mundelein found that the ethnic groups were strong and he was forced to make concessions to them. Even after Mundelein declared there would be no more national parishes, he officially created national parishes for Mexicans and Slovaks. And some of the territorial parishes functioned as national parishes even though they were not designated as such. Mundelein created nine new parishes in Polish areas; even though they were designated as territorial parishes, they functioned as national parishes (Kantowicz 1983).

Parish staffing was a particularly important issue. And Mundelein quickly ran into conflict with the Poles. In 1917, Mundelein appointed Polish priests to multi-ethnic parishes. "Sixty-eight priests of the Polish Clergy Association signed a letter of protest against the assignments" (Kantowicz 1983, 78). Mundelein made concessions to the Poles and allowed them to retain influence over clerical appointments and

Polish parishes.

Centralizing Parochial Schools

Mundelein was more successful at reducing ethnic character by beginning the process of centralizing Chicago's parochial school system. Centralizing Catholic education was no easy task. Catholic ethnic groups used parochial schools to pass their language, traditions, and culture to their children. Chicago's parochial schools, until the middle of the 20th century, could be thought of as a number of different systems, organized by ethnicity and religious order (Sanders 1977). Each of the religious orders developed their own teaching methods and materials. As Sanders notes, "The inbred peculiarities displayed by religious communities, compounded with isolation in the parish unit, ethnic separatism, and the unquestioned prerogatives of local pastors, posed abundant obstacles to centralized control of the schools" (Sanders 1977, 145). Sanders acknowledges that this system was not economically efficient. "The presence of several distinct national school systems, each overlaid on the other, resulted in absurd lack of coordination and prodigious economic waste in a diocese where "lack of funds" was the common complaint" (Sanders 1977).

Mundelein created a central school board, which quickly ran into trouble with the Poles. The school board adopted English textbooks in 1916. The Poles criticized Mundelein's decision to teach only English in the schools. Again Mundelein recognized that he had to be flexible and allowed that religious and cultural education could be taught in the native language (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983). Mundelein continued to acknowledge the importance of the ethnic groups even as he was creating central decision-making structures. In 1916, he appointed three interim school

superintendents (all pastors), an Irish, a German, and a Pole (Koenig 1981, 94; Sanders 1977; Walch 1988).

Centralizing Charity Care

Mundelein began to centralize charity care. Assistance for the poor was provided at the parish level by St. Vincent de Paul Associations. In 1894, eight parishes had St. Vincent de Paul Associations (Koenig 1981, 304). This was a fragmented way of delivering services; it depended on volunteers and 152 parishes did not have St. Vincent de Paul Associations. Additionally, there was no way for poorer parishes to get resources from wealthier ones. The Society attempted to centralize its efforts and created a central office in 1911. In 1918, there were 126 associations; by 1979, there were more than 150 associations (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983).

Mundelein appointed a board of directors, which included representatives from all of the parishes to manage the Associated Charities, created in 1918¹². To support the central charity institution, each family was expected to contribute five dollars. Again ethnic groups balked. Ethnic groups provided their own social services; they did not want to contribute to central efforts in addition to supporting their own charity efforts. The central charity collected funds from Irish and German parishes but it had difficulty collecting from Polish, Lithuanian and Slovak churches. Both St. Hedwig and St. Joseph orphanages felt the effect of the reduced donations (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983). Again Mundelein made a concession to the ethnic groups. National

¹²Some organizations chose to remain outside of the Associated Charities framework. St. Vincent Infant Hospital and Maternity Home run by the Daughters of Charity chose to stay out since they wanted to remain fiscally self reliant after a difficulty with a New York Bishop (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983).

orphanages received 80 percent of the money collected for the Associated Catholic Charities in their parishes (Coughlin and Riplinger 1983, 209).

CARDINAL STRITCH: ORGANIZING AND ACTIVISM 1939-1958

During Cardinal Stritch's (1939-1958) tenure, two administrative staff members ran the Archdiocese. Unlike Mundelein, Stritch was not involved in day to day diocesan administration. When these two staff members left, they took much of the knowledge about archdiocesan administration with them. There were few policies or procedures and little information was recorded.

Stritch's tenure oversaw some substantial changes to the Archdiocese. By the 1940s, the once urban immigrant Church was becoming increasingly middle class and suburban. Catholics reaped the benefits of prosperity; they were educated at their neighborhood parish parochial school and in some cases had degrees from Catholic colleges (McGreevy 1996). By the 1960s, according to Greeley and Rossi, Catholics had achieved "economic parity with Protestants" (Greeley and Rossi 1966, 29).

Catholics moved to the outskirts of the city and into the suburbs as the result of population growth and increased wealth, tax breaks for home ownership, extended roads, and African American migration from the south. Suburban migration meant that the ethnic enclaves centered around the Catholic parish were breaking up, beginning a new role for the urban Catholic parish.

Reflecting their change in economic status, Catholics, once solidly Democrats began voting in increasing numbers for the Republican Party. The Democratic Party

regained some lost Catholics with the election of JFK and the off year 1974 election following Watergate. These were not sufficient however to stop the stampede of Catholic voters leaving the Democratic party, the majority of which vote for Republicans. Prendergast explains this change in voting pattern as a result, for the most part, of class change. These new Catholics: “occupy a more elevated position in the socioeconomic order. They are better educated, richer, more secure. They hold better jobs, more power, and more influence” (Prendergast 1999).

To meet the needs of suburban migration and population growth, the Archdiocese conducted a massive parish and school building effort. One quarter of Chicago’s parishes were constructed between 1940 and 1965. And the focus was no longer on urban parish construction. Only 28 parishes were built in the city, most on the outskirts. Seventy-two were built in the suburbs (Avella 1992, 79). Parish building boomed on the south and west sides, a direct result of increasing population growth as whites moved further south and west, fleeing the entrance of African Americans into their neighborhoods. By 1962, there were more suburban Catholics in the Chicago area than urban ones (Archdiocesan Conservation report cited in Avella 1992). Suburban parochial schools had 19 percent of the total population in 1950; by 1965, they had 41 percent (Sanders 1977).

VATICAN II: “CONSULTATIVE BODIES”

Vatican II was the Catholic Church’s response to modernity; it mandated changes both in the way in which the Church responded to society and democratic institutions and its internal structure (Baum and Vaillancourt 1991). Internally, Vatican II mandated collegiality or increased communication between the laity, religious, and the bishop to

create more informed decision-making. Consultative structures were to be created at all levels, diocesan, and parish (Ebaugh 1991). As a result, new participatory structures such as priest senates, parish councils, diocesan pastoral councils, and school boards were created (Baum and Vaillancourt 1991; Ellis 1969).

Baum and Vaillancourt argue that despite the fact that the Church was responding to the needs of democratic society externally, it did not make similar democratic changes internally. The creation of participatory structures within the Church did not amount to significant institutional change because the new structures were consultative bodies; bishops retained final decision-making authority. "Parish councils, priests' councils, and diocesan councils were recommended, but they were defined as purely consultative bodies, depending on the generosity of the pastors who convoked them and were willing to learn from them" (Baum and Vaillancourt 1991, 32).

Despite their limitations, laity and religious used the consultative bodies to meet, discuss issues, and establish agendas to influence bishops' decisions. Ellis notes that priests' associations across the country tested the "limits of ecclesiastical authority, the extent and degree of ecumenical activities, and the priests' demands for liturgical experimentation which when refused gave rise in certain instances to the so-called underground Church" (Ellis 1969, 247). Gleason concludes that the result of Vatican II changes were that the "bosses [bishops] would have to work within new rules. And when the bosses showed little disposition to create the new, flexible, democratic structures; when they tried to go right back to business as usual, there was bound to be enormous disappointment, resentment, and frustration" (Gleason 1987, 91). This was the case in Chicago in the 1960s and 1970s (Dahm 1981).

CARDINAL CODY: RE-CENTRALIZING POWER

In the 1960s, Cardinal Cody (1965-1982) controlled archdiocesan decision-making and refused insights and participation from clergy and laity. Andrew Greeley describes Cody: “The new archbishop (Cody) believed in only one power center in the church--himself: “I am Chicago.” All other bases, no matter how small, had to be eliminated. With considerable skill at manipulation, he set about demolishing every subinstitution in the Archdiocese” (Greeley 1987). Cody removed any person who challenged his ultimate control of archdiocesan decision-making.

The consequence of these actions was that he removed priests who engaged the Archdiocese in community organizing, civil rights, and a host of other issues. Cody removed Father Jack Egan from his position as head of the Office of Urban Affairs. Egan had engaged the Archdiocese in community organizing efforts, and he directly challenged city urban redevelopment policy that he believed would disproportionately affect poor communities of color. Cody appointed Egan as pastor of Presentation, a parish on Chicago’s West Side that had undergone rapid racial change. Ultimately, Father Jack Egan went to Notre Dame. Father Andrew Greeley, another outspoken critic, went to the University of Chicago.

Cody came during the 1960s, precisely when there was freedom and support for Father Jack Egan’s urban social justice efforts and the actions of other progressive priests and laity. Politically left Chicago religious leaders were energized by the events of the Vatican II Council and the Civil Rights Movement. Even though Vatican II legitimized their activities, Cody did not (Frisbie 1991).

Cody's appointment as archbishop was pivotal to the development of the Archdiocese and to its reaction to people of color and the poor. Prior to Cody, Chicago's clerical leaders and laity were on the forefront regarding the Church's involvement in cities. Many were active participants in the Civil Rights Movement; they were at the forefront of Vatican II debates, and they were involved in community activism and supported community leadership development.

According to Dahm, the activist priests of the 1950s and 1960s were not willing to let the Church turn its back on social justice issues. They created the Association of Chicago Priests (ACP) to increase communication between priests and Cody (Dahm 1981). The redistribution of resources within the Archdiocese emerged as an issue. The Archdiocese began to provide subsidies for poor parishes and schools in 1960 (Gaspar 1974). But archdiocesan financial statements were not made public until 1972 so neither the laity nor men and women religious could review how funds were allocated. The Cardinal determined which parishes received subsidies and which closed. Frequently, priests were not even forewarned that their parishes were about to close. Cardinal Cody argued that it was impossible to provide any more resources for poor communities. However, he authorized 4 million dollars for a television network that was widely criticized. There were also indications at this time that Cody was providing resources for the suburbs that were not available to poor communities such as money from special fund raising efforts and priest appointments (Dahm 1981).

The lack of communication regarding archdiocesan planning and the allocation of funds for parishes and schools set the stage for the fights regarding subsidies and

school and parish closing procedures in the 1980s and 1990s. Additionally, Cody ignored priests' requests that it was necessary to conduct thorough planning efforts to maintain the Archdiocese's schools and parishes. He also ignored the pleas of many priests, women religious, and laity to increase or at least not decrease funding to poor parishes and schools. His plan to meet the needs of inner city parishes was to support them through inter-parish relationships in a mandatory twinning or sharing program. Parishes were to share their resources with one another through individual parish relationships (Dahm 1981)(Interviews 1998).

At a time when there was supposed to be increasing communication and participation in decision-making, there was less. The significance of this is compounded by the transition occurring within Chicago with a massive move to the suburbs and a change in the city from white ethnic to Latino and African-American. Not only were structures not created to allow access for Chicago's newer groups, but also those who did seek access to influence decision-making were consistently thwarted.

Vicariates

In addition to consultative bodies, large dioceses decentralized their formal structures by creating vicariates and deaneries. According to the Vatican II Council, the vicariates could be used for administrative purposes, increasing communication, and for pastoral care. Vicariates were a way to bring the bishops closer to the people. In large urban dioceses or in rural dioceses, the bishops might be far away. Cardinal Cody created Chicago's vicariate structure. Chicago's Archdiocese is divided into 6 geographical vicariates headed by auxiliary bishops. Two people of color have headed vicariates. Bishop Wilton Gregory was head of the predominantly African

American vicariate 6 on the South Side; Placido Rodriguez was head of predominantly Mexican Vicariate 3 on Chicago's Near West Side (D'Agostino 2000). But their appointments did not increase minority participation in archdiocesan decision-making.

The vicariate and deanery structure, D'Agostino observed, created opportunities for decentralized decision-making and for discussion of common concerns. Within vicariates and their sub-units, deaneries, neighborhood parishes were grouped together into clusters. According to D'Agostino:

This new ecclesial map encouraged parishes operating in similar urban environments to identify common problems, compare solutions, and form common local strategies. This permitted urban problems to be addressed regionally rather than either parochially—where resources were scarce and knowledge was limited—or on the archdiocesan level, which seemed distant or insensitive to local residents” D'Agostino adds “In this sense, geographic reorganization was both a delegation of authority and decision making from the center to the periphery and a loss of parish autonomy (D'Agostino 2000).

But pastors in the Archdiocese of Chicago argue that the creation of the vicariate structure, while it has increased communication at the local level in some

communities, has not decentralized authority or decision-making. According to Dahm, originally the vicars were not given the full title of episcopal vicar and they were granted little authority. They also had full time jobs elsewhere in the Archdiocese. After the vicariates were created, the Association of Chicago Priests (ACP) attempted to work through the vicariates. They developed priest education programs and they pressed Cody to use this structure to democratize the Church (Dahm 1981). Priests and laity however have had few successes in using the vicariate and deanery structures to increase access to archdiocesan decision-making. One parish priest noted that “This diocese is so large and so centralized that you can’t do much. The vicariates are more administrative than strong” (Interview with parish pastor 1999).

Vatican II also supported lay involvement and in Chicago there was an increased involvement of lay people. Towards the end of the 1960s, there were new efforts to decentralize the parochial school system and increase parental involvement. For the first time, in 1967, the Board of Catholic Education included lay people and gave them equal representation on the Board and held the meetings in public (Dahm 1981, 97). And at the parish level, there was a push for local Catholic school boards that increasingly gained power; in 1972, parish school boards were able to hire school principals, shifting power away from pastors (Gaspar 1974, 4). Although it is the policy that schools have school boards, not all Catholic schools have school boards and most that do are ultimately subject to pastors. Additionally, many pastors today hire principals (Interview 2000).

CONCLUSION

D’Agostino suggests that there have been both positive and negative effects of the

centralization of the Archdiocese of Chicago (D'Agostino 2000). The centralization of the Archdiocese, D'Agostino suggests, offers possibilities to reach beyond the parochialism of the Catholic parish. Rather than remaining focused on individual narrow neighborhood issues, the metropolitan reach of the Archdiocese offers the ability to draw together issues across the diocese and force localities to deal with issues like race, poverty, and ethnicity in broader ways. It can encourage people to work more closely together to reach across neighborhood boundaries, between suburb and city, and to join forces to deal with many issues. This potential has been realized in some ways. Often though these issues have been tackled by local parishes and local parish clusters which argue that they lack the support of the Archdiocese.

The negative effect of centralization is that it is difficult for community level actors to access archdiocesan decision-making processes. This is further complicated by the lack of Latino representation in archdiocesan positions of power. Few within the Pastoral Center understand Latino culture(s) or speak Spanish; they are unaware of the problems poor communities of color face. As Dolan points out, "the decision makers in the Church, both at the local and national level, are overwhelmingly non-Hispanic" (Dolan 1994, 442). This issue is explored in the next chapter, which examines archdiocesan decision-making in the 1980s and 1990s.

V. ACCESSING ARCHDIOCESAN DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURES

“Hispanics have traditionally been made to feel that
they are mere tenants in someone else’s house”
(Sanchez 1999b, 7).

The vast growth of Chicago’s Latino population came after 1960, after the development of a central administrative archdiocesan structure. This has generally made it more difficult to access decision-making since so many decisions are centralized. Compounding this difficulty, there are few Mexican or Puerto Rican priests and there is little Puerto Rican or Mexican representation in the archdiocesan administration. Fifteen of the Archdiocese’s active diocesan priests are Latino; that’s 2 percent; 21% of ordained deacons are Latino (Falsani 2001).

Without their own priests, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans have relied on white priests to lobby their cause within the Archdiocese. As one priest relates, it is an “important fact that Hispanics didn’t bring their own clergy. Mexicans and Puerto Ricans do not have anyone. They don’t have any representation in the diocese. The Hispanic Caucus had to have a sit-in in [Cardinal] Bernardin’s office. We have to fight every step of the way to get Mexican representation” (Interview with Pastor 1998).¹³

¹³It is important to note that the Hispanic Caucus at that time was nearly entirely Anglo.

Nationally, Latinos and church leaders who worked in Latino communities participated in the first national “encuentro” in 1972 in Washington, D.C. The first encuentro, or encounter meeting, was one of the first national efforts to confront the institutional Catholic Church and demand that it be more responsive to Latinos. The 250 participants of the encuentro created a list of demands of the Church. Most of the demands were focused on improving ministry to Latinos by increasing Latino representation at diocesan and national levels, training priests to speak Spanish and teaching them about Latino culture, and developing support for Christian Base Communities. The Church responded to the request for increased representation by incorporating Latinos in national Church structures. Other requests, including priest training, were not approved by the national Bishops until the 1990s (Sandoval 1994). By the time of the second national encuentro in 1977, the institutional Catholic Church, not lay leaders, dominated the encuentro. As Sandoval notes, “the institutional Church had appropriated the process of the encuentro; it could no longer be considered part of the movimiento, coming from and controlled by the people” (Sandoval 1994, 145).

CHICAGO’S FIRST ENCUESTRO

Chicago held its own encuentro in 1974 that was attended by approximately 125 people interested in Latino communities; it was organized by the Archdiocesan *Departamento Hispano de Educacion Religiosa* (DERA) (Dahm 2001). Participants created a list of recommendations to reform the Chicago Archdiocese. One of the recommendations was for the Archdiocese to create a Center for Hispanic Ministry to increase the representation of Latinos at the Pastoral Center and to improve Latino

ministry. The Cardinal did not act on the encuentro's recommendations.

A group of Latino priests created the *Comite Guadalupano* and requested that Cardinal Cody appoint a Latino bishop. Instead, Cardinal Cody appointed Bishop Nevin Hayes as the Vicar for the Spanish Speaking in 1978. Those involved felt that this was not sufficient, especially since it was little more than a ceremonial position within the Archdiocese (D'Agostino 2000; Dahm 1990). Latinos did not get a Latino bishop until 1983 when Cardinal Bernardin appointed Placido Rodriguez. But, "Like all auxiliary bishops, he lacked any power or jurisdiction to advance ministry within his vicariate, and like Bishop Hayes, worked primarily as the Cardinal's representative at Hispanic functions" (Dahm 2001, 10). Currently there is no Latino bishop in Chicago.

INCREASING RESPONSIVENESS

Recognizing the need for a coordinated lobbying effort on behalf of Latinos within the Archdiocese, a group of 33, mostly Anglo priests, within the Association of Chicago Priests (ACP), created the Hispanic Caucus in 1977 (Dahm 1990). Priests formed the Caucus to "provide mutual support, surface issues in Hispanic ministry, promote involvement in the National Encuentro, address other needs in the Hispanic community" (Dahm 1990, 8). They met monthly, drawing between 20 and 60 people. The Hispanic Caucus was initially composed only of priests but by the 1980s, the Caucus operated independently from the ACP and included lay people and women religious (Headley not dated).

One of the first issues the Caucus addressed was to provide pastoral training for

Latinos in Spanish. Since the Archdiocese did not offer a program targeted to Latinos, the Caucus created its own training program in 1982 called *El Instituto de Liderazgo Pastoral*. The Archdiocese incorporated the program into the Office of Lay Formation in 1984 and members of the Hispanic Caucus continued to teach courses. The program has graduated 400 Latinos and Latinas since its inception (Dahm 2001).

Vengan y Siganme

The Hispanic Caucus felt that the Archdiocese was not planning adequately (or at all) for the growing Latino population in the Chicago area and since it had not collected statistical data on Latinos, knew little about their presence in the Archdiocese. The Hispanic Caucus developed its own planning effort in 1982. The Caucus analyzed census data and conducted interviews to identify where Latinos lived and what their needs were throughout the area covered by the Archdiocese. According to one of those involved in the process, leaders involved with these efforts:

began a process of analysis, study and suggestions for action that included dialogue with people in the parishes and the different Church movements. Those who participated eventually presented a plan for evangelization of the Hispanic community that was quite comprehensive and has recently been honored by having its principal points included in the suggestions of the National Hispanic Encounter and the Hispanic Committee of the Conference of Catholic Bishops

(Headley not dated, 7).

The plan that emerged from the research was called *Vengan y Siganme*. The Hispanic Caucus presented the plan to the then new Cardinal Bernardin (1982-1996) who initially agreed to respond to the plan but never followed through. As Headley notes, the plan that was so well received nationally “was most honored by being ignored by the Chicago Hierarchy” (Headley not dated, 7).

To encourage Cardinal Bernardin to respond to *Vengan y Siganme*, in 1983, the Caucus threatened to hold an even larger meeting. This prompted Bernardin to create a new administrative office—the Office of the Hispanic Apostolate—led by two priests who were actively involved with the Caucus, Pedro Rodriguez and Ted O’Keefe (Dahm 1990; Dahm 2001)(Interviews 1999). The Office initially engaged in Hispanic ministry by supporting community organizations, training lay leaders, and working closely with the United Neighborhood Organization (UNO). But Caucus leaders quickly discovered that the Pastoral Center officials did not intend for the Office to play an activist role. “Chancery officials wanted a minimal function of coordination and clearinghouse for the Office” (Dahm 1990, 10). As Dahm notes,

frustrated by the lack of support from archdiocesan administrators and their agencies, including their involvement in and tolerance of ethnic jokes about Hispanics and African Americans in archdiocesan offices, and discouraged by the lack of support among many pastors, both priests resigned their positions,

O'Keefe in 1985 and Rodriguez in 1986, just a few years after having taken office (Dahm 2001, 15).

Sister Dominga Zapata was hired to direct the office in 1989-1990. In the interim, the Office's former secretary ran the program. While Sr. Dominga remained in the position far longer than her predecessors, through the end of the 1990s, she too was frustrated by institutional limitations. As one priest observed: "Sr. Zapata, for her part, was scarcely allowed by Archbishop Bernardin and Pedro Rodriguez to function in a leadership role" (Dahm 1990, 7). A staff member from this office acknowledged that at the end of the 1990s, they were not making change within the Archdiocese. "I don't feel we are fully impacting enough of the agencies, culturally and clerically" (Interview 1998). One of the biggest frustrations archdiocesan staff noted is that Pastoral Center staff and officials do not make an effort to learn about Latinos and relate to them on their own terms. Everything is done in the dominant culture, society, and language, and everyone else has to conform (assimilate) (Interviews 1998-1999).

That the Archdiocese has not reached out to Latinos is evident considering the lack of resources dedicated to Spanish Catholic newspapers and radio. The Caucus pressed the Archdiocese in 1984 to create a Spanish Catholic newspaper. The Archdiocese created *Chicago Católico*. But it has not provided adequate resources for editing, writing, or distribution. The Archdiocese has also not supported the development of Spanish radio programs. A few priests ran their own radio programs; one funded it privately and the other received a \$200 budget from the Archdiocese (Dahm 2001).

Hispanic Apostolate Task Force

The Hispanic Caucus met with Cardinal Bernardin and other chancery officials in 1987 to again press the Archdiocese to develop a plan to respond to Latinos. Cardinal Bernardin responded by creating the Hispanic Apostolate Task Force, which recommended the creation of a pastoral council for Latinos, *Consejo Pastoral Hispano*, and new Hispanic ministry coordinators in each of the Archdiocese's vicariates (Dahm 1990, 13; Dahm 2001).

The *Consejo* was originally conceived of as a broad based consultative body that would advise the archbishop. Cardinal Bernardin explained its purpose as helping him incorporate "Hispanic people into the full life of this local church" (Office of the Archbishop Archdiocese of Chicago 1991). This included supporting the integration of Latinos into the Archdiocese, not their assimilation, and facilitating the development of base communities. The *Consejo* was supposed to be composed of religious and laity with a grassroots basis, but as a result of a flawed selection process, a top down process was used to select the laity. The problem was compounded by the lack of an institutional arrangement for the lay leaders to report back to the community (Dahm 1990)(Interviews 1998-1999).

There was little communication between this group and the Pastoral Center; Cardinal Bernardin did not ask the *Consejo* for any advice, and no one ever asked them for a report. As one archdiocesan official aptly concluded, "The recipient of a consultative body is the Bishop and if he did not use it, it had no purpose" (Interview 1999). The group functioned for six or seven years before Cardinal Bernardin agreed to meet with them. Illustrating the fact that the Archdiocese did not actively use the consultative

body, the *Consejo* was not consulted before the Archdiocese decided to close St Francis of Assisi, known as the Latino cathedral (Interview with archdiocesan staff member 1998).

The *Consejo* also was not consulted before the Archdiocese closed the Cultural Center that housed the activist efforts at 1300 Wabash. This was a particularly frustrating event for those involved who suggested that the building could have been used for some other activity. And valuable murals were in the building. It took some dedicated priests and laity who found out about the closure to get the murals out of the building and to relocate them to St. Romans, a Mexican parish in Little Village (Interview with parish priest 1999).

Initially priests and others involved with Hispanic ministry hoped that the *Consejo* would play an important consultative role. But priests who were elected as head of the group quit when they saw that it was not producing anything. The *Consejo* provided direction for Sister Zapata, but by all accounts it was not working in the way that was originally intended. One priest described it as “window dressing” (Interview 1999). Despite the fact that the *Consejo* did not function as a consultative group, the Archdiocese used it to legitimize its activities. Archdiocesan planning documents from the 1980s and 1990s state that the Cardinal consulted the *Consejo* as part of the consultative process that gave archdiocesan-planning processes legitimacy that perhaps was not warranted.

The Task Force also recommended the creation of Hispanic ministry coordinators for each of the vicariates; these positions were put in place in 1991 (Office of the

Archbishop Archdiocese of Chicago 1991). Some of these coordinators were able to develop innovative programs for Hispanic ministry. But all of the coordinators lacked sufficient resources and coordination from the Archdiocese that could have aided their planning efforts (Dahm 2001).

The Archdiocese decreased the Hispanic Caucus's influence by ignoring it, co-opting its programs and watering them down, and penalizing the Caucus's priests in subtle ways. According to one priest, the administration "worked against the Hispanic Caucus until they killed it. There was a campaign against the Caucus" (Interview with parish priest 1999). One of the issues that wore the Caucus down was over holding an archdiocesan meeting to identify and discuss needs in Latino communities and determine how different archdiocesan agencies could work to meet those needs. As one priest involved with the effort related, "We wanted to ask those from agencies working in Latino communities what they could offer [to our communities] (Interview 1999).

Second Encuentro

Instead of the broader meeting proposed by the Caucus, Bernardin decided to hold another encuentro in 1992-1993. According to Bernardin, the goals of the Encuentro were to identify "what are the most urgent and clearest pastoral priorities, and how shall we realistically meet them" (Office of the Archbishop Archdiocese of Chicago 1991). Caucus members did not fully support the encuentro because they believed it would be another occasion during which the Archdiocese would "Ask the same questions and get the same answers." Caucus members wanted the focus to be on implementing recommendations made in the last encuentro rather than holding

another one to make more recommendations without an implementation plan. As they expected, the encuentro did not deal with the questions directly facing Latinos.

Adding frustration to the process, the recommendations from the encuentro were not released until 1996 and they were not distributed to all priests (Interviews with participating priests 1999)(Dahm 2001). Not surprisingly, since there was no plan to implement the recommendations, no institutional change was made.

More importantly perhaps, the Hispanic Caucus was told to put its activities on hold while the encuentro process, which took 5 years, was ongoing. This took a toll on Caucus participation. Between 1990 and 1994 the Caucus dropped to about 20-30 priests, in 1995 to about 5 priests and then in 1999 to 1 priest, a Mexican priest who was pastor of St. Romans in Little Village. About 8 lay Latinos still attend meetings (Interviews with priests 1998-2001).

The debate over the most appropriate way to respond to Latinos within the Archdiocese continues. Most recently it surfaced when the director of the Office of Religious Education (ORE) fired Juan Huitrado, a Latino Priest who is an active participant in the Hispanic Caucus and was formerly pastor at St. Romans and St. Vitus, who worked on the *El Instituto de Catequesis Hispano* program, a catechetics program designed specifically for Latinos. His removal was highly controversial. The director of ORE said that the reasons were administrative but some within the Archdiocese believe it was because he did not support the merger of the Latino catechetics and regular catechetics programs that the ORE director was pursuing. Two Mexican women religious who also worked in the *El Instituto de Catequesis* quit in protest (Dahm 2001). One priest described this experience as an example of

institutional racism (Interview 1999).

Juan Huitrado and the two Mexican women religious believed that a catechetics program targeted to Latinos that reflected their cultures and language was important enough that they formed a new catechetics program independent of the Pastoral Center called, *El Instituto para la Catequesis Hispana*, the Institute for Hispanic Catechists. They ran the program for a year with no financial resources (Headley no date). Others involved in Hispanic ministry confronted Cardinal George after a mass on the street in Pilsen to request funding for the program. The debate went on for a year and in June of 1998, a separate Hispanic religious education program was created at Holy Trinity parish (Interviews with Parish priests 1999). Even with funding, the program devoted to Latinos, who make up at least a third of Chicago area Catholics, is under funded and understaffed in contrast with the program that serves white Catholics.

Recently, three Latino archdiocesan employees filed a discrimination complaint with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. One of the employees is a Deacon at O'Hare Airport, one edits Chicago *Catolico*, the Spanish-language archdiocesan newspaper, and the third works for the Pastoral Center with Latino media. According to the *Sun-Times*, "their allegations includes verbal harassment, intimidation, unfair working conditions and denial of resources. The women also filed gender discrimination charges. One also says she was retaliated against after filing her complaint" (Falsani 2001, 6). And, Father Esequiel Sanchez who directs the Archdiocese's Hispanic Ministry office, distributed a memo within the Archdiocese which "castigated the archdiocese for rampant discrimination" (Falsani 2001, 6).

The issue over putting Latinos into positions of power within the Archdiocese is similar to what happened in the U.S. Catholic Church. Latinos successfully lobbied for increased Latino representation in national Church structures but found that despite the increased representation, little changed within the Church. Stevens-Arroyo describes the situation at the national level:

including people with Spanish surnames within a bureaucracy or even within the hierarchy does not in itself ensure the adoption of an agenda favoring Latinos or a change in the priorities. But political institutions in the secular sphere engaged in tokenism—appointment of Latinos but without concession of power—and the Church was not immune to the same tactic. In a sense, it better served the institution to have a Latino who could or would do nothing for the community in an official post, than to have no representation at all. Persons who protested against that token power implicit in their position could easily be forced to resign since they held no real power (Stevens-Arroyo 1994, 115).

This was the case in the Chicago Archdiocese. Despite efforts by the Hispanic Caucus, lay, and religious leaders, the Archdiocese of Chicago has not elevated Latinos to positions of power. Father Esequiel Sanchez, the most recent director of the Archdiocese's Office Hispanic Ministry, wrote an article in the Archdiocese's

newspaper, *The New World*, in which he pointed out that “Hispanics have taken major leadership roles in almost every area of American society except one: the church.” He added that:

In the Archdiocese of Chicago there are no Hispanic bishops. There are no Hispanics who are in church decision-making levels even though Hispanics are no longer a small minority in the archdiocese. Those Hispanics who are present are normally support staff for the various agencies and department directors (Sanchez 1999b, 7).

It is important to note that even those who have attempted to participate in archdiocesan decision-making have left pastoral center staff positions, Task Forces, and other committees in frustration because of a lack of commitment by the Archdiocese. And more recently, Father Sanchez wrote an internal memo stating that ““The absence of Hispanics in the archdiocese leadership has prevented the Hispanic community from even being informed as to the issues that affect all Catholics in the archdiocese...There is no avenue in which Hispanic Catholics can speak for themselves on issues that affect the entire Church of Chicago”” (Falsani 2001, 6).

Many priests, women religious, and lay leaders have engaged in community level efforts and have created archdiocesan wide programs to meet the needs of Latinos. These innovative programs have focused on training new leadership and have often used community organizing as a strategy. Many of these programs received no

resources from the Archdiocese. There has been little effort by the Pastoral Center to coordinate the activities within the Archdiocese to minister more effectively to Latinos.

Father Don Headley describes the situation:

While neither the Cardinal's Office for the Spanish Speaking nor the Panama mission exist at present, there is an hispanic office and a mission in Guerrero, Mexico. However, on no level of formational or institutional Church activity is there to be found a sense of coordination, focus, or evaluation, whether of programs or structures, that might give value and importance to all the laity manages to do. Parishes work at parallels with the rest of the institution. Agency lines run on but they do not necessarily cross (Headley no date, 7).

In 1996, Latinos accounted for 31 percent of Chicago's archdiocesan Catholic population (Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Research and Planning 1997). Yet, they have little access to or representation in decision-making structures. One Archdiocesan official noted that the "the challenge for Chicago is to have more personnel in leadership positions. Archbishop George is more perceptive and he speaks Spanish" which has given Latinos hope that he will institute change (Interview with archdiocesan staff member 1999). A priest who works in Pilsen noted that the "Downtown representation hasn't changed." He avowed that increasing Latino

representation is “a real priority. I intend to continue to push it. If you want to get representation in cabinet positions, we have to take some effort when the next openings come up. It’s a priority that we look for more people otherwise it’s a voice in the wilderness” he said. (Interview 1999).

A lack of Latino representation and power in archdiocesan decision-making is not uncommon in dioceses across the country. The Archdiocese of Los Angeles faces similar issues. Los Angeles’s Bishop Manning created a tax for suburban parishes to pay for much needed improvements for inner city parishes and schools, began Spanish language classes in parochial schools, and supported the appointment of the first Latino bishop in L.A. And Bishop Mahoney included lay people in setting Archdiocesan priorities:

The day after his installation, he launched the most ambitious polling of the Catholic grassroots ever attempted in the USA. For the first time, ordinary Latino, as well as Anglo, Catholics were invited to participate in setting goals for the archdiocese. Over the course of a year, 70,000 people attended parish assemblies or regional convocations, while 320,000 answered questionnaires (in Spanish as well as English) on the archdiocese’s ‘mission’ (Davis 1990, 348).

But this plan did not include Christian base communities nor did it address the growing need for Latino priests. Davis concludes that the Latino Aid Plan did not

redistribute power in the Archdiocese and, in fact, it re-centralized power in the hands of the archbishop. Archdiocesan decision-makers remained white. PADRES (United Priests for Religious Educational and Social Causes), an advocacy organization, was formed to gain attention for Latino issues, but most Latinos did not join organizations to advocate for change within the Archdiocese, they simply changed religions (Davis 1990).

New York's Archdiocese provides a contrast to the experiences of Los Angeles and Chicago. New York included Puerto Ricans and other Latinos in decision-making structures. However this inclusion only lasted until just after the First National Encuentro in the early 1970s. Cardinal Cooke decreased the effectiveness of the Office of the Spanish Apostolate in the New York Archdiocese by decreasing its staff and finances and removing its director (Diaz-Stevens 1993).

Institutional Change

Making change at the Pastoral Center level is difficult. A high level priest in the Archdiocese noted that:

Some very good things have been done by Catholic personnel in the Latino community but we're behind. We're not doing enough. It's a lot of frustration. I've upset many people downtown because of pushing on it. The next few years will be crucial. Cardinal George has said we need to reach out to Hispanics but will he be able to. There will have to be structural changes. He's

trying to be patient (Interview 1999).

Even though the Cardinal sets the tone for the Archdiocese, and archdiocesan staff members assert that change will not happen until the Cardinal initiates and supports it, the Cardinal is limited by the institution of the Archdiocese. The Cardinal has authority, but “the real authority is to persuade people which is slower” (Interview 1999).

Cardinal George may have a greater awareness of the need to respond to Latinos. He elevated the ethnic consultant to Director and he appointed a young Mexican American priest, Esequiel Sanchez, as Director of Hispanic Ministry in September 1998 (Sanchez 1999a). In the position, he is to “direct the archdiocesan effort to identify the pastoral/social needs of Hispanic Catholics, represent and advance these needs with appropriate archdiocesan agencies and promote leadership on behalf of the archdiocese in various Hispanic communities” (1998, 13). It is too early to tell whether this administrative change will result in any real decision-making power for Latinos; priests who work in Latino communities are optimistic.

The change in the strength of the ethnic ministry positions reflects another change in the Archdiocese’s approach to ethnic groups. Earlier policy on ethnic ministry was designed to decrease ethnic divisions, a policy that was referred to with the ironic name of multiculturalism. Cardinal Bernardin consolidated ethnic ministry offices in the early 1980s and cut their resources again in 1989. This replicated what other dioceses and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops were doing which was to have four desks covering European Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian

Americans, and African Americans. It was also an attempt to save money (D'Agostino 2000)(Interview with archdiocesan staff member 1999)(Stevens-Arroyo 1994).

According to Stevens-Arroyo, cutbacks in offices for Latinos were common across the country. "The cuts in staff, diminution of authority, restrictions in budget during the late 1980s effectively halted the expansion of special offices and agencies for Latinos" (Stevens-Arroyo 1994, 116). Cardinal George's changing the ethnic ministry positions to director positions gives more visibility and possibly power to the ethnic offices (Interview 1999).

The United States Catholic Conference has recognized the growth in the Catholic immigrant population but it appears that dioceses across the country do not have structures in place to incorporate new immigrant groups. A study conducted for the Conference by Michael Foley found that despite an increase in Catholic immigration, ethnic ministry offices across the country are under funded and understaffed. Many efforts to respond to new immigrants are dependent upon the cooperation of parish priests, who may or may not be interested in reaching out to new immigrant groups. Not surprisingly, the study found that efforts that work best are those that "enjoy the full, public support of their bishop and the fullest integration into diocesan structures" (Foley 1997, 2). Also effective are parish level and what Foley calls "small group models." Chapter III illustrates how the parish cluster that covers Pilsen on Chicago's lower west side, which could be considered a "small group model," has been successful at reaching out to Latinos.

CONCLUSION

Unlike immigrant groups at the end of the 1800s and beginning of the 1900s, Latino immigrants, if they want to influence their religious institutions, have little choice but to deal with the Archdiocese. If they want programs that respond to their needs, they need to access and influence the archdiocesan bureaucracy. If they want to determine how resources are allocated and whether their schools and parishes are closed, consolidated, or remain open, they need to access and influence the bureaucracy.

When asked why the Archdiocese does not recognize the need to reach out to Latinos, one pastor responded “People just don’t know. They don’t understand the gifts. They hang on to their own power” (Interview 1999). A Latino priest suggested that “We Hispanics are a problem. They are waiting for us to acculturate” (Interview 1999). These comments raise three issues.

The first is that without adequate representation, archdiocesan staff members do not know first hand about Latinos or Latino issues. According to some archdiocesan staff members, who recognize that there is a diversity of Catholics in the Chicago region, the Archdiocese itself and many parish priests do not seem to recognize this. “They haven’t even noticed that the faces have changed. People are not the same but [the archdiocese] is still addressing them with the same attitudes” (Interview with archdiocesan staff member 1998).

Considering the class, gender, ethnicity, race, culture, and language differences between those in the archdiocese administrative structure and those in communities, it is sometimes difficult for those who make decisions to fully understand new

immigrant communities and poor communities. One interviewee suggested, “Within the archdiocese, there are different ways to make decisions and there is unconscious discrimination” (Interview 1998). Those who make decisions have little contact with poor communities. The Archdiocese often relies on “experts” instead of on the people who are most affected by archdiocesan policies.

Second, there is a question about how the Archdiocese should respond to new immigrant groups. Archdiocesan staff members are frequently heard stating that they do not want to create a separate Church for Latinos. Foley notes that this:

puts bishops in the uncomfortable position of continually resisting deeply felt requests rather than fully welcoming newcomers. Concerns on the part of both pastors and bishops over the control of financial resources only compound the probability of misunderstanding between immigrant communities and the larger church (Foley 1997, 4).

The Church throughout the country is in a position in which it has to reconcile its historic effort at Americanization with the fact that the Catholic Church in the United States is again becoming an immigrant Church.

Finally, Latinos, as much of the current literature suggests, are not willing to continue the traditional pattern of assimilation established by the Catholic Church. They are not willing to drop their language, culture, or religious traditions to become

Americanized. Cardinal Mundelein's effort to decrease the role of individual ethnic groups within Chicago's Church is precisely the opposite of what they would like to see happen. Latinos point out that there are unique aspects to Latino religion and they have been fighting on local and national levels to secure the preservation of Latino Catholicism (Diaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo 1998; Sandoval 1994; Stevens-Arroyo 1994).

In 1983, the Catholic Bishops wrote a pastoral letter, *The Hispanic Presence: Challenge and Commitment* that ended the policy of Americanization—instead opting for preservation and celebration of the Spanish language and Latino culture and traditions (Sandoval 1994). In the conclusion to *Hispanic Catholic Culture*, Jay Dolan concludes that Latinos have been successful in creating a Church within a Church nationally (Dolan 1994). In Chicago this is only true in the practice of Catholicism in certain parishes—not at the level of the Archdiocese.

The inadequate representation of Latinos in archdiocesan decision-making structures has contributed to the lack of understanding within the bureaucracy of the issues that Latinos confront, including racism and discrimination. White middle class professional staff members dominate the Archdiocese. An archdiocesan staff member who worked in the ethnic ministry office mentioned how they made a point of asking other staff not to make ethnic jokes. That they had to even raise this as an issue with other archdiocesan staff is telling. According to one priest, the cultural training classes for priests used to have them make a piñata. Now there is a realization that a greater effort to train priests is necessary (Interview with archdiocesan staff member 1999).

To some degree, there is also a lack of understanding that discrimination towards Latinos is racism. Because of the events of the 1950s and 1960s in Chicago, there is a clear understanding of racism towards African Americans. The relationship to Latinos is less clear. This is evidenced in a pastoral letter issued by the Bishops of Illinois in April 2000. The bishops declared that racism is a sin and said that it could be individual or institutional; they defined institutional racism as allowing “racist attitudes or practices to shape the structures of an organization” (Bishops of Illinois 2000, 1a). In their initial description of racism they mentioned Latinos but all of the subsequent examples that illustrated different types of racism referred to African Americans, not to Latinos.

Community vs. “Downtown”

Many pastors and lay leaders complain that the Pastoral Center lacks identification with the realities communities’ experience. Pastoral Center employees are often referred as the folks “downtown,” referencing their office location just off Michigan Avenue, just south of the Water Tower, in the high rent shopping district. One pastor noted that the:

guys in the parish and the guys downtown are like two different worlds. Bureaucracy and racism are downtown. They don’t know what it’s like in the trenches, and even less in a brown or black trench (Interview with a pastor 1998).

Another member of a religious community noted that the “whole system has to be

revamped. The hierarchy will have to come down [to the community] to find out what's going on" (Interview 1998). One priest notes that "Some pastoral ministers in the field perceive the lack of understanding or resistance of archdiocesan authorities as ignorance, unconscious discrimination, deliberate racism, or simply arrogance of people in power" (Dahm 2001, 19).

In the 1980s and early 1990s, the lack of action may have been due in part to Bernardin's leadership style. He was committed to consultative processes—meaning that there were many task forces and meetings and issues would be studied and studied and studied but little action was taken. An example of this consultative process was the many committees created at the Pastoral Center to deal with race. Father Michael Pfleger, pastor at St. Sabina Catholic Church, on Chicago's south side resigned from one of the Archdiocese's race task forces. He criticized the Archdiocese for a lack of action on race issues, citing a lack of African American and Latino teachers and "the absence of affirmative action goals throughout the archdiocese" (Lawrence 1997, 23).

Archdiocesan staff who recognize the needs in these communities suggest that the difficulties in understanding these communities and responding to them is in large part a question of institutional change. They add that changing the institution of the Catholic Church is a very difficult process that happens over long periods of time. Those who want to respond to the needs have found that they have a certain leeway to maneuver within the institution. But they acknowledge that within such a hierarchical structure, this is an imperfect way to make change. As one archdiocesan staff member related, "I don't need to ask permission to do everything, but we do need the power

when it means institutional change.” An issue “only becomes an institutional priority when the Cardinal says it is” (Interview with Archdiocesan staff member 1998).

But it is not just a question of recognizing the needs of new immigrant populations. At stake are issues about how resources will be allocated and what theology will be pursued. Greater representation of new immigrant populations in archdiocesan decision-making structures would certainly influence archdiocesan priorities. There is a resistance on the part of the Archdiocese to create two separate Churches. But without adequate representation of Latinos in positions of power within the Pastoral Center, Latinos remain as tenants—rather than owners of the institution.

“

VI. ARCHDIOCESAN PLANNING IN THE 1980S AND 1990S

The centralization of archdiocesan power and decision-making in the hands of experts has reduced the ability of people of color and the poor to access church decision-making which means that they have few opportunities to influence archdiocesan decision-making, priorities, or the allocation of resources. As a result, the preferential option for the poor has largely been moved aside and the financial bottom line has taken precedence. This chapter examines the financial issues facing the Archdiocese, the planning processes that were developed to redistribute resources equitably, and how these have not resulted in an equitable resource distribution because they have not adequately understood the realities facing poor communities of color.

THE CONTEXT

In the 1980s, Catholic urban dioceses across the country found themselves with increasingly large amounts of debt. The Catholic Church in many cities did not plan for the demographic changes that were occurring in major metropolitan areas. Many dioceses found themselves with increasing poverty in urban areas and growing populations in suburban areas requiring them to spread their resources across a large area. And because Catholic parishes remain in neighborhoods rather than moving with their parishioners, Catholic parishes remain active even when there are few Catholics in their service area. Dioceses found themselves subsidizing poor parishes and schools and building new institutions in growing suburban communities.

Additional costs arose from the growth of central bureaucracies. In Chicago, Pastoral Center debt contributed to their high debt in the 1980s. And recently it has again ballooned. Pastoral Center debt increased from \$2.8 million in 1998 to \$12.2 million in 1999. The increase was attributed to higher health and property insurance and the costs of upgrading Pastoral Center technology (2000b). Dioceses have other seen other costs climb such as the legal fees associated with the sexual misconduct of priests. In 1993, the Archdiocese spent 2.8 million dollars, an increase from the 1.9 million dollars spent in 1992.

The Archdiocese has attempted to reduce parish debt. Chicago's Catholic parishes were built for, and often by, diverse groups of immigrants. Parish and school buildings reflect the architectural styles of the various ethnic groups--physical monuments to the ethnic groups that lived in those neighborhoods. But these neighborhoods have changed. White flight from the city to the suburbs and the migration of African Americans from the South and Latino immigration/migration in particular have transformed the city. Archdiocesan officials argue that the Archdiocese no longer needs the extensive institutional presence in some urban neighborhoods, cannot afford to maintain an institutional presence, and as a result has closed and or consolidated schools and parishes.

For many years the Archdiocese has subsidized parishes and schools in poor communities. The subsidy amount peaked in 1990 at nearly 21 million dollars (See Figure 3). The number of parishes that require financial support from the Archdiocese has been growing since the early 1980s. In 1982, 29 parishes could not support themselves; in 1988 the number grew to 88, and in 1989 to 109 parishes out of a total

425 parishes (Gannon and Schwartz 1992, 114). In 1990, 116 parishes received grants; 96 did in 1992 (Archdiocese of Chicago 1993). Subsidies come from parish taxes, the Cardinal's Appeal (an annual collection), income from Catholic Cemeteries, and from the Archdiocese's endowment (Archdiocese of Chicago 1993). As Figure 3 shows, the Archdiocese has been decreasing the total amount of subsidies.

Table 2. Archdiocesan Subsidies to Parishes

Fiscal Year	Total Subsidy to Parishes (operating and capital)
1996	\$11,200,000
1993	\$15,800,000
1992	almost \$ 18,000,000
1990	\$21,800,000
1987	\$11,100,000
1974	\$2,020,000

(2000b; Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Research and Planning 1997; Archdiocese of Chicago 1993)

The Archdiocese does not reveal exactly how subsidies are distributed. Some priests are agitated because they are not able to participate in the decision-making or even analyze the decisions that have been made (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998).

Besides the growing archdiocesan debt, there are conflicts within the Church about whether and how these subsidies should be provided. According to Perella, traditionalists,

always distrusted this form of parish ministry because it was unorthodox and did not, in their view, fulfill the

church's chief mission: the spread of faith in Jesus Christ through participation in the Roman Catholic Church. Traditionalist critics describe this model of parish as "social activism," activity deemed less spiritual, and ephemeral (Perella 1996, 187).

This has been an enduring conflict within the Archdiocese.

Much of the financial difficulty parishes are experiencing is attributed to the high cost of maintaining Catholic schools. Parishes resort to paying the bulk of their income to support their schools and after they use up their parish savings, they turn to the Archdiocese for subsidies. This is a problem for the financial stability of individual parishes and for the Archdiocese. One priest noted that the "Parishes are taxed 10% of Sunday and holy day income which goes to the diocese—almost primarily to schools. That's sinking us. It's become a kind of negative welfare" (Interview 1999). Priests in poor communities note that the total amount of subsidies has been decreasing and these subsidies are being divided among a larger number of parishes. As a result, parishes are being forced to use up their savings to support their schools, which eventually forces them to close the schools (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998).

The increased cost of supporting parochial schools is due to a variety of factors. In the 1960s, two Catholic periodicals, *America* and *Commonweal* had many articles that questioned whether support for Catholic schools should continue. In Chicago, Cardinal Cody declared that no new parochial schools would be built which left many of Chicago's suburbs without Catholic schools. Archdiocesan officials are now

struggling to build suburban schools to meet the demand that's been growing over the last forty years.

The decline in the number of religious personnel who staffed many of the parishes, schools, and institutions has been a major factor in the escalating costs. The percentage of women and men religious (nuns, priests, brothers), as the total percentage of teachers in parochial elementary and secondary schools nationally, declined from 58% in 1967 to 15% in 1990 (Bryk, Lee, and Holland 1993) and to about 8% in 1997 (National Catholic Educational Association 1998). This has increased the cost of salaries and benefits dramatically since nuns were paid only subsistence wages. In an important aside, one pastor mentioned that given the local teacher salaries, "good pastors slip money under the table" to the teachers (Interview May 1999). So the amount for teachers' wages is likely higher than is reported and the burden on parishes to support the schools is also likely higher. The Catholic Church did not prepare itself for this rapid decrease in its relatively free teacher labor pool.

The number of students attending parochial elementary schools in Chicago and in many other cities across the country has declined. The number of students in Chicago dropped from 70,428 in 1988-1989 to 52,894 in 1997-98¹⁴ (Archdiocese of Chicago 1989; Archdiocese of Chicago Office Of Catholic Education 1998). With so few students in schools, archdiocesan officials find it economically wiser to close or consolidate schools to make better use of their resources.

¹⁴The number of students attending parochial elementary schools in the suburbs was virtually unchanged during that time period.

The rising cost of Catholic education has meant that many poorer students—who tend to be students of color—in Chicago and some poorer suburbs, cannot attend Catholic school. The average annual tuition for Chicago elementary schools was \$1,539 in 1998. The average annual tuition for Chicago high schools was \$4,306 in 1998. This puts Catholic education considerably out of reach for the poor. This is not just a Chicago phenomenon. It is a problem faced across the country. Rising tuition costs are moving Catholic schools into a position of educating an elite—a dramatically different role than the one they played during the first immigrant Church.

Harris and Riordan looked at the school costs issue nationally and concluded “Catholic schools are serving an increasingly wealthy student population because only relatively affluent parents can pay the bills.” Catholic schools, they note, “are serving a progressively more elite student population. The poor and working class are being squeezed out by rising cost” (Harris and Riordan 1997). The Archdiocese itself notes that “as tuitions continue to escalate, even the middle class finds it difficult to afford the costs of Catholic schooling. As a result, Catholic schools may not be available for all who would choose them” (Office of Catholic Education Archdiocese of Chicago 1994, 13). One lay leader added that “there are some scholarships but Catholic education is not for the poor” (Interview 1998).

There is an important racial dimension to the high cost of parochial education. The poor in the city of Chicago are disproportionately African American and Latino. The high cost of Catholic schools in the city puts them out of reach, cutting off a primary avenue that earlier ethnic groups used to get ahead. As the following two tables show,

the number of Latinos attending Catholic elementary schools in Chicago decreased between 1988 and 1999 despite an increase in the Latino population (See Figures 4 and 5). Archdiocesan school officials suggest that Latinos are less interested in having their children attend parochial schools. However, in interviews, community residents, community leaders, parish priests, and school principals all said that the cost of Catholic education was the deciding factor. Archdiocesan officials suggest that new Latino immigrants are either uninterested in Catholic education or are too uneducated to appreciate its importance. Pastoral Center officials contrast the experience of African Americans who scrimp and save to send their children to Catholic school with Mexicans who, according to them, come from rural backgrounds, are illiterate and do not understand or value a Catholic education. Priests, women religious, and others in Latino neighborhoods say that lacking an appreciation for education is not the issue. Many Latinos simply cannot afford Catholic school (Interviews 1999).

Table 3. Archdiocese of Chicago Parochial Elementary School Enrollment 1970-1999

School Year Ending	Native American	Asian	Black, non Latino	Latino	White, non Latino	Bi-racial	Total
1999	165	3,464	15,634	15,675	61,946	1969	98,799
1988	128	4,471	21,036	16,904	74,372	NA	116,911
1980	81	3,668	25,414	15,662	91,481	NA	134,639
1971	186	1,094	23,275	12,104	174,186	NA	210,845

Source: Office of Catholic Education, Archdiocese of Chicago

Table 4. City of Chicago Parochial Elementary School Enrollment 1970-1999

School Year Ending	Native American	Asian	Black, non Latino	Latino	White, non Latino	Bi-racial	Total
1999	67	2027	12,689	11,880	23,190	1097	50,950
1988	94	2938	18,791	14,110	34,964	NA	70,897
1980	64	2584	22,469	12, 723	43,772	NA	81,612
1971	101	977	21,813	11,033	95,532	NA	129,456

Source: Office of Catholic Education, Archdiocese of Chicago

The Archdiocese's solution is to lobby for vouchers or tax credits and to step up development efforts (Office of Catholic Education Archdiocese of Chicago 1994). As of January 1, 2000, families who send their children to Catholic school in Illinois can qualify for a \$500 tax credit (Lowe 2000). Additionally, the Chicago Archdiocese is considering a 100 million dollar fund-raising campaign to provide money to sustain parochial schools in low-income communities (Kloehn 1997). The Church may also close some of its Catholic schools and reopen them as charter schools. St. Sabina's, a school serving an African-American population on the south side, was mentioned as the first potential candidate (Anderson 1999). Catholic schools would have to be reopened without any religious education or symbols in the classrooms.

The Archdiocese has established programs to support low-income students. The Big Shoulders Fund is the most successful effort to provide funds for parochial education in poor communities, regardless of race or religion. The Fund was created in 1986 after a study of Chicago's civic and corporate leaders showed that they were willing to help support Catholic schools to ensure that they had a well educated labor pool (not, one might note, strictly for social justice reasons). Cardinal Bernardin contacted James

O'Conner, Chairman of Commonwealth Edison Company, and other corporate leaders to create a committee that is now composed of 92 civic and corporate leaders called The Big Shoulders Fund. The board members are the prime fundraisers; they collect money from foundations, corporations, and individuals (Interview with Judith Silekis August 4, 1998).

The Big Shoulders Fund raised 67.2 million dollars in 11 years. In 1998, it provided resources for 42,000 students attending 104 parochial elementary schools and 22 parochial high schools in poor communities. Thirty three percent of the students who receive Big Shoulders funds are not Catholic. For the 1997/1998 school year, Big Shoulders distributed \$4,517,759 (The Big Shoulders Fund 1998a; The Big Shoulders Fund 1998b). People of color comprised 82 percent of the students in Big Shoulders elementary schools and 70 percent of secondary schools in 1997/98 (The Big Shoulders Fund 1998a). Big Shoulders schools must be located within the city of Chicago and they have to meet strict poverty criteria¹⁵. Schools must be eligible for and participate in Title I; 20 percent of the students must receive free or reduced lunches, and the school has to have at least a 20 percent poverty index (calculated by using the students' zip codes and census tracts). If the school has less than a 20 percent poverty index but 30 percent of the students receive free or reduced lunches the school also qualifies (Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Catholic Education undated). However, as the Executive Director of the Big Shoulders Fund admits, the Big Shoulders Fund is not sufficient to meet all of the need in poor communities. A more intensive effort is necessary (Interview with Judith Silekis August 4, 1998).

¹⁵As a result of a school consolidation, one Big Shoulders school is located in the suburbs; however most of the school's students are from Chicago.

Funding for non-Catholics in Catholic schools is a contentious issue and it overlaps urban and racial issues. Most non-Catholics who attend parochial schools live in the city of Chicago and many African-Americans who attend parochial schools are not Catholic. Seven percent of students attending parochial elementary schools in the suburbs are non-Catholic in contrast with 23 percent in the city (Archdiocese of Chicago Office Of Catholic Education 1998). Black Non-Latinos account for 16 percent of the Archdiocese's elementary school population—within the city of Chicago, they account for 25 percent (Archdiocese of Chicago Office Of Catholic Education 1998).

Wealthier suburban parishes could be tapped to reduce the inequities in the city and poorer suburbs, especially given the supposed motivating force of religion. In addition to the parish taxes, other parish funds and in-kind services are exchanged through the Parish Sharing or Twinning program (Interview with Tom Lund, Office of Peace and Justice 1997). Twinning was originally started by Monsignor Jack Egan in 1968-1969 and the Association of Chicago Priests, with the intention that low-income parishes of color could develop relationships with suburban parishes (Frisbie 1991). Parishes share about 3 million dollars and another 3 million in in-kind services (Schlumpf 1996).

Sharing arrangements have generally developed as personal relationships between priests. Priests who are very charismatic or who have good contacts with priests in better off parishes can make deals to benefit their parishes. As one priest noted, "Twinning is basically classmates who made deals. We have to break relationships

between the old guys. Some guys get really frustrated” (Interview with parish priest 1999). Parishes in low-income communities without these charismatic or well-connected priests are at an additional disadvantage. Some suggest that the original reason for Cody’s requiring that all parishes participate in the twinning program in 1976 was that it was a way to keep parishes and schools open without forcing the Archdiocese to tax wealthier parishes directly. Bernardin reemphasized that twinning should build relationships between communities and counter racism and he issued a pastoral statement called “Building Bridges Between Communities of Faith” to encourage better use of the parish sharing program (Interview with Tom Lund 1997)(Schlumpf 1996). The program, however, continues to face many of the limitations related to personal relationships.

In response to a suggestion that the tax on parishes—especially wealthy parishes—be increased to provide for the poor, priests and some administrators quickly assert that if the Archdiocese increased parish taxes, pastors of wealthier parishes would hide the real amount of their funds to avoid giving it all away to “downtown,” their label for the Pastoral Center. Priests who minister in poor communities are often frustrated by what they see as the ridiculous expenses of wealthier parishes. One priest in a poor Latino community related how one suburban parish spent \$500,000 on a cross (Interviews 1998-1999).

ARCHDIOCESAN PLANNING EFFORTS

In the 1980s Cardinal Bernardin believed that the Archdiocese was experiencing a financial crisis. He appointed a financial committee to investigate reducing the debt. Chairmen from First Chicago, Motorola, and Sears among others, worked with the

Archdiocese's financial planners to develop a strategy. First Chicago bank donated five people full-time to work with the Archdiocese (Kelly 1991). The financial committee strongly recommended that Archbishop Bernardin take action. To respond to the crises, the Archdiocese hired six financial advisors, one for each vicariate.¹⁶ Loan procedures were made stricter, parishes were required to have three year budgets and quarterly reports, there were budget reductions and office restructuring to reduce waste, parish taxes were increased, and the percentage of school funding from tuition was increased from 60 percent to 65 percent (Kelly 1991).

The committee also recommended parish and school consolidations. Later explaining the reasons for the parish and school closures and consolidations, Bernardin was quoted as saying, "The cost of subsidizing so many parishes and schools could no longer be sustained without economic chaos. But there was a deeper reason—namely, the demographic changes of recent years. In some areas, we simply had too many facilities for too few people" (Stahel 1991, 618).

Planning and Evaluation 1987

The 1987 planning and evaluation effort was undertaken initially by a nine-member committee of archdiocesan staff. It developed 43 guidelines for parish planning and evaluation that focused on "a parish plan, the ratio of priests to people, the ratio of registered and non-registered Catholics to priests, religious education, schools, ministerial support, and support staff" (Johnston 1987, 29). The guidelines specified that parishes should have at least 300 families and Catholic schools should have at

¹⁶Chicago's archdiocese is divided into six vicariates, which are sub-administrative levels.

least 200 students. Parishes should not be closer than a half mile from one another.

The Archdiocese should not subsidize each parish for more than 50,000 dollars a year.

And repair costs should not be more than 10 percent of a parish's budget for the prior three years (Lehmann 1987).

The guidelines were developed centrally and the planning process was conducted quickly. The Archdiocese, in each of its planning efforts, has maintained that its goal is the better allocation of resources—not parish and school closure and consolidation. For this planning round, Archdiocesan officials acknowledged that they were responding to population shifts and that population declines in Catholic parishes and schools in African American communities would likely mean some closures and or consolidations. They emphasized that closure and consolidations would not decrease the quality of ministry in African American and Latino communities.

People involved in ministry have not always felt that was the case however. Pilsen's parishes were organized as a cluster in 1987; the Archdiocese instructed them develop a plan to minister in their communities. According to Pilsen's pastors, the Archdiocese wanted the parishes to decide which of their parishes they were willing to close. A priest in Pilsen summarized the response of the parishes. "We proposed in January of 1988 that we weren't going to close anything. The diocese did not want to approve our plan. They did not want to talk to us. We forced Bernardin to come here and he said, "I approve this plan. I will not close any parish here for five years." Two years later, he closed St. Vitus" (Interview with parish priest 1998).

As a result of the 1987 planning process, 28 parishes, 18 schools, two missions, and

one of the Archdiocese's seminaries were closed in 1990 followed by five more parishes and two elementary schools in 1991 (Gannon and Schwartz 1992). The closures were extremely controversial. Laity and religious were frustrated, and at times angered, by a process that they believed was not consultative and was quickly pushed through. The Cardinal was quoted as saying that he did not close parishes and schools without extensive planning. However, many people were upset up the closings and more than a few felt as though there were not adequate planning processes (Stahel 1991, 618).

Decisions: Archdiocesan Strategic Planning Process, September 1993

Cardinal Bernardin launched the Archdiocese into a long term planning effort called Decisions beginning in 1993-1994. Despite the parish and school closures of the 1980s and early 1990s, the Archdiocese remained in debt. Bernardin believed that coordinated strategic planning was necessary to insure an equitable distribution of resources throughout the Archdiocese. D'Agostino reports that Bernardin thought of the planning effort as a religious experience, as an evolving process (D'Agostino 2000). The Presbyteral senate and others originally called for a more extensive planning effort called a synod, which would have focused on many issues. The archbishop instead decided on a scaled back effort to focus on two issues.

Decisions was led by a thirteen-member steering committee, chaired by Bernardin's Chief of Staff. There was no Latino representation on the committee.

Representatives from the Presbyteral Council, the Archdiocesan Pastoral Council, Vicariate Teams and the Département Directors and Agency Directors from the Pastoral Center attended a presentation that outlined the state of the Archdiocese.

They received information on “personnel, operations, structure, finances, and strategy” and demographic data (Archdiocese of Chicago 1994a, 4). These representatives divided into teams to identify priorities which were prioritized by the steering committee. From the priority list, the Cardinal selected Evangelization and Education and Ministerial Leadership as the two issues the Archdiocese would focus on.

Teams with expertise in these areas were assembled to develop position papers and make recommendations. According to the Archdiocese, “more than 8,000 people representing every parish in the archdiocese” participated in a consultation process to respond to the position papers (Archdiocese of Chicago 1994a, 4). Their comments were included in a final report. The Archdiocese then launched a strategic planning effort to decide how to implement the recommendations (Archdiocese of Chicago 1994a). Decisions made a number of recommendations including strengthening the Parish Sharing program, developing a program to promote racial and ethnic sensitivity, and changing the deanery structure.

One area in which the Decisions process has received praise is the Archdiocese’s efforts to develop race and ethnicity training programs. The Archdiocesan ethnic ministry offices developed a workshop on racism and ethnic sensitivity. Phase I is a workshop on racism. In Phase II, parishes send parishioners who are interested in the topic and they bring what they learn back to the parish. In Phase III, the people who go back to the community put on a presentation for the parish and community. And in Phase IV, the group that goes back to the community puts on a racism workshop. Parish priests who have sent their parishioners through this program had positive

things to say about it (Interviews 1998-1999).

Decisions has received less praise for the efforts to develop a long-term plan to support Catholic schools. Given that so many parochial schools were finding it difficult to maintain financial stability, the Decisions document identified criteria that schools need to meet to qualify for financial support. And Decisions concluded that the Pastoral Center should not provide school subsidies. That means that taxes collected from other parishes (i.e.-wealthier parishes) would not be used to subsidize poorer schools (Archdiocese of Chicago 1993). According to *Decisions*, “The Archdiocese will continue to supplement well-attended and needy parish schools, but new standards for recipients of grants are to be established. The goals of the annual Cardinal’s Appeal are being expanded to include these schools” (Archdiocese of Chicago 1994b, 9). The Archdiocese limited that source of support to The Big Shoulders Fund and the Cardinal’s Annual Appeal. Since this decision, the Cardinal’s Annual Appeal has failed to bring in the funding that the Archdiocese was anticipating. The Pastoral Center has continued to subsidize schools, but it has used the criteria as a guide to close schools.

1996 Special School Task Force on Catholic Schools

Cardinal Bernardin created the Special Task Force on Catholic Schools in 1996 to continue the long range planning for schools and to develop ways to implement the findings of the 1994 Decisions report (Zielinski 1996). The Task Force was separated into two teams, one on financing and one on availability. Each team was led by an archdiocesan staff member and included a working group—the Work Group on Financing for Catholic Schools and the Work Group on Planning for Catholic

Schools. The finance team received input from the Archdiocesan Finance Council and from other experts in finance. And the School Availability team received input from the Office of Catholic Education, the Office of Religious Education, the Office of Research and Planning, the Vicariate Administrative Consultant, the ACP, and Presbyteral Council representatives (Archdiocese of Chicago undated). A Coordinating Review Committee, composed primarily of university based people outside of the Archdiocese (either presidents of colleges or people who did research on education), was to identify gaps in Task Force findings.

The poor and people of color were underrepresented in this structure, and only one woman served on the finance committee (Interviews 1998). Presumably their input was to be gained through the Vicars' Review when vicars, local planning units or deanery leaders reviewed the working group plans. Their comments were given to the Coordinating Review Committee "for analysis and further consideration by the work groups, if necessary" (Archdiocese of Chicago 1997b). There was no process for the direct participation of the poor or people of color. They were to participate through their parish clusters, deaneries, and vicariates. Local level actors were wary that their comments and thoughts on the process would not be related to the Task Forces.

Instead of turning to the people who use these institutions and have a first hand knowledge of the communities, the Archdiocese relied on professionals within and outside of the Archdiocese. And these professionals conducted a study based primarily on quantitative data. One member of one of the task forces said "We spent almost a year working out what the process and procedure would be. We decided to use a comparative quantitative approach" (Interview August 1998). They looked at

variables that included school spending per child, ethnicity and race, financial cost per child, parish expenses for the schools, population age of children, projected enrollment, and class size. Consultants Arthur Andersen and McKinsey & Company provided demographic data and projections, compiled statistical data about the Archdiocese, and prepared marketing analyses for parochial schools (Interviews August 1998)(Archdiocese of Chicago 1997a).

This approach lacked qualitative data that community level research might have provided which resulted in inaccurate conclusions. For example, in a response to the Interim Task Force Report, Deanery E, which includes Pilsen, wrote that the Task Force's use of household income underestimates the level of poverty in poor Latino communities. Extended Latino families often live in one house and children often work, which makes household income levels look higher than they really are. Additionally, Latinos tend to have more children so the need in Latino communities is higher. Deanery E recommends that the Task Force should have used per capita income (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998).

The Task Force completed a preliminary report by the end of 1997 but did not release it to the public. They said that those schools that were in perilous positions and had the potential to be closed knew about it. An editorial in the *Daily Southtown* pointed out that while school administrators might have been aware of the plans, the public was not and closing schools in many of these communities would clearly have a public impact (Editorial 1997a).

Parishes, schools, priests, women religious, and the laity pressed the Archdiocese to

discuss the report with them and to incorporate the information that they could provide—the information that was not purely quantitative. This was a long fight, in some instances, to get the Archdiocese to meet with and work with community groups. The Pilsen cluster of parishes wrote their own report but the Task Force refused to meet with them explaining that if they met with them, they would have to meet with everyone (Interview 1999). After a priest, who has some power within the Archdiocese pressed the issue, the group was granted a meeting to discuss their issues.

The lack of qualitative research, combined with the Task Force's lack of significant Latino representation, resulted in their making some misjudgments about Latino communities. As the Deanery E group put it, in some cases the Task Force asked the wrong questions. In other cases they seem to have come to the wrong conclusions about Latinos. The most significant issue concerns school availability.

The Task Force suggests that Latinos do not value parochial schools. One Task Force member explained: "Our experience is that Hispanics don't make use of Catholic schools. It was not in their culture to attend private school. Our public schools were superior to Mexican schools. Wealthy send their kids to private schools" (Interview August 1998).¹⁷

When I repeated this statement to parish priests and a principal in Pilsen they were visibly frustrated. According to them, many Latinos come to the schools to register

¹⁷The final reports left open the door that there may be reasons why families choose not to send their children to school and marketing approaches hope to improve this but it is an easy thing to let slide when money is at stake.

their children but cannot afford it (Interviews 1999). Deanery E's response to the draft Report echoes this sentiment. "...all our principals turn away Hispanic families each year who simply lack the necessary funds for tuition" (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998, 4). The Archdiocese's solution is better marketing which the Deanery E group supports but they note that it may have a limited effect because of poverty.

The marketing effort thus far has been limited by the Archdiocese's lack of networking within the Latino community. The Archdiocese "organized a press conference to announce a media campaign to promote Catholic schools in the Hispanic and African American communities" but they did not invite Latino media to the event (Dahm 2001, 27). As a result of this incident and others like it, an archdiocesan staff member complained to archdiocesan officials and filed a complaint with the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Dahm 2001, 27).

Laity suggest that there are other limitations, such as a lack of bilingual teachers and a dominance of clerics who do not fully understand or appreciate Latino culture (Interviews 1998-1999). Deanery E faults the Task Force for short sightedness regarding this issue. The report supports the increased use of bilingual education but points out that the high cost of bilingual education would put already financially strapped schools out of business even more quickly (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998).

The Task Force also failed to emphasize the importance of meeting the needs of the poor. The original Decisions planning process and resulting report emphasized the preferential option for the poor. By failing to understand that open seats in Catholic schools may not reflect a lack of demand but rather a lack of financial means, the Task

Force has not addressed the problem of poverty nor has it sought solutions. As the Deanery E group points out, “‘Empty desks’ equals ‘too many schools’ is mistaken and misleading logic. Empty desks in an area such as ours which is overwhelmingly Catholic, means families lack the money necessary to afford Catholic schools” (Deanery E of Vicariate III 1998, 6).

The planning effort was already suspect in the eyes of laity and religious since previous planning efforts resulted in the closure of schools and parishes. D’Agostino points out that

After 1990, they often associated planning with a purely financial response to a financial problem and evinced little interest in the theological framework for planning and for a new postconciliar Catholic identity. This limited the success of planning in the 1990s (D’Agostino 2000, 278).

One pastor, who explained how the planning processes work, confirmed this: “Decisions to close parishes were absolutely financial and they take geography into account. In the end, it’s the Cardinal who makes decisions” (Interview with a pastor 1998).

ACCESSING DECISION-MAKING

The process by which the Archdiocese of Chicago has closed parishes and schools illustrates the lack of access that new immigrant groups—particularly people of color—

have to archdiocesan decision-making structures. An archdiocesan staff member was frustrated by the lack of involvement of people from communities. “If you’re really serious about dealing with Catholics in poor communities, we have people, tremendously committed people, then involve them. Instead we have the same garbage with the same old people. We are closed to learning” (Interview 1998). As recently as Fall 2000, the Archdiocese announced the creation of a Special Task Force on Catechesis, another part of the Decisions planning process. Only five out of eighty-one people appointed to eight Task Force working groups are Latino (Archdiocese of Chicago 2000).

According to the Archdiocese, its planning processes includes consultative elements. These are usually reviews in vicariates by planning groups, clusters, or another local grouping. Many parish priests criticize this process for not providing adequate opportunities to participate in the process. By conducting the consultation in this way, people at the community level are responding to reports that have been put together by the “expert” groups assembled by the Archdiocese. People in neighborhoods do not have the opportunity to participate in research, drafting reports, and making conclusions. They are only able to respond to these documents once they are completed. And the feedback, rather than going directly to these experts, is directed instead through the vicars.

The Pilsen cluster of parishes has repeatedly responded directly to the Archdiocese during planning efforts. They have strongly requested that they have a formal opportunity to participate. On a few occasions their persistence has paid off and they have discussed their issues and brought their community experience directly into the

process. But for the Archdiocese, this only happens when a local group is extremely well organized, has some access to the archdiocesan power structure, and is diligent.

Much of the frustration experienced by the laity and clerical leaders was not just that their parishes and schools were closed but that they believed there was a lack of a collegial process to determine what should be closed. This has been a constant frustration on the part of the laity. Laity often argue that they were not aware of the dire situation of their parish or school. School and archdiocesan officials are quick to state that people are well aware of their situations. However, parishioners from two different parishes took their case to the Vatican arguing that the Archdiocese violated parish closing procedures. One of the parishes won but the Archdiocese reviewed its process and closed the church again; the Vatican refused to re-hear the case (Herrmann 1994).

The Archdiocese closed St. Vitus parish in Pilsen, a small but historically important parish in that predominantly Mexican community. St. Vitus was the home of a worker-priest during the 1970s; it was closely connected with Chicago's Chicano movement. One of St. Vitus's former pastors reflects, "St. Vitus was a symbol of the movement there. It was vital but it was very poor. It was very strong when they closed it. We started Resurrection (The Resurrection Project) the same year and that helped to hold the community together" (Interview with parish priest, 1999).

Some have suggested that the way in which the parish was closed was disrespectful to the Latino community. Some of the problem lies in the way the Archdiocese handles decision-making. One priest noted that Cardinal Bernardin came when they opened

The Resurrection Project (TRP), a community development corporation created by, and with the support of the Catholic area parishes and parishioners, and said many wonderful things about St. Vitus and how it would be used as the home for TRP. As one priest related, “If Bernardin had said those same things years ago when St. Vitus was closed, it would have been so much better. People feel like they’re excluded from decision-making already and this amplifies it. It’s not like we’re equal partners” (Interview with parish priest 1999). In fact, community leaders and Pilsen area parishes negotiated with the Archdiocese for more than a year to purchase St. Vitus’ parish buildings. The Archdiocese originally wanted \$200,000 for the St. Vitus complex of buildings and after the community pressed, it eventually sold it to TRP for \$10 (Interviews 1997, 2000).

St. Martin de Porres

Despite the creation of decentralized structures to increase collegiality as suggested by Vatican II, laity and some priests are frustrated and feel left out of decision-making processes. The closure of St. Martin de Porres (250 East 111th Street) at the end of the 1996-1997 school year is an example. St. Martin de Porres was created from the consolidation of Mendel, Unity Catholic, and St. Willibrord in 1988. It was the only remaining Catholic high school on the south side that served predominantly African American students.

The Archdiocese gave parents three weeks to come up with a plan to save the school. Parents created an alternative plan, which the Archdiocese rejected as overly optimistic in fund-raising, enrollment, and the cost of rehabilitating buildings. Curiously, the public school system, one of many institutions interested in the site,

found that the school buildings were in good shape and the main school building would not require much in the way of rehabilitation (Britt 1997a; Editorial 1997b).

The Archdiocese reports that enrollment declined by 62 percent from 1987-1997 and tuition increased from 1,850 dollars to 3,600 dollars from 1988-1989 to 1996-1997 (still below the average tuition for Catholic high schools that was 4,500 dollars at that time). The announcement of the closure came after the Archdiocese spent three years examining the issue. According to the Archdiocese, they consulted with “school administrators, parents, faculty, education experts, business and community leaders, and the African-American consultant to the Office of Ethnic ministries” (Britt 1997b, 15).

This is not an unusual pattern. What is confusing is that the Archdiocese often reports that it has undergone extensive procedures before it closes schools and or parishes. But communities still seem as though they have had the rug pulled out from under their feet. The local newspaper quoted one parent as saying: “Many parents are angered that parents weren’t forewarned that the closing was a possibility so that they could have made other plans for next year. We have been meeting with the administration, and they have never said anything to us about financial problems” (Watters 1997, A8). When asked why the school didn’t advise parents about the possibility of its closure, the administration responded that “the school was reluctant to inform parents that closure was a possibility because such a warning likely would have resulted in a greater decline in enrollment” (Watters 1997, A8).

Between 1988 and 1998, the Archdiocese closed 68 elementary schools, 55 of which

were in the city of Chicago (Archdiocese of Chicago 1989; Archdiocese of Chicago Office Of Catholic Education 1998). The Archdiocese announced the closure of three more schools and the consolidation of four schools at the end of the 1999 school year (no author 1999). Harris found that the Great Lakes region had the second highest rate of school closures across the country following New England and the Mid East. The pattern of closure reflects the degree of urbanization in the area (Harris 1996, 107).

For many white Catholics, learning of the closure of their parish (read neighborhood) school and or parish brings on sad feelings. One priest noted, “Many people have an affection for the buildings” (Interview 1999). For new poor communities of color, school closures and high tuition costs are not just sentimental issues. They will likely make a difference in the opportunities that earlier white Catholic ethnics had in contrast to the opportunities that they have. The Church is a private institution, but its actions affect communities. The white ethnic groups that came during what I’ve described as the first immigrant Church ran their own schools and language and culture were transmitted through the schools. There are fewer opportunities for Latinos to do the same.

CONCLUSION

Despite the presence of consultative bodies and vicariates, archdiocesan planning processes have not sufficiently included poor people and people of color. As a result, these communities are not able to advance their concerns and do not participate fully in establishing archdiocesan priorities. As the report produced by the Task Forces illustrates, there is no significant effort placed on addressing the needs of the poor. If

people of color and people with low incomes were better represented, questions about how best to serve these communities might be addressed. Earlier white immigrant groups controlled their own resources and institutions. They identified their community needs and responded to them. To do the same, Latino communities have to access a centralized bureaucracy in which they have little representation.

VII. CONCLUSION

Catholic parishes have contributed to the development of social capital in new immigrant communities. At the end of the 1800s and the beginning of the 1900s, Catholic parishes structured neighborhood space. They were an important neighborhood center for immigrant groups that pulled together worship, social activities, education, and social services. And they helped to preserve immigrant identity, language, and culture. Some Latino parishes have been used in much the same way. Pilsen has been a predominantly Latino community for more than thirty years. Its Catholic parishes have adapted to the new population and many have openly welcomed Mexicans and Mexican Americans. The religious symbols and cultural religious practices of Mexican Catholicism are readily apparent and many of Pilsen's parishes and pastors actively engage in these practices and teach them to younger generations.

There is an important connection between religious practice and political awareness in Mexican Catholic worship. Religious worship, symbols, and various practices are often linked to the specific conditions parishioners face as often poor and working class Mexican and Mexican residents of Pilsen, in the city of Chicago. For example, there is political content in sermons, the *Via Crucis*, and in the Christian Base Communities.

Importantly, Pilsen's Catholic parishes have been engaged in addressing the physical

conditions of the neighborhood and in ensuring adequate social service provision and education. Jointly, they created The Resurrection Project (TRP) a community development corporation to address neighborhood issues. The parishes are in close contact with many of Pilsen's residents forming a network to access the grassroots. By working together they facilitate the development of social capital on an organizational and personal level. TRP is an extremely successful CDC, and the parishes have been very successful in bringing resources into the neighborhood from government and private philanthropy—in utilizing the “bridging” form of social capital.

ACCESSING ARCHDIOCESAN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

Despite the responsiveness of parishes like those in Pilsen, Latinos have had a much more difficult time accessing archdiocesan decision-making processes. Latinos make up at least 33 percent of the Chicago Archdiocese's members, but they have not been able to secure positions of power within the Archdiocese nor have they been equal partners in archdiocesan planning processes that determine priorities for resource allocation.

By the time Latinos immigrated and migrated in large numbers, they encountered a very different Church from the one encountered by earlier immigrant groups.

Immigrants no longer dominated the Church. Earlier immigrant groups moved into the middle class economically and physically into the suburbs and the demographics of the city had changed.

Latinos were the new immigrants in what had essentially become a middle-class white

institution. Church policy no longer supported the use of Catholic institutions such as the national parish that preserved the relationship between culture and language for new immigrant groups. Americanization was the reigning policy. And Church decision-making was centralized and dominated by white professionals. Latinos, unlike many of the earlier ethnic groups, could not control their Church resources locally. And they were confronted by what many have described as institutional racism. The Catholic Church for earlier immigrant groups was a haven against nativism. Latinos, in contrast, found that they were not eagerly welcomed in many Catholic parishes or into the institution of the Archdiocese, the Pastoral Center.

Structural Change: Centralization of Power and Authority

The Archdiocese of Chicago from the 1850s through the first few decades of the 20th century was highly decentralized. Immigrant groups controlled their own Church resources. During this period, immigrant groups “owned” their own Catholic institutions. In the first decades of the 20th century, Mundelein began the process of centralizing decision-making, and thus power and authority, which in effect took power away from neighborhoods and immigrant groups. This was not unlike the movements occurring in business in government at the turn of the century.

Catholic bishops, including Cardinal Mundelein, earned the label of brick and mortar priests because of the massive construction projects built during their tenures.

Centralizing issues like finance and approval for parish building processes became necessary with the vast number of building projects underway. It ensured a more efficient use of resources. And, importantly, Mundelein used this centralization to require parishes to invest in Catholic Bishops Bonds that he used to finance building

projects—effectively forcing one parish to lend to another.

Mundelein and other national Catholic leaders sought to decrease the ethnic character of the Church by reducing the individual power of ethnic groups and by pressuring Catholic immigrants to Americanize. Even though Mundelein created some national parishes, he established a goal of reducing the ethnic character of Chicago's Catholic Church. He dramatically reduced the number of new national parishes created.

English was required as the teaching language when he began the centralization of the parochial schools. And the centralization of charity associations made it difficult for ethnic groups to support their own charity organizations since some of the money they used to collect was now collected as archdiocesan taxes. The Americanization of the Church and the efforts to reduce immigrant control have made it difficult for new immigrant groups to maintain their languages and cultures.

At the same time Mundelein was centralizing control over resources and decision-making, the demographics of the city and its surrounding metropolitan area were beginning to change. As people moved out to the edges of the city and into the suburbs, the resources of the Church were stretched thinner beginning the process of weighing the needs of different groups and establishing what role the Church would play in a changing metropolitan area.

Lack of Effective Structures for Participation

The centralization of decision-making within the Church did not include formal structures to allow parishioners to participate in centralized decision-making. In part because of the vast size of the Archdiocese, which covers the city of Chicago,

suburban Cook County and all of Lake County, the Archdiocese was divided into administrative units called Vicariates, which are divided, into deaneries. However, the presence of a decentralized structure did not transfer power or authority, nor did it result in an effective tool to communicate between parishes and centralized decision-makers. In some cases the structure has effectively increased dialogue within communities but vicariate leaders have little power which has limited the effectiveness of vicariates.

In addition to the formal decentralized administrative structure, Vatican II supported the creation of collegial structures to involve religious and laity in the Church. In Chicago priests created a priests' senate and lay leaders created their own institutions and programs. However, just as the Vatican II changes were being implemented, Chicago's Archdiocese was led by Cardinal Cody who centralized power, authority, and decision-making in his own hands. Rather than involve others in establishing priorities, Cody believed that he alone had the most complete information and therefore could make the most informed decisions. This limited the power of the consultative bodies.

Cardinal Bernardin was more open to the participation of laity, entrepreneurs within the Church, and staff. However, he was committed to planning processes which often led to more planning processes with little outcome. A prime example is the issue of race. Rather than directly address the problem, the problem was studied by multiple task forces, which often lacked adequate representation of people of color.

Additionally, despite the encuentros and efforts by the Hispanic Caucus and others to

identify the presence of Latinos in the Chicago Archdiocese, to increase the representation of Latinos at the Pastoral Center, to minister to Latinos, and to generally improve the responsiveness of the Archdiocese to its growing Latino population, very little was done.

Lack of Latinos in Archdiocesan Positions of Power

Centralizing decision-making about Church finances, education, and social services potentially could have been used to significantly reallocate resources throughout the Archdiocese and to establish archdiocesan policies that responded to new immigrant groups, the needs of the city, and the poor. In short, the centralization could have been used by progressive leaders to make the Church more responsive to the needs of Latinos.

The Archdiocese has redistributed income and subsidized poor parishes and schools for decades. How this is decided and which parishes and schools benefit from the subsidies and which are closed and or consolidated is a somewhat closed process. And the issue has become more important because the financial crisis since the 1980s has meant a reduction in subsidies and the realization that the Archdiocese needs to close some of its inner city institutions. Planning was never an open participatory process. Cardinal Cody subsidized parishes and schools but kept the total amount of resources and the rationale for allocating them out of public review. Professional staff dominated planning processes during Bernardin's tenure.

Since planning decisions that allocate resources are conducted centrally, Latinos need to access that structure to influence decision-making. The Hispanic Caucus and

others have lobbied the Archdiocese to increase the representation of Latinos in key decision-making positions at the Pastoral Center. Unfortunately, even after they have been successful in getting a new office and or staff appointments, those appointed lacked power and authority and were often not consulted on issues which affected Latino communities.

Dolan describes the Catholic Church as a “two-tiered Church.” “Catholicism in the United States is divided into a white, suburban, middle-class Church and an urban, lower-class Church made up of people of color” (Dolan 1994, 453). This is an apt description of Chicago’s Catholic Church. And importantly, people from the lower-class Church have little contact with people from the white, suburban, middle-class Church. And the decision-makers in the Pastoral Center are largely from the white, suburban, middle-class Church.

There are cultural, language, class, and racial divides between those in decision-making positions and poor Latino communities. Archdiocesan decision-makers lack an understanding of Latino culture and few speak Spanish. Since there is already a divide between the archdiocesan decision-makers and communities, the lack of understanding Spanish and Latino cultures, widens the divide.

Immigrant groups who came at the end of the 1800s and beginning of the 1900s used their Catholic institutions to strengthen their communities through worship, service provision, and as a place to connect with one another and celebrate their language, culture, and traditions. Archdiocesan leaders do not place a premium on supporting the relationship between culture, religion, and language. They are reluctant to create

many programs that serve Latinos specifically. They do not want to create a Church within a Church. Many community leaders and those who have attempted to establish a Latino presence within the Archdiocesan bureaucracy suggest that they have faced institutional racism. And recently three employees established complaints within the Equal Opportunity Commission stating that they were discriminated against.

The lack of Latino decision-makers within the Archdiocese has been particularly important over the last fifteen years. In response to a financial crisis, which is attributed to changing demographics and the rising cost of schools and parishes, the Archdiocese embarked on a number of planning processes ostensibly to distribute resources equitably throughout the Archdiocese. Often the focus of the planning processes has been to determine which parishes and schools should be consolidated and or closed and which new ones should open. The planning processes are run centrally at the Pastoral Center level by professional staff and financial experts.

There are two implications for the lack of significant Latino representation in the decision-making structure. The first is that because archdiocesan planning efforts lack Latino representation and the representation of people who are poor, and archdiocesan planners and consultants do not have first hand day to day experience with these communities, they can unwittingly bias the findings. By creating planning processes that are rooted in quantitative data and analyses and lacking an understanding of Latinos and new immigrant communities, there are significant chances for not understanding the reality of what communities face.

The second is that Latinos do not have a place at the table in establishing how scarce

resources will be allocated. They cannot determine that they have too many parishes serving their communities or too few. And they cannot directly explain why they do or do not use Catholic schools, social services, or other religious institutions. White professional staffs who have direct experience with their own communities and a lack of experience with poor communities of color dominate these decisions.

Class

The division between decision-makers and communities is not only about ethnicity and race. It is also about class. Those left out of decision-making processes tend to be poor. And to complicate matters, Church resources need to be stretched to meet the growing parishes in wealthier communities while still providing for poor communities. This is a complicated task.

Wealthy parishes can afford to pay to up-keep their buildings, to provide schools, services, organizations, and extensive staff to cover the many ministries parishes now include. But poor parishes cannot afford the staff. They cannot afford to maintain their buildings, many of which are nearly a century old.

This is made all the more difficult by the lack of effective access for poor people to archdiocesan decision-making structures. And by the fact that Latinos do not have positions of power within the Archdiocese to make their needs known or to participate in determining how resources are allocated. The priorities of the white middle-class and of those who live in the suburbs are no doubt going to be different from poor people of color.

Tocqueville observed that the class make-up of Catholics was a significant factor in their adoption of political doctrines. Catholics were poor and thus were adamant that government is open and accessible to all otherwise they could not participate. He expected that if their economic position changed, their outlook would also change. As he noted, a change in financial condition would “induce them, even unconsciously, to adopt political doctrines which they would perhaps support with less zeal if they were rich and preponderant (Tocqueville 1945a, 301).

Perhaps we should not be surprised that the resources are focused where they are provided. If the suburbs bring in the resources then one would expect that resources like staff would be dedicated there. The Archdiocese has subsidized parishes and schools in poor communities of color for decades. However, it has not significantly included the populations who use these institutions in central decision-making processes that determine how resources are allocated.

Movement Politics

Actors within the Archdiocese have been responsive during different periods of time. During the Civil Rights era, leaders within the Church like Father Jack Egan and even some of the Archbishops like Cardinal Stritch actively attempted to engage Latinos. They funded and provided other types of support to the Industrial Areas Foundation to organize communities and to train Latinos as community leaders. Leaders within the Church participated in Civil Rights marches and fought discriminatory housing policy within the city. During the Chicano movement, parishes in Pilsen became important local institutions that residents used to meet to discussion community issues.

An alternative explanation for the Archdiocese's behavior is that with the decline in movement politics, the political culture of the city has changed. There isn't the time to support activist efforts in communities. The Church needs these external pushes to engage in social change activities. Without them, it lacks the leadership to get involved.

FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS AND COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION

Private philanthropy and government and those from the political right and left are supporting funding for religious institutions to revitalize urban neighborhoods and to deliver social services. Philanthropy and government both appear to assume that faith-based institutions are more responsive to poor urban communities of color, are closer to these communities and know them better since they are often located in neighborhoods, and are more accessible to these communities.

The findings of this research demonstrate clearly that in some cases, religious institutions may not be much different than other public and private institutions in the U.S. The Catholic Church in Chicago appears to be affected by the same issues that affect other institutions. The political culture of localities, issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and class are all prominent in the Archdiocese. The Archdiocese has marginalized poor people of color. And, importantly, the Archdiocese is much more insulated from institutional change than are public institutions. Latinos and those who serve Latino communities have been working unsuccessfully for decades to gain positions of power within the Archdiocese. And, since the Church is not a democracy, Catholics do not have the power to elect their religious leaders.

The findings of this research should press funders to take a more critical look at religious based initiatives. There is support for faith-based institutions to revitalize communities at exactly the time that the Archdiocese of Chicago is reducing its presence in the city of Chicago. It is closing and consolidating parishes and schools in precisely the types of neighborhoods that that faith-based proponents are hoping that they'll help to revitalize. Some religious institutions may not be capable of independently producing social change. Depending on religious institutions to act as mediating institutions between communities and the state is not productive if the religious institutions themselves are disengaged from particular communities.

Certainly religious institutions have the potential to reach into communities and to contribute to the development of social capital. This is evident in Pilsen. Parishes are even actively engaged in physically redeveloping the neighborhood. Funders should examine religious institutions to determine what their relationship is with the communities they are serving rather than presume they have a relationship. And they should understand the complex institutional structures of religious institutions like the Catholic Church. Again, the Church is not monolithic. Parishes may behave in one way and the institutional Church may behave in another. In funding faith-based efforts it is important that funders to encourage them to be more responsive to poor communities of color and to support social change.

Appendix A: Table of Research Methods

Research Design			
Objective	Unit(s) of Analysis	Method	Data and Source
<u>Phase I: Ethnic Groups and the Church</u>	Ethnic groups, neighborhoods, archdiocese	Documentary research, field interviews, and mapping	Documentary Research: Ethnic group historical studies, archdiocesan histories, neighborhood histories, local newspaper articles, and unpublished accounts of Church role in neighborhood Field Interviews: Historians and parish priests, archdiocesan staff members, Latino community leaders
Phase II. Archdiocesan Administrative Structure	archdiocese	Documentary research and field interviews	Documentary Research: Archdiocesan histories Field Interviews: Archdiocesan staff and parish priests
Phase III. Mexican and Puerto Rican Representation	archdiocese	Documentary and field research	Documentary Research: Written histories, archdiocesan planning documents, archdiocesan staff directories, histories of the Hispanic Caucus Field Research: Interviews with archdiocesan staff, parish priests, Hispanic Caucus, and community leaders
Phase IV. Planning for Resource Allocation	archdiocese	Documentary, telephone and field research, and mapping	Documentary Research: Historical studies on the structure of the archdiocese and decision-making, Decisions Planning Documents Field Research: Interviews with archdiocesan school staff, parish priests, Hispanic Caucus, women religious
Phase V. Church and Community	archdiocese and neighborhoods	Documentary, telephone and field research	Documentary Research: Histories on the Industrial Areas Foundation, Saul Alinsky, and the archdiocese. Field Research: Interviews with archdiocesan staff, United Power for Action and Justice leaders, community organizers, parish priests, community leaders/ parishioners

APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Sheila Adams
African-American Consultant
Ethnic Ministries Office
Archdiocese of Chicago,
August 3, 1998

Father Roger Boland
Director, Catholic Charities
August 5, 1998

Father Roger Coughlin
Former Research Director
Catholic Charities
July 9, 1997
October 16, 1997

Father Charles Dahm
Pastor, St. Pius V Parish
August 5, 1998
May 10, 1999

Sister Connie Driscoll
Executive Director
St. Martin de Porres
August 4, 1998

Monsignor Jack Egan
Assistant to the President for Community Affairs
DePaul University,
October 14, 1997

Father Jim Gartland
Pastor
St. Procopius Parish, Pilsen
July 29, 1998

Mary Heidkamp
Codirector of Peace and Justice Office
Archdiocese of Chicago
June 9, 1997
October 14, 1997
July 30, 1998

Father Don Headley

Pastor, Our Lady of Mercy
May 10, 1999

Father Juan Huitrado
Pastor, St. Romans Parish, Little Village
May 12, 1999

Father Mike Ivers, Pastor
St. Agatha Parish, Lawndale
July 28, 1998

Ed Kantowicz
Church Historian and researcher
July 31, 1998

Father Jim Kaczorowski
Pastor, St. Adalbert
May 10, 1999

Steve Kloehn
Religion Writer
Chicago Tribune
July 28, 1998

Jim Lago
Former Director, Catholic Charities
Former Executive Assistant to Archbishop
Former Director of Illinois State Catholic Conference
October 17, 1997
July 31, 1998

Tom Lenz
Great Cities Institute, UIC/
United Power for Action and Justice cochair
August 4, 1998

Lowell Livezey
Religion and Urban American Project
University of Illinois at Chicago

Jim Lund
Codirector
Peace and Justice Office
Archdiocese of Chicago
October 16, 1997

Bishop John Manz
May 10, 1999

Sister Judith Murphy, O.S.B.
Principal
Cristo Rey Jesuit High School
August 7, 1998

Connie O'Brien
Research and Planning
Archdiocese of Chicago
October 17, 1997

Jesus Zeferino Ochoa
Director
Immigration and Naturalization Program
and Refugee Resettlement Services
Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago
August 6, 1998

Sister Corinne Raven
High Schools
Office of Catholic Education
Archdiocese of Chicago
August 3, 1998

Jim Rojak
Finance
Archdiocese of Chicago
July 30, 1998
May 12, 1999

Father Charles Ruby
Catholic Charities
May 11, 1999

Dominic Pacyga
Liberal Education Department
Columbia College, Chicago
May 13th, 1999

David Schwartz
Research and Planning
Archdiocese of Chicago
July 18, 1997
April 29, 1999

Sister Josephine Sferella
Data/Research Consultant
Office of Catholic Education
Archdiocese of Chicago
October 26, 1997

August 3, 1998

Judith Siekis
Executive Director
Big Shoulders Fund
August 4, 1998

Ellen Skerrett
Historian
May 12, 1999

Father Esequiel Sanchez
Director
Ethnic Ministries, Archdiocese of Chicago
May 5, 1999

Jack Traynor
Director
Archives, Archdiocese of Chicago
May 11, 1999

Carmen Velazquez
Director
Alivio Medical Center
August 5, 1998

Steve Warner
Sociology
University of Illinois at Chicago
May 11, 1999

Judith Winn
Schools Task Force
Office of Catholic Education
Archdiocese of Chicago
August 4, 1998

Sister Dominga Zapata
Ethnic Ministries Office
Archdiocese of Chicago
July 30, 1998

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1997. *American Behavioral Scientist* 40 (5).
1998. New Hispanic Ministry Director. *The New World*, September 13, 9.
- 2000a. Cristo Rey Celebrates New Day at New Building: Campus Expansion Makes Room for Growth. *The Catholic New World*, January 30-February 5, 17.
- 2000b. Parishes Show Better Bottom Line but Still have a Deficit, Report Says. *The Catholic New World*, January 30-February 5, 6,14.
- Abbott, Edith. reprint 1970. *The Tenements of Chicago 1908-1935*. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.
- Acuna, Rudolfo. 1996. *Anything But Mexican*. Verso: Los Angeles.
- Alexander, Dan, and Salvador Cervantes. 1999. Block Clubs Close Down Building. *El Mensajero De San Pio V*, May, 7.
- Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 1997. *Congregation and Community*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Anderson, Hilary. 1999. Archdiocese Considering Charter Schools Option. *The New World*, January 24, 19.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. *Diamond Jubilee*. Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1989. *Catholic Schools*. Chicago: Author.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1993. *Decisions for the Future of Our Church: Proposed Decisions and Actions on Two Priority Issues, Evangelization and Education, Ministerial Leadership*. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1994a. *Archdiocesan Strategic Planning Process*. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1994b. *DECISIONS: Implementation Plan*. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1997a. *DECISIONS*. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 1997b. *DECISIONS: Special Task Force on Catholic Schools*. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Archdiocese of Chicago. 2000. *DECISIONS: The Special Task Force on Catechesis*.

Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.

Archdiocese of Chicago. undated. Special Task Force on Catholic Schools. Chicago: Author.

Archdiocese of Chicago Office Of Catholic Education. 1998. Shareholders Report. Chicago: Author.

Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Catholic Education. undated. Big Shoulders Criteria. Chicago: Author.

Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Research and Planning. 1997. Data on the Organization, Resources and Activities of the Archdiocese of Chicago: Facts and Figures for Year Ending 1996. Chicago: Author.

Archdiocese Pastoral Center. 2000. *Official Directory of the Archdiocese of Chicago, 2000*. Chicago: Author.

Arroyo, Antonio Stevens, ed. 1980. *Prophets Denied Honor*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Avella, Steven. 1992. *This Confident Church: Catholic Leadership and Life in Chicago, 1940-1965*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Badillo, David. 1994. The Catholic Church and the Making of Mexican-American Parish Communities in the Midwest. In *Mexican-Americans and the Catholic Church, 1900-1965*, edited by J. P. D. a. G. Hinojosa. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Baum, Gregory, and Jean-Guy Vaillancourt. 1991. The Church and Modernization. In *Religion and the Social Order*, edited by H. R. Ebaugh. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Belluck, Pam. 1999. Catholics Try to Reseed St. Louis With \$5,000 Offer. *The New York Times*, January 26, A10.

Berger, P., and R. Neuhaus. 1977. *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Bishops of Illinois. 2000. A Pastoral Letter from the Bishops of Illinois. *The Catholic New World*, April 9-15, 1a-3a.

Britt, Bill. 1997a. 3 Catholic Schools Close Their Doors. *The Catholic New World*, May 23, 2.

Britt, Bill. 1997b. St. Martin de Porres to Close. *The Catholic New World*, April 11, 15.

Bryk, Anthony, Valier Lee, and Peter Holland. 1993. *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Casuso, Jorge, and Eduardo Camacho. 1995. Latino Chicago. In *Ethnic Chicago: A Multicultural Portrait*, edited by M. Holli and P. d. A. Jones. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Chicago Fact Book Consortium, ed. 1980. *Local Community Fact Book*. Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Cisneros, Henry. 1996. Higher Ground: Faith Communities and Community Building. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Coleman, James. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (S):95-120.
- Coughlin, Roger, and Cathryn Riplinger. 1983. The Story of Charitable Care in the Archdiocese of Chicago 1844-1959. Chicago: The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Cox, Harvey. 1965. *The Secular City: A Celebration of its Liberties and an Invitation to Its Discipline*. New York: Macmillan.
- D'Agostino, Peter R. 2000. Catholic Planning for a Multicultural Metropolis, 1982-1996. In *Public Religion and Urban Transformation*, edited by L. W. Livezey. New York: New York University Press.
- Dahm, Charles. 1981. *Power and Authority in the Catholic Church: Cardinal Cody in Chicago*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Dahm, Charles. 1990. Working Paper: A Brief Analysis of Some Historical Developments in Hispanic Ministry in the Archdiocese of Chicago. Chicago.
- Dahm, Charles. 1996. History of the Resurrection Project (draft).
- Dahm, Charles. 2001. A History of Hispanic Ministry in the Archdiocese of Chicago. Chicago.
- Dahm, Chuck. 1997. St. Pius Joins United Power for Action and Justice. *El Mensajero De San Pio V* 3 (3):7.
- Dahm, Chuck. 1999. People Walk With Jesus. *El Mensajero De San Pio V*, May, 10.
- D'Antonio, William. 1995. Small Faith Communities in the Roman Catholic Church: New Family Approaches to Religion, Work, and Family. In *Work, Family, and Religion in Contemporary Society*, edited by N. T. Ammerman and W. C. Roof. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, Mike. 1990. *City of Quartz*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Deanery E of Vicariate III. 1998. Response of Deanery E of Vicariate III to the Interim

Report for Review of the Special Task Force on Catholic Schools of Fall 1997. Chicago.

Diaz-Stevens, Ana Maria. 1993. *Oxcart Catholicism on Fifth Avenue: The Impact of the Puerto Rican Migration upon the Archdiocese of New York*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Diaz-Stevens, Ana Maria, and Anthony Stevens-Arroyo. 1998. *Recognizing The Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Dolan, Jay. 1975. *The Immigrant Church: New York's Irish and German Catholics, 1815-1865*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dolan, Jay. 1992. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Dolan, Jay P. 1994. Conclusions. In *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the U.S.: Issues and Concerns*, edited by J. P. Dolan and A. F. Deck. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose. 1991. Vatican II and the Reconceptualization of the Church. In *Religion and the Social Order*, edited by H. R. Ebaugh. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Editorial. 1997a. Report Should be Open: Archdiocese's Plans Could Affect Many. *Daily Southtown*, December 14, 16.

Editorial. 1997b. Rescuing St. Martin's: Archdiocese Rejects Plan to Save High School. *Daily Southtown*, May 17, A6.

Ellis, John. 1969. *American Catholicism*. 2 ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ellison, Christopher, and Linda George. 1994. Religious Involvement, Social Ties, and Social Support in a Southwestern Community. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33 (1):46-61.

Falsani, Cathleen. 2001. Discrimination in the Church? *Chicago Sun-Times*, February 5, 6.

Farrell, James T. 1932 (reissue 1993). *Studs Lonigan: A Trilogy Comprising Young Lonigan, The Young Manhood of Studs Lonigan, and Judgment Day*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Felter, Eunice. 1941. The Social Adaptations of the Mexican Churches in the Chicago Area. Master's Thesis, The University of Chicago, Chicago.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph. 1988. The Hispanic Poor in a Middle-Class Church. *America* 159 (1):11-13.

Foley, Michael. 1997. Welcoming the Stranger: The Catholic Church and the New

Immigrants. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, Life Cycle Institute.

Frisbie, Margery. 1991. *An Alley in Chicago: The Ministry of a City Priest*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward.

Funchion, Michael. 1987. The Political and Nationalist Dimensions. In *The Irish in Chicago*, edited by L. McCaffrey, E. Skerrett, M. Funchion and C. Fanning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Gamm, Gerald. 1999. *Urban Exodus: Why the Jews Left Boston and the Catholics Stayed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gannon, Thomas, and David Schwartz. 1992. Church Finances in Crisis. *Social Compass* 39 (1):111-120.

Gaspar, Michele. 1974. Race and Catholic Schools: More Mixed Than Public; Strong in Inner City. *The Chicago Reporter* 3 (3):1-7.

Gittell, Marilyn, Kathe Newman, Janice Bockmeyer, and Robert Lindsay. 1998a. Expanding Community Participation: The Federal Urban Empowerment Zones. *Urban Affairs Review* 33 (4):530-558.

Gittell, Marilyn, Kathe Newman, John Flateau, Gibbs Knotts, and Sarah Gardner. 1998b. Empowerment Zone Implementation: Community Participation and Community Capacity. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York.

Gittell, Marilyn, Kathe Newman, Isolda Ortega-Bustamante, and Francois Pierre-Louis. 1999. The Politics of Community Development: CDCs and Social Capital. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York.

Gittell, Ross, and Avis Vidal. 1998. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Gleason, Philip. 1987. *Keeping the Faith: American Catholicism Past and Present*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Gleason, Philip. 1992. *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth-Century America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gluckman, Max. 1967. *The Judicial Process among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia*. Vol. 2. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gosnell, Harold. 1969 c1937. *Machine Politics: Chicago Model*. New York: AMS Press.

Granovetter, Mark. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *The American Journal of*

Sociology 78 (May):1360-1380.

Greeley, Andrew. 1977. *The American Catholic: A Social Portrait*. New York: Basic Books.

Greeley, Andrew. 1987. The Fall of An Archdiocese. *Chicago*:128-, 130-131, 191, 192.

Greeley, Andrew, and Peter Rossi. 1966. *The Education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Guterbock, Thomas. 1980. *Machine Politics in Transition: Party and Community in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harris, Joseph Claude. 1996. *The Cost of Catholic Parishes and Schools*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward.

Harris, Joseph Claude, and Cornelius Riordan. 1997. Catholic Education: For Those Who Can Afford it or Those Who Need It? *National Catholic Reporter*, October 10.

Hays, Samuel. 1992 (1964c). The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era. In *Enduring Tensions in Urban Politics*, edited by D. Judd and P. Kantor. New York: Macmillon.

Headley, Don. not dated. Chicago History of the Catholic Church in the Hispanic Community. Chicago: Our Lady of Mercy Parish.

Headley, Father Don. no date. The Latino Church Community, Gospel inculturation and the Archdiocese of Chicago. A slight record of its philosophy and general history from 1950 to 1997. Chicago.

Herberg, Will. 1960c, 1983. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herrmann, Andrew. 1994. Vatican OKs Parish Closing. *Chicago Sun-Times*, September 21, 22.

Hurtig, Janise D. 2000. Hispanic Immigrant Churches and the Construction of Ethnicity. In *Public Religion and Urban Transformation*, edited by L. Livezey. New York: New York University Press.

Imbroscio, David. 1997. *Reconstructing City Politics: Alternative Economic Development and Urban Regimes*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Interview with Judith Silekis. August 4, 1998. Executive Director, Big Shoulders Fund.

Jablonsky, Thomas. 1993. *Pride in the Jungle: Community and Everyday Life in Back of the Yards Chicago*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Johnston, Robert. 1987. Parish planning, evaluation criteria issued. *The Chicago Catholic* 96 (6):1.
- Jones, Anita Edgar. 1928. Conditions Surrounding Mexicans in Chicago. PhD, The University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Kantowicz, Edward. 1983. *Corporation Sole: Cardinal Mundelein and Chicago Catholicism*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Kantowicz, Edward. 1995. The Ethnic Church. In *Ethnic Chicago: A Multicultural Portrait*, edited by M. Holly and P. d. A. Jones. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Katznelson, Ira. 1981. *City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kelliher, Thomas. 1993. Mexican Catholics and Chicago's Parishes, 1955-1976. In *Working Paper Series*.
- Kelly, Kevin. 1991. Chicago's Catholic Church: Putting It's House in Order. *Business Week*, June 10, 60-1.
- Kerr, Louise Ano Nuevo. 1976. The Chicano Experience in Chicago: 1920-1970. PhD, History, University of Illinois, Chicago.
- Kloehn, Steve. 1997. Archdiocese's New Boss Faces Shortage of Priests, Race and School Woes. *Chicago Tribune*, April 9, 20.
- Koenig, Harry, ed. 1980. *A History of the Parishes of the Archdiocese of Chicago*. II vols. Vol. I. Chicago: The Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Koenig, Harry, ed. 1981. *A History of the Offices, Agencies, and Institutions of the Archdiocese of Chicago*. Vol. 1. Chicago: The Archdiocese of Chicago.
- Kornblum, William. 1974. *Blue Collar Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurien, Prema. 1998. Becoming American by Becoming Hindu: Indian Americans Take Their Place a the Multicultural Table. In *Gatherings in Diaspora: Religious Communities and the New Immigration*, edited by R. S. W. a. J. G. Wittner. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lawrence, Curtis. 1997. Priest Quits Race Task Force, Says Effort Came Up Short. *Chicago Sun-Times*, December 14, 23.
- Lawrence, Stewart. 1998. Religion and Immigration in the Contemporary United States: A Bibliographic Essay: Stewart Lawrence.
- Lehmann, Daniel. 1987. Catholics Await Cardinal's Plan on Troubled Parishes.

Chicago Sun-Times, February 12, 48.

Levine, Edward. 1966. *The Irish and Irish Politicians*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Livezey, Lowell, ed. 2000. *Public Religion and Urban Transformation*. New York: New York University Press.

Lowe, Frederick. 2000. Tuition Tax Credit Takes Effect. *The Catholic New World*, January 30-February 5, 19.

Maloney, Thomas. 1994. "Making Room": The Role of the Catholic Church in Fostering Political Participation Among Hispanic Immigrants in Los Angeles. Paper read at The Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1-4, at New York.

March, James, and Johan Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press.

McGoldrick, Joseph. 1960. Book Review. Governing New York City: American Political Science Review.

McGreevy, John. 1996. *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McMahon, Eileen. 1995. *What Parish are You From?: A Chicago Irish Community and Race Relations*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Morris, Charles. 1997. *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church*. New York: Random House.

National Catholic Educational Association. 1998. United States Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools 1997-98. The Annual Statistical Report on Schools, Enrollment and Staffing. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

Nelli, Humbert. 1970. *Italians in Chicago 1880-1930*. New York: Oxford University Press.

no author. 1999. Schools closing, consolidating; tax credit bill gains in Capital. *The New World*, March 28, 4.

Office of Catholic Education Archdiocese of Chicago. 1994. Strategic Plan 2000. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago.

Office of the Archbishop Archdiocese of Chicago. 1991. Letter to people working in Hispanic Ministry.

Olson, James. 1987. *Catholic Immigrants in America*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

- Pacyga, Dominic. 1998. Progressive Era Reform, Public Space, and Chicago's Working-Class Polonia, 1865-1930. In *Ethnicity. Culture. City: Polish-Americans in the USA. Cultural Aspects of Urban Life, 1870-1950 in Comparative Perspective*, edited by T. Gladsky, A. Walaszek and M. M. Wawrykiewicz. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Padilla, Felix. 1987. *Puerto Rican Chicago*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Perella, Frederick. 1996. Roman Catholic Approaches to Urban Ministry, 1945-85. In *Churches, Cities, and Human Community: Urban Ministry in the United States 1945-1985*, edited by C. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Prendergast, William. 1999. *The Catholic Voter in American Politics: The Passing of the Democratic Monolith*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ramsay, Meredith. 1998. Redeeming the City: Exploring the Relationship Between Church and Metropolis. *Urban Affairs Review* 33 (5):595-626.
- Reichley, James. 1985. *Religion in American Public Life*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Reilly, Megan. 1998. People Living Community. *El Mensajero De San Pio V* IV (1):4.
- Salamon, Lester. 1992. *America's Nonprofit Sector*: The Foundation Center.
- Sanchez, Esequiel. 1999a. Change in the Air for Hispanic Catholics. *The New World*, January 31, 16.
- Sanchez, Esequiel. 1999b. Hispanics Need to Feel Like Owners, Not Just Tenants in the Church. *The New World*, March 7, 8.
- Sanders, James. 1977. *The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholics in Chicago, 1833-1965*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sandoval, Moises. 1994. The Organization of a Hispanic Church. In *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the U.S.: Issues and Concerns*, edited by J. P. Dolan and A. F. Deck. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Schafer, Marvin. 1929. *The Catholic Church in Chicago, Its Growth and Administration*. PhD, Christian Theology and Ethics, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Scheie, David, and et al. 1991. *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development: Findings from Year One of the Lilly Endowment Program*. Indianapolis: Lilly Endowment.

Schlumpf, Heidi. 1996. Cardinal Promotes Parish Sharing. *The Catholic New World*, June 28/July 5, 6.

Sclair, Helen. 1995. Ethnic Cemeteries: Underground Rites. In *Ethnic Chicago: A Multicultural Portrait*, edited by M. Holly and P. D. A. Jones. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Skerrett, Ellen. 1987. The Catholic Dimension. In *The Irish in Chicago*, edited by L. McCaffrey, E. Skerrett, M. Funchion and C. Fanning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Skerrett, Ellen. 1993. Sacred Space: Parish and Neighborhood in Chicago. In *Catholicism, Chicago Style*, edited by E. Skerrett, E. Kantowicz and S. Avella. Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Skerrett, Ellen, Edward Kantowicz, and Steven Avella. 1993. *Catholicism, Chicago Style*. Chicago: Loyola University Press.

Smidt, Corwin. 1998. Religion and Social Capital in the United States and Canada. Paper read at American Political Science Association Conference, September 3-6, at Boston.

Stahel, Thomas. 1991. An Interview with Cardinal Joseph L. Bernardin. *America* 164 (22, June 8):613-621.

Stark, Robert. 1981. Religious Ritual and Class Formation: The Story of Pilsen, St. Vitus Parish, and the 1977 Via Crucis. PhD Dissertation, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Stevens-Arroyo, Anthony. 1994. The Emergence of a Social Identity among Latino Catholics. In *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the U.S.: Issues and Concerns*, edited by J. Dolan and A. F. Deck. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Stoker, Gerry. 1997. Governance as Theory: Five Propositions. Paper read at Paper Presented at Urban Affairs Association Conference, April 16-18, at Toronto, Canada.

Suttles, Gerald. 1968. *The Social Order of the Slum: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Taller de Estudios Comunitarios. Rudy Lozano: His Life, His People.

Tangney, Mary Catherine. 1935. The Development of Catholic Institutions in Chicago During the Incumbencies of Bishop Quarter and Bishop Van De Velde 1844-1853. MA, Loyola University, Chicago.

The Big Shoulders Fund. 1998a. Big Shoulders Schools Eleven Year Statistical Summary. Chicago: Author.

The Big Shoulders Fund. 1998b. School Year 1997 Distribution Final. Chicago: Author.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago. 1998a. 1998 Annual Report: Working Miracles in Our Neighborhoods. Chicago: Author.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago. 1998b. Archdiocese of Chicago 178 Different Service Programs, 156 Sites. Chicago: Author.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago. 1999. 1999 Annual Report: Working Miracles in Our Neighborhoods. Chicago: Author.

The Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago. no date. Overview of Catholic Charities. Chicago: Author.

Thomas, June Manning, and Jr. Reynard N. Blake. 1996. Faith-based Community Development and African American Neighborhoods. Lawrence: University of Press of Kansas.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1945a. *Democracy in America*. 1990 ed. Vol. 1. New York: Vintage Books.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1945b. *Democracy in America*. 1990 ed. Vol. 2. New York: Vintage Books.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1990.

Vasquez, Susana. 2000. This Community Didn't Run From Its Problems. *Hispanic Link Weekly Report* (June 5):4.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walch, Timothy. 1988. *The Diverse Origins of American Catholic Education: Chicago, Milwaukee, and the Nation*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Wald, Kenneth. 1997. *Religion and Politics in the United States*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Warner, R. Stephen. 2000. Epilogue. In *Public Religion and Urban Transformation*, edited by L. Livezey. New York: New York University Press.

Warner, R. Stephen, and Judith G. Wittner. 1998. *Gatherings in Diaspora: Religious Communities and the New Immigration*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Watters, Brent. 1997. Planned closing Shocks St. Martin de Porres. *Daily Southtown*, April 11, A8.

Weber, Max. 1946c. The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism. In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Raymond. 1988. *Religions of Immigrants from India and Pakistan: New Threads in the American Tapestry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, Richard. 1997. Social Capital and Political Culture: God Meets Politics in the Inner City. *American Behavioral Scientist* 40 (5):595-605.

Wood, Richard L. no date. Faith and Power. Paper read at COMM-ORG The On-Line Conference on Community Organizing and Community Development.

Yin, Robert. 1989. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Zahrobsky, Mary Lydia. 1924. The Slovaks in Chicago. Master's, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Zielinski, Graeme. 1996. Task Force to Plan Catholic Schools' Future. *Chicago Tribune*, October 9, 5, section 2.

Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren. 1929. *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.