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Abstract

This history of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary (1941 – 2000), frequently called Banyo, discusses the preparatory training of Catholic priests. In the strict rule-regulated regime of 1941 – 1964, priests trained in a monastic setting for a traditionally cultic role based on the celebration of the Eucharist. In the years 1965 – 2000, following the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965), Banyo reoriented its training to preparing priests as presbyters or ministers, emphasising their roles in the proclamation of God’s word and a ministry of service as well as presiding at Eucharistic gatherings. This thesis shows how Erving Goffman’s construct of a ‘total institution,’ pervaded the monastic structure of the preparation of priests through the seminary system in the 1941 – 1964 period; it then examines the attempts to modify seminary training for preparing presbyters, an adaptation that destabilised but did not destroy the ‘total institution’ character of the seminary.

During changing times before Vatican II, the ability of a restrictive seminary system to provide appropriate preparation for cultic priests in the conditions of the local church was questioned. After Vatican II, attempts were made to develop an effective preparation program for the emergent model of presbyter as priest, prophet, and servant leader for the Queensland Church. When the new training program emerged, only a few students benefited.
This research focuses on how students, in the recollection of their seminary experiences, evaluated Banyo’s spiritual and personal formation, theological education, and preparation for sacramental celebration and pastoral ministries. This information was collected through interviews of former students of Banyo from 1941 to 2000 and supplemented with interviews of priest-lecturers, including rectors, who had been former students, as well as through other oral and documented sources.

While originally the isolated and regulated monastic seminary life with its ‘total institution’ structure only partly prepared students for the life and work of priests, later efforts to relax this isolated and regulated life and to facilitate closer contact with social and Church life encountered difficulties that became obstacles to the development of more appropriate seminary training. An effective preparation for priestly celibacy was a notable shortcoming in those 60 years.

This research provides information for understanding students’ experience of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, one of the most influential and prestigious religious institutions in Queensland. More specifically, the dissertation assists in comprehending their experiences of the institutional life of the seminary and of those who directed the seminary.
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Preface

In seeking sources to support my research I was fortunate to discover *The Boys from Banyo*, compiled by Merle Norris. It consisted of a brief biographical index and a pastoral profile of each priest who had studied at the Pius XII Provincial Seminary. The life of the institution that bore this name had come to an end during the final weeks of 2000 when the Queensland Bishops divided the seminary into two sections, the Holy Spirit Seminary and St Paul’s Theological College. Thus the life of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary had come to an end and Merle Norris had provided a summary overview of its 60 years’ history.

From *The Boys from Banyo* I discovered that between 1948 and 2000 there had been over 400 ordinations. I was also able to establish from her data that during those years more than 100 Banyo priests had left official ministry.

Another important statistic that came to light through other documents was that during those sixty years over 800 students had enrolled at the Banyo seminary. Those numbers suggested an interesting area of study, particularly since I had been a student there and one of their ordinands who later resigned from the practice of the presbyteral ministry.

My supervisor and I agreed that an oral and social history of the seminary, based on the recollections and reflection of those who had been students there
during those 60 years, would be a rewarding approach for this topic. On the basis of a proposal developed with this in mind I was accepted as a doctoral candidate at the University of Southern Queensland. The research entailed interviewing former students to develop, as far as was possible, a comprehensive history of the seminary. Later I decided to include in my gathering of information interviews with a small number of former students appointed to the Banyo staff as lecturers and rectors. I also interviewed a small number of religious sisters who also had been on the Banyo staff in the years following the Second Vatican Council.

At the outset I wrote to the five Queensland Bishops to inform them of my project with a request to interview them to discuss the project further and to ask them for access to their diocesan archives for resources. Their responses were rather negative. One bishop did not respond to my letter; two others denied me any access to their archives, one of them telling me that from what I had previously written about church issues I had been too critical. The two others were supportive, if not enthusiastic, about what I was doing.

The basic tasks of arranging and conducting interviews with former students were enjoyable and rewarding. For personal and private reasons not all of those I contacted agreed to be interviewed, something I expected. I was pleasantly surprised by some who welcomingly accepted my request when I had wondered whether they would be willing to be involved. Originally I set
out with the intention of interviewing two former students from every class. For the periods immediately before and after Vatican II, I was substantially able to do this. The ‘Cleary years’ posed a problem as many of those early students had died. The last twenty years were also a problem as so many had left the seminary or the priesthood and moved interstate and overseas. However, I did interview a sufficient number to be able to constitute what I consider to be a continuous and cohesive story of Banyo.

I was encouraged by the positive reaction of those I interviewed. Many told me that they were pleased that someone was prepared to write a history of the seminary, something they had hoped would happen. Others told me how pleased they were to have the opportunity to tell their side of the story, something they felt had been sadly lacking in the whole process of seminary training. They were open and frank with me and often we went down paths that originally I had no intention of exploring.

Most stories recalled happy times at Banyo but for many those happy times were interspersed with hurts. They went to the seminary with lots of enthusiasm but found that they needed a large capacity of tolerance to accept the rigidity of the regime and alienating character of many features of the seminary rules. They had been buoyed in their journey to the priesthood by the spirit of camaraderie that existed among them and the consequent fun this generated even though their antics, at times, were immature and irresponsible.
As a student prior to the Second Vatican Council, I was an insider investigating the seminary lifestyle inherited from the Council of Trent. As I had no experience and little contact with seminary life in the years following Vatican II, I believed I could act as an outsider. Yet, in my research, I found myself continually bringing my own seminary experiences to bear on what I was learning about the ‘new seminary’ after Banyo had changed. While I have taken pains to be as objective as possible in what I have written I accept that as a researcher and an author I could not entirely divorce myself from my own biases. Therefore I take responsibility for what I have written in the hope that the points of view I have expressed will contribute to any discussions that eventuate from this study.

In places I have included information that may seem irrelevant to the thesis and extraneous to its development. This has been included to try to convey a reflection of the life at Banyo, particularly among the students. I have also allowed myself the liberty of using the informal names students gave to rectors and other staff members at the seminary. This also was part of the life there and I thought that this would help the reader to appreciate better the manner in which students interacted during their seminary years.

As I compiled this history of Banyo I often thought that what I was putting together is no more than a beginning. Now that I have finished it I am more
convinced of this. Many features of the Banyo story have the potential for further investigation and are worth pursuing.

The fruits of such investigations could provide useful insights into all features of seminary training and, consequently, the shaping of seminaries and the priesthood in the future. Those who experienced seminary life in its various stages before and after Vatican II are in an advantageous position to investigate any aspects of seminary life that appeal to them. Those investigations could reveal vital information about seminary practices of the past and have a positive impact on the future preparation for the priesthood.

Jim Madden
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Chapter I  Introduction to a Seminary Banyo

Seminary and Its Problem

Students for the Catholic priesthood became familiar with two Latin textbook phrases: *opera ad intra* and *opera ad extra*. Roughly translated these mean the workings or activities (*opera*) within (*ad intra*) and the activities without (*ad extra*). Applied to the institution of a seminary, they can be used for an approach to the study of its internal activities and its activities in relation to its environment. This thesis focuses on the internal activities or the internal ‘life’ of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Queensland, which trained students of this state for the diocesan priesthood. Attention was given to the internal activities (*opera ad intra*) of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary during its first 25 years when it was set in isolation, separated from the general activities of the Church and from the secular world. In its last 35 years when it tried to reach out to the local church and the secular world the focus remains on its inner life, specifically, on how, internally, it attempted to break out of its isolation and the results of those efforts. The objective of this study is not the impact of a changing world that stimulated changes at Banyo but Banyo’s reaction to that impact. The core of this thesis then is on what happened at Banyo in response to the world’s challenge to change, a challenge channelled by the Church through the Second Vatican Council (Vatican II). It is concerned with what happened in the inner life of Banyo in response to the call for change issued by Vatican II.

The inner activities of the 60 years of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Queensland (1941 – 2000), referred to as ‘Banyo’ in what follows, are contrastingy divided by the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965). During its first stage from its opening in
1941 to the end of Vatican II in 1965, trailing off in the years to 1970, Banyo, with a monastic style regime, experienced relative stability. The second stage, beginning in 1965 and continuing to 2000, was characterised by radical changes and instability leading almost to a complete breakdown of the seminary system. It is the paradoxical contrast in character that emerged between these two stages, which is central to this investigation.

As the setting of their preparation for the priesthood, students of the earlier stage experienced a strict, rule-regulated monastic regime, successively directed by two autocratic rectors. The preparation undertaken within these surroundings included formation through an inapt spirituality program; sporadic, questionably relevant, human development activities; education through theological, philosophical, scriptural and other programs that were inadequate, outdated, and, pedagogically, poorly presented; and a minimum of training in pastoral and liturgical skills needed for their future parish ministry. In spite of its inadequacies during those years, Banyo attracted a high number of students and retained a high proportion of them up to ordination time to provide enough priests for the Church in Queensland to cope with its growing needs.

For students of that time ‘being a priest’ principally meant a cultic person offering worship as a celebrant of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The priest was a man of God set apart from the world to offer, as the representative of Jesus Christ, worship on behalf of his people which the French Dominican, Jean Baptiste Lacordaire (1802 – 1861), thus epitomised:
To live in the midst of the world without wishing its pleasures; to be a member of each family, yet belonging to none; to share all sufferings; to penetrate all secrets; to heal all wounds; to go from men to God and offer Him their prayers; to return from God to men to bring pardon and hope; to have a heart of fire for charity and a heart of bronze for chastity; to teach and to pardon; console and bless always. My God, what a life! And it is yours, O Priest of Jesus Christ!¹

Seminarians quickly familiarized themselves with these words that became a rationale for the seminary’s isolated monastic lifestyle. They accepted the seminary as the necessary preparation for a priest whom the Church expected to live an eremitical life of prayer and ascetical practices in a parish as a man of God and as a man apart. It was a means to an end even if this official vision of ‘the end’ was considered as an unreal expectation.

Through exact obedience to the seminary rule as interpreted by the rector, a seminarian was expected to learn that humble submission to his religious superiors was, for him, the will of God. He learnt that while his principal task was to gather his people in the parish church to offer the sacrifice of the Mass this task included and extended to making Christ’s sacraments available to them. He learnt too that his supplementary roles were instructing parishioners of all ages in the beliefs and practices of the Catholic religion and exercising pastoral care for them in a way that encouraged their attendance at Mass and their reception of the sacraments. Ideally this was the limitation of his contact with people as Thomas a’Kempis (1380 – 1471)

reminded him in the *Imitation of Christ*: “As often as I have been amongst men ... I have returned less a man.”

The life of a diocesan priest, St. John Mary Vianney (1786 – 1859), was held up to seminarians as an example of how a parish priest should lead an eremitical life. John Vianney spent almost 42 years living an austere life of prayer, fasting and other mortifications. He confined his contact with lay people to his sacramental worship activities and his pastoral care work. He allowed himself only two hours of sleep each night and spent from 14 to 16 hours each day in a cramped confessional where he absolved the sins of those who came to him to reveal their failings to God and others and seek forgiveness. Banyo students listened to what they heard about John Vianney, admired him for the way he served as a priest but lightly smiled in disbelief and rejected any prompting to imitate the degree of his solitary austerity in their own lives. Nevertheless, they learned that as priests they were expected to be men of obedience, men of prayer, men of self denial, and men of zeal.

Banyo owed its existence to the March 1939 decision of the Queensland bishops, taken under persuasion from Most Rev. John Panico, Apostolic Delegate to Australia, to establish a regional or ‘provincial seminary,’ to prepare men for the priesthood in the Archdiocese of Brisbane and in the Cairns, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, and Townsville Dioceses. At a meeting in March, 1939, Panico and the bishops resolved

---

2 Thomas A’Kempis, *Imitation of Christ*, Book I, Ch. XX., No. 2. Translation from the original Latin.
to establish and open the Pius XII Provincial Seminary for its first intake of students in March 1941.\(^4\)

The new seminary immediately succeeded in attracting students and continued to do so. Certainly there were factors of a social, ecclesiastical, and family nature that induced students to seek entrance to Banyo To delve into these would take this study too far afield from its main theme. Initially, Banyo had an enrolment of 56 students.\(^5\) High enrolments continued during this first period and to it was added a high level of retention of students through the training years until ordination.\(^6\) Of the 465 students accepted up to 1965, including those who enrolled for their secondary schooling in the minor seminary where there was a high proportion of departures, 270 were ordained, a proportion of just over 58 percent. Three times during its first three decades, in 1946,\(^7\) 1958,\(^8\) and 1968, the facilities at Banyo were extended to cater for increasing enrolments.\(^9\) The seminary’s largest ordination class, the 20 students ordained in 1961, indicated how well Banyo had been supplying priests for Queensland.\(^10\)

In spite of its success, concerns were frequently raised about the kind and quality of seminary training provided at Banyo. Priests and Banyo students questioned the

\(^5\) List of First Day Students prepared for Golden Jubilee of Seminary, 1991, TDA.
\(^7\) Pianum: The Pius XII Seminary Annual, Banyo, 1947, p. 40.
\(^8\) Follow in the Footsteps of Christ the Priest, Banyo: Students of Banyo Seminary, 1961, p. 12.
\(^9\) Denis W Martin, Priests of 1928, Brisbane: Brisbane Catholic Archives, p.19.
suitability of Banyo’s isolated monastic lifestyle for preparing priests for a ministry in busy parish communities. They were critical of the rigidly programmed days with long periods of silence, the manner in which authority was exercised, the restrictions on personal associations, the use of Latin for studies, and the lack of practical training for pastoral ministry. These appeared to be contradictory to the kind of life most of them expected to live in a modern parish of a Queensland city or town. Banyo had high enrolment and retention rates in a system judged by many who had been through that system as less than suitable. Paradoxically, the impact of Vatican II brought with it a reversal of these trends from which it never recovered.

The Second Vatican Council surprisingly inaugurated by Pope John XXIII, heralded radical changes of direction in all sections of the Church including seminaries. When John XXIII acceded to the papacy the world was becoming increasingly secular and rapid technological, economic, social and cultural change following the end of World War II had, by then, become the hallmark of western society. Pope John convoked the Council to change the Church so that it could exercise a beneficial influence on the world of which it was part and with which it had, for over four centuries, become disconnected. John XXIII wanted the Church to take what he considered to be its rightful place in the world.

Prior to the papacy of John XXIII, the Church tended to see itself as existing in a hostile world from which it had distanced itself. Since the Protestant Reformation and

---

11 This author, as a student at Banyo, and later, as a priest, often engaged in such discussions.
the subsequent wars of religion, then the Enlightenment and rationalism, the French Revolution, Liberalism and Marxism that followed in Europe, the Roman Catholic Church had isolated itself off from the world it viewed as unfriendly and antagonistic. In the centuries after the Reformation up to the time of Pius XII (1939 -1958), the Church, through its disengagement with the world, emerged with what the German theologian, Peter Fransen, described as a ‘ghetto image.’

The Church had practically ignored the wider world except for when it was directly confronted by secular institutions. Pope John aimed to heal that rift by bringing the Church into closer contact with the modern world. He wanted the Church to offer inspiration and service to this secular world. He sought to bring about “a shift in the church’s view that saw the world as a partner in dialogue.” Pope John XXIII called Vatican II to modernize the Church in the hope of making it relevant in the modern world. It is questionable how much the Australian bishops and clergy, trained in seminary isolation and suspicious of the secular and religious worlds beyond the Church, understood this. Their responses to proposed changes varied but most were, at least, resigned to accepting changes in their dioceses and parishes.

Vatican II had two main messages for seminaries like Banyo. The first was that, like the rest of the Church, seminaries should no longer stand apart in isolation from the wider world but become a part of the Church in that world. The second message was

---

that seminaries needed to modernise their formation, education, and training programs so that students would leave the seminary after ordination equipped to meet the modern world and be confident in doing so.\textsuperscript{15} What then happened at Banyo in the years after the Council was an attempt to reform the training of priests for a Church endeavouring once again to become involved in the world.

Even before the Council finished the Queensland Bishops facilitated the establishment of conditions needed for change at Banyo. In 1965 they appointed a pastorally minded rector to replace his rigidly authoritarian predecessor then in charge for 11 years. This followed with the appointments of new spiritual directors who took a more practical approach to the way they engaged students and newly qualified and younger staff who tried to transform the content and pedagogy of the theological education courses. The new rector, Monsignor John Torpie, invited student participation in the establishment of the new order for the seminary. He encouraged gatherings and activities for seminarians with Catholic Church, ecumenical, and social groups outside, as well as inside, the seminary. To enable all this and the pastoral experience opportunities he initiated for senior students, he relaxed many restrictive rules. Students saw Banyo moving from a monastic model to a college model. As this process continued it was expected that these changes would produce more students who would be better trained as future priests.

Almost the opposite happened. Students became discontented and rebellious, the numbers seeking enrolment each year declined, and a higher proportion left the seminary before ordination. Enrolments peaked at 140 in 1968 and then rapidly declined to 74 students by 1974.\(^\text{16}\) This decline continued over the next 26 years. In 1996, a Brisbane journalist, Charles de Foucauld, reported: “Brisbane’s Banyo seminary has only 29 men preparing for the priesthood, for the whole of Queensland. Eighteen students are studying for Brisbane, six for Toowoomba, four for Rockhampton, one for Townsville and none for Cairns.”\(^\text{17}\)

During the ten years following Vatican II, 211 students commenced studies for the priesthood in the first year of the major seminary at Banyo. Of these 72, or just over 34 per cent, were ordained. Of the 120 students who enrolled during the next ten years (1976 – 1985), 45 or 35.5 per cent were ordained. From then to 2000, enrolment levels and the numbers ordained continued to decline.

At the beginning of 1998, the Queensland Bishops moved the small number of students living in a large but almost empty building at Banyo site into smaller lodgings, a former convent in the Wavell Heights parish.\(^\text{18}\) It was named ‘Lanigan House’ after Father Michael Lanigan, an original Banyo student and its first senior student.\(^\text{19}\) Two further decisions of the Bishops in 2000, one, to separate the theological education for the priesthood from the seminary by establishing St Paul’s

\(^{16}\) Bill O’Shea, Rector, Interview, 2 April, 2009.
\(^{17}\) Charles de Foucauld, “Catholic seminaries seek to turn back the tide,” \textit{Courier Mail}, 23 March 1996.
\(^{18}\) \textit{Ibid}.
Theological College, and two, to replace Banyo with the Holy Spirit Seminary effectively brought to an end the 60 years history of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary. Soon afterwards, the Banyo buildings were designated as the site of the Brisbane campus of the Australian Catholic University.²⁰

When, under the impact of the Second Vatican Council, Banyo tried to modify its monastic regime and improve its programs under the direction of pastorally caring rectors, annual enrolments which at first increased fell substantially. The number of students continuing to ordination also fell dramatically. The fact that a significant number of newly-ordained priests who trained at Banyo in the 35 years after Vatican II spent only a short time as priests in parishes before resigning their ministry adds to the paradox.

In narrative style, this thesis, primarily focused on the internal life of the Banyo seminary, illustrates the contrast between the periods before and after Vatican II and the paradox that emerged when attempts were made to change Banyo in accordance with the directives of the Council. Vatican II stimulated the overhaul of the outdated Tridentine system in vogue at Banyo. The process of change at first destabilized the system and brought with it the loss of students. From this chaotic state improved programs for the formation of priests emerged but by that time the priesthood and Banyo seminary had lost most of their attraction for the young Catholic men of Queensland. Within the Church, its dioceses and parishes, two tendencies emerged –

those eager for change and those reluctant for change to occur. The changes at Banyo took place within that context.

Literature Review

This literature review is as a prelude to examining the internal life of Banyo seminary in the light of what the seminary was trying to do, how well it was succeeding, what were its weaknesses and failings, and what were the reasons for these. As Banyo’s mission was to train priests, an understanding of what the priesthood meant in Catholicism is established. From there the way the seminary trained priests and its appropriateness, the nub of this thesis, is investigated. Basically the following literature review is organised around priests and their training in a Catholic seminary. As it is the internal life of a Catholic seminary under examination, the literature is mostly Catholic in origin and application.

The accepted and long standing concept of priesthood that guided Banyo during the years preceding the Second Vatican Council underwent development with the Council and gave rise to the changes that took place at Banyo after 1965. This literature review has therefore traced the evolution of the concept of priesthood adopted in ancient societies and in Israel, then moves to how the Christian priesthood developed from the Jewish model which became merged with the earliest Christian practices. The review then looks at circumstances underlying the initial model at Banyo, the original type of seminary established by the Council of Trent (1543 –
1563) which remained unchanged until the Second Vatican Council. Literature relating to those changes and attempts to implement the directives of Vatican II and the consequent problems is discussed. Attention has been given to literature relating to the religious and Catholic world, especially in Queensland where Banyo functioned. The economic, social, political, cultural, and religious conditions of the secular world of these years that impacted on Banyo were filtered through the Second Vatican Council and are considered not directly but in that context.

For the development of the understanding of priesthood in the Catholic Church, this review begins with L W Countryman’s broad definition of a priest: “The only absolute qualification of a priest is insight, an insight that comes from some encounter with the arcane, some time spent in awareness in the border country.” In this way Countryman identifies a priest as any person who gains a deeper insight into the area where experience and speculation meet and offers any insight gained to enlighten others of the meaning of life. It is of someone having an association with the world beyond immediate experience and using the insights thus obtained in the belief and hope of assisting fellow human beings to give a deeper meaning to life.

In the perspective of ancient religions, John Crossan wrote in The Birth of Christianity of a Priestly Class “that involved anyone who, institutionally or charismatically, officially or popularly, claimed religious authority and leadership in

an agrarian society.” This social group he described as: “The Priestly Class means religious leadership, whether we are dealing with priest or prophet, visionary or teacher, institutional or charismatic individual, official or popular personage – as long as the claimed authority is transcendent or divine.” Hence a priest is anyone who claims to act with divine authority as an agent of that divinity.

Priests claiming divine authority to exercise religious leadership in agrarian societies implied belief in the existence of a god or gods and a relationship between the deities and the members of their agrarian communities. Priests acting in the name of the gods fostered that relationship. Being in a relationship with one’s deity and having a priest to foster the growth of that relationship then constituted the basic religion. Thus the priest was the agent of God who fostered the development of the relationship between the divinity and his people.

Taking a monotheistic stance, Jack Risley narrows the role of priests as acting with divine authority in matters connected with the divine-human relationship, namely, that of acting as mediators between God and humanity in humankind’s search for salvation:

No matter where you look at priesthood in the religions of the world, past and present, it responds to a reality: humanity in need of salvation with the hope of attaining it, and that salvation is seen in reference to God.

---

And the priesthood is seen as some kind of mediation between God and humanity to be saved.\textsuperscript{24}

A priest is the one who leads people in search of salvation to God with the hope of finding it. He is the mediator who acts on behalf of God to bring salvation to God’s people.

This salvation theme pervades the history of the Israelite people recorded in the Old Testament. They claimed a special relationship with the one and only God. Genesis and Exodus tell how the patriarchs of Israel sought God’s salvation by being saved from their sinfulness in constantly turning away from Yahweh and by being rescued from the oppressions of hostile peoples and their precarious life conditions. They believed their God, Yahweh, intervened in the history of his people, the Israelite, for this purpose. They reached out to Yahweh through ritualised sacrifices offered by priests as gifts offered to God to implore his saving presence and action among them to forgive their sinful transgressions and rescue them from the hardships of life and the hostility of their enemies. Risley summarises:

Old Testament priesthood, like that of non-biblical religions, was a ritualistic solution to the problem of distance between and separation of God and human beings, expressed as the reality of sin. How to bridge the gap, how to pacify and reach God and thus find salvation? The answer is to exercise rites and rituals – sacrifice, expiation, purification etc. – that allow us to approach and get nearer to God and be saved. It all makes up

the world of the “sacred,” and the priest is the key figure, because it is he (or she in some religions) who effects the mediation.\(^\text{25}\)

The cultic actions of offerings of gifts were carried out through institutionalised rituals by Aaron and his sons of the tribe of Levi. Moses, their leader, commissioned them to act as priests in God’s name on behalf of the people to offer gifts to God making them holy or sacred.\(^\text{26}\) Designated cultic persons offering sacrifices to God on behalf of the people in their hope for salvation from Yahweh was one aspect of mediation between God and his people. Israel had other kinds of mediators too.

Up to the time of Christ, a messianic theme of one being sent by God to rescue the Israelites, his chosen people, from their enemies pervaded their life and religion. The mediator can be seen as the divine response to the people’s prayer for assistance implied in the sacrifices offered by their priests. The Israelites believed that God, through the leadership of Moses, had rescued them through the ‘passover’ from the slavery of Egypt to the freedom of the Promised Land of Palestine.\(^\text{27}\) Joshua and other leaders followed. As they became established in their new land their leaders became kings. It was to Saul, David, and Solomon they looked to for protection from their foes. They saw their kings as agents of God who acted on their behalf. They were the Lord’s Anointed Ones. During the invasions, occupations, deportations and returns from exile in the times of the Syrians, Persians, Greeks and Romans, the Israelites, up to the time of Christ and beyond, waited in expectation for a great messiah who

\(^{25}\) Jack Risley, *op. cit.*, p 129.
\(^{26}\) Numbers, 18: 2 – 18.
\(^{27}\) Exodus, Ch. I – Ch. XV.
would conquer their enemies and give them the peaceful occupation of their own land. They saw this messianic king as the victorious agent of their God. The messiah was a leader whose role was to act in the service of a saving God to defeat their enemies.

The Israelite people also regarded, often begrudgingly, their prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others, as agents of their God. In the times of invasion, occupation and exile, the prophets interpreted their woes as God’s punishment of his people for their failure in the fidelity they pledged to Yahweh in their sacrifices. They assured them of their God’s loving kindness and readiness to restore them once they repented. The prophets called the Israelites to repentance and conversion, to return to their God. Often the prophets railed against the cultic priesthood, although it was not so much the priesthood that they objected to but to the way those who held this office exercised it. Of this situation, Paul Dinter wrote:

Prophetic ministry did not oppose the priesthood as such, but without its challenge, priesthood as an institution was always tempted by the semi-idolatrous worship of its own sacrality, of its presumed spiritual influence, and of the money and power that alone could assure that the ritual cult could continue.29

The prophet, as an agent of their saving God, had the office of keeping the people faithful to their God and calling them back to God when they became unfaithful. Pivotal in this was the fidelity of the cultic priesthood.

Thus within Israel, three groups - priests, prophets and kings - were recognised as agents of a saving God. These three roles were attributed to Jesus in the New Testament and, later, to the ministers in the Christian church. This threefold ministry of salvation was exercised through offering sacrifice, preaching and teaching repentance and conversion, and a leadership of service in providing protection to others. A realization that the Second Vatican Council renewed and emphasized the kingly or leadership service and prophetic ministries of Christ to the cultic priesthood is vital for this thesis. These two dimensions of the priesthood had become dormant long before the Council of Trent following the Reformation and overshadowed by Trent in its emphasis on the priestly role of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice.\(^{30}\) Their restoration had explicit bearing on changes for training of priests at Banyo after Vatican II.

The four Gospels never identified Jesus as a priest. The ministry of Jesus had no connection with the official priesthood of the Jewish religion, the Sadducees, or with that of the Scribes and Pharisees, that is, the Rabbis, although on occasions Jesus was called Rabbi, meaning a teacher. During his life on earth Jesus Christ spoke publicly as a teacher and a prophet. According to Matthew, “He went out to the whole of Galilee teaching in their synagogues, proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and curing all kinds of diseases among the people”\(^{31}\). As a teacher and prophet he proclaimed the kingdom of God that was counter cultural to the earthly messianic


\(^{31}\) Mat. 4:23.
order the Jews were expecting. As a servant of his followers he cared for and healed all who were in need – the sick, the poor, widows and lepers. Nowhere is he seen in the role of a priest according to the Jewish understanding of priesthood.

On this, Gerard Gleeson commented: “What is remarkable about the New Testament’s use of the term priest is not that it is not used of ordained leaders, but that even its application to Christ is so rare: indeed it occurs only in the Letter to the Hebrews’ remarkable theology of Jesus as ‘high priest’”, which the author of that Letter expressed:

Nor did Christ give himself the glory of becoming high priest, but he had it from the one who said to him: ‘You are my son, today I have become your father’ and in another text, ‘You are a priest of the order of Melchizedech, and forever.’ During his life on earth, he offered prayer and entreaty, aloud and in silent tears, to the one who had the power to save him out of death, and he submitted so humbly that his prayer was heard. Although he was Son he learnt to obey through suffering; but having been made perfect, he became for all who obey him the source of eternal salvation and was acclaimed with the title of high priest of the order of Melchizedech.

This belief in Christ’s priesthood was realized by his followers through their later reflection on his death.

34 Hebrews 5:5 – 10.
It is Catholic doctrine that Jesus Christ had a priestly mission during his life on earth. “From the time He came into the world, it was as a priest that the Word Incarnate presented Himself to the Father and, during His whole life on earth, the adoration and praise of Jesus was continuous.”

His entire existence was interpreted as a priestly act of offering his life in sacrifice to God on behalf of his people, a priesthood that came to its culmination only with his crucifixion. However, prior to his death, his priesthood was expressed through his roles as prophet and as servant of his people, except on the night before his death when, in the company of his apostles at the Last Supper, Jesus offered bread and wine in a ritual act.

According to the Gospel narrative, when he gathered the Twelve Apostles around Jesus that night for a meal celebrating the Jewish feast of Passover he instituted a memorial of himself. He shared with them bread identified as his body and wine identified as his blood and directed them to do the same thing as a commemoration of himself. After his death the early Christian leaders gathered their groups of believers to break bread and drink wine as a memorial of Jesus. These leaders were known interchangeably as bishops and presbyters (elders). Nowhere in the New Testament are they referred to as priests in the Jewish sense of the term. Osborne has stated, “The early Church did not use the liturgical title of a ‘priest’ ... for church ministers. Even though this title was readily available, it was evidently shunned by the early Church for designation of its ministers”.

Through reflection on the Eucharistic ritual during the first three centuries, the Christian Church gradually came to see it as the representation of Christ’s sacrifice on Calvary and their leaders or presiders of these gatherings as priests, sacramentally offering sacrifice in a manner similar to that of the Jewish priest. Christians saw their leaders as priests who made Christ present in their midst in such a way that those present could in a symbolic and sacramental manner take part in the what they believed to be Christ’s saving Death and Resurrection. They saw the Last Supper as an ordination ceremony in which Christ made his apostles priests, giving them power to change bread and wine into his body and blood as he had done so that all could participate in his saving sacrifice. 39 Priests were the ministers of Christ’s Eucharistic and sacramental presence. In doing what Jesus did the priest was ‘another Christ’ \textit{(alter Christus)}. Until Vatican II this was the accepted understanding of a priest.

According to Catholic teaching, emphasised by the Council of Trent, 40 men were called by God to offer the sacrifice of the Mass described officially by the Catechism as: “The Mass is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the Cross.” 41 To offer the Mass for the people, most priests, referred to as diocesan priests, located in dioceses and parishes under the leadership of a bishop. Priests had the duties of preaching and teaching the Catholic faith and exercising pastoral care for their people directed at gathering them around the altars of their churches to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass which brought about their salvation. All priests were ordained to offer the Sacrifice of

41 \textit{Catholic Faith: A Catechism, Book I, Q & A No.38}, Sydney: E.J. Dwyer, 1941, p. 73.
the Mass but not all priests worked in parishes and dioceses. They were members of religious orders, known also as the regular clergy.

Before the Council of Trent there was very little training for diocesan priests or the secular clergy whose work was directly connected with the world. Training young men to work as priests in parishes was an important issue discussed by the Bishops at Trent. The English historian, Paul Johnson, comments on the origin of seminaries at this Council:

Where Trent did introduce an important change was in instructing bishops to create seminaries for the training of clergy. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan (1560 -1584), founded three in his diocese, and set about the creation of an educated and resident clergy by insisting on minimum standards before ordination. ... No provision for training priests in their specific duties had ever existed before. This was the curse of the Church until Borromeo’s system was widely imitated.\(^{42}\)

According to Philip Hughes, seminaries originated at Trent because, until then, “the Church never faced the problem of training and educating the rank and file of the parochial clergy,” before which “the most ignorant of men, and sprung from the dregs of society, and even themselves depraved, mere youths, are everywhere admitted to holy orders,” and after the Reformation, the Council of Trent ordered that

---

“every bishop shall set up a special college where picked boys shall live and be given a religious training, be taught to live the clerical life. … This college will become a permanently fruitful seed-bed (seminarium) of ministers of God.”

Seminaries were to be ‘nurseries’ where the ‘seeds of vocations’ to the priesthood in young men were ‘germinated and nurtured to come to fruition’ in priestly ordination. According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*:

A priest is the representative of Christ among men: his mission is to carry on Christ’s work of salvation of souls; in Christ’s name and by his power, he teaches men what they ought to believe and what they ought to do: he forgives sins, and offers in sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ. He is another Christ (*sacerdos alter Christus*). His training, therefore, must be in harmony with his high office. ... To teach candidates for the priesthood what a priest ought to know and to make them what a priest ought to be is the purpose of seminary education; to this twofold end everything in the form of studies and discipline must be directed.

There were to be two levels of seminaries, major seminaries and minor seminaries:

A theological seminary (grand séminaire) provides courses in Holy Scripture, philosophy, theology etc., and gives young men immediate preparation for ordination. A preparatory seminary (petit séminaire)

---


gives only a collegiate course as a preparation for entrance into the theological seminary.  

To provide the ‘religious training’ for a priest in harmony with his high office as ‘another Christ,’ the Church adopted the monastic lifestyle for seminaries. Monasteries, the houses of religious orders, had become organized around the practices of piety and study set within a rule-regulated life lived in isolation as the means of growing in holiness, a quality the Church demanded of its priests. Monasticism had originated in the early centuries of the Church as a way of meeting “Jesus’ challenge to the rich youth to sell all possessions and give the proceeds to the poor so as to follow him” (Luke 18:22). Those who followed this call withdrew from the world to an isolated life of ascetic self-denial and prayer to allow “God’s transforming love” to “work in the lives of those who open themselves to God in prayer.” It was assumed too that the demands of this strict and secluded, rule-regulated life of prayer and study and the vigilance of seminary authorities would help those following a call to the diocesan priesthood to discern whether or not they had such a vocation. The seminary’s monastic lifestyle was a training in holiness and a means of discernment.

\[45\] Ibid.
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\[49\] Ibid., p. 166.
Following Trent, seminaries were guided by papal teachings and other directives issued by the Roman Curia. In regards to Banyo, some of the more modern and contemporary documents are important. The encyclical letter, *Aeterni Patris*, of Leo XIII (1878 – 1903) was central to the endorsement of the study of the Philosophy and Theology of St Thomas Aquinas for studies in Church educational institutions.\(^5\) This recommendation was prescribed for seminaries by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical letter, *Ad Catholici Sacerdotii*, 1935.\(^5\) This medieval approach to seminary studies became less than helpful for students confronted with the issues of the modern world.

The next pope, Pius XII (1939 – 1958), published the encyclical *Menti Nostrae* in 1950.\(^5\) This and Pius XI’s encyclical underlined the priesthood almost exclusively in cultic terms, teaching that the priest was an *alter Christus*. Dr Cornelius Roberts, a young theologian writing in 1930, testified to this teaching on the priesthood:

“Endowed with the power to do as Christ has done, the priest is with special reason called *alter Christus*, even though this participation of Christ’s office is only a participation and always restricted to particular actions.”\(^5\) The essential action of a priest was cultic worship in offering the sacrifice of the Mass for which the priest must remain holy and pure. The priest achieved this by separating himself from the world and giving himself to a life of prayer and ascetical practices. In this was an uncritical justification of the obligation of celibacy. Then he could render worship, especially the sacrifice of the Mass, acceptable to God on behalf of his people. Mgr

---

Cleary stressed this papal teaching at Banyo.\textsuperscript{54} It was reflected in an idealistic image of the priesthood in A. Tanquerey’s \textit{The Spiritual Life}, the prescribed text on the spiritual life.\textsuperscript{55}

Pius XII issued three other documents, \textit{Mystici Corporis Christi}, 1943, \textit{Mediator Dei}, 1947, and a \textit{Decree on the Lay Apostolate}, 1957, advocating developments in the understanding of the priesthood beyond a purely cultic role. These indicated that, in the Church, a change in the understanding of the relationship between the priest and the laity was beginning but it was one which the Church was little prepared to follow through. In France, as the biography of worker priest Henri Perrin illustrated,\textsuperscript{56} Vatican authorities quickly prohibited the Worker Priest Movement, an attempt by some priests to share the working life of the people of Paris. Vatican officials regarded it as taking the priesthood out of the ‘sacred’ and immersing it too deeply in the ‘secular.’ Nevertheless, these documents of Pius XII provided a basis for the development of the understanding of the priesthood taken by Vatican II.

In relation to the priesthood in Australia, Patrick O’Farrell comments on the need for priests and seminaries when he relates how the growing number of native-born Catholics influenced Cardinal Moran to establish, under his jurisdiction, St Patrick’s

\textsuperscript{55} A. Tanquerey, \textit{The Spiritual Life: A Treatise on Ascetical and Mystical Theology}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} rev. ed., Tournai, Desclee, 1930. A cursory study of Tanquerey’s Spiritual Life was required for an introduction to spirituality.
College, Manly, as a host seminary for all the dioceses of Australia. Kevin Livingstone, influenced by O’Farrell, explores the theme of the emergence of the native Catholic priesthood in Australia against the backdrop of a predominantly Irish clergy in Australian dioceses. Kevin Walsh depicts Manly as a ‘Tridentine Seminary’ emphasizing rules and obedience as essentials for priestly training. According to Walsh, a former student and professor at Manly, this approach implemented by successive presidents, and never entirely suitable nor fully successful, broke down under the impetus of Vatican II decrees.

This criticism was affirmed in Chris Geraghty’s autobiographical works *Cassocks in the Wilderness,* and *Priest Factory.* Geraghty, a former priest, wrote a trenchant criticism of the practical application of the Tridentine system at Manly and its junior seminary, St Columba’s College, Springwood. He complained about seminary isolation, the repetitive monotony of the seminary, the narrow interpretation of obedience and how these inhibited any ability to develop normal human relationships with others. Geraghty spent many years as a student, first in the minor seminary from a young age and then in the major seminary. He returned to Manly as a graduate student and later was appointed as a seminary lecturer. Through these experiences he gained an intimate knowledge of his seminaries.

---

Paul Crittenden, a scholar and an academic, has recently commented on the studies undertaken at Springwood and Manly in his days as a seminarian. He relates:

The course text for philosophy was a Latin tome, *Cursus Philosophiae* (1937), written by a French Jesuit, Charles Boyer … This was a work of Neo-Thomistic or neo-scholastic philosophy, the late nineteenth-century reappropriation of the philosophy of the Medieval Schools, developed with particular reference to the writings of Thomas Aquinas and, at a further remove, the thought of Aristotle. This modern version of Scholastic thought was typically set out in axiomatic form, with proofs intended to identify and refute erroneous views and to lead to sure and certain truth in the various branches of philosophical inquiry.\(^62\)

He described the Dogmatic Theology as taught by Dr Thomas Muldoon, (later Bishop Muldoon) at Manly in his time thus:

The ... general problem was the conviction that just about everything in theology could be formulated as a thesis and could be settled by the marshalling of arguments in defence of the chosen view against those of opponents. This energetic and combative approach tends to put a straightjacket on topics, shaping them to a preconceived framework and lopping off what does not fit. This works against reflection, openness to puzzle and mystery, and to the recognition that there are issues that might be intractable or insoluble, even though it is important for us to think

---

about them. On the whole there was too much dogmatism in this form of Dogmatic Theology, a theology transfixed in the past.  

Crittenden here has highlighted a basic problem of seminary studies, namely, the claim of the Church to possess divine truth and the ability to express it so completely through syllogisms. These characteristics of Manly were incorporated into the Queensland seminary.

After Walsh summarised the development of seminaries in Australia, particularly the efforts of the English Benedictine bishops in Sydney, to establish seminaries prior to the opening of Manly on the 23 January 1889, he relates how the high number of students from Queensland at Manly influenced the Queensland bishops to provide their own state seminary. He notes too that the Apostolic Delegate to Australia, Most Rev. John Panico, was pressuring the Queensland bishops along with all the Australian bishops, to establish more minor seminaries for their dioceses.

In planning for the new Pius XII Provincial Seminary in 1939 the Queensland bishops were obliged to accept the Tridentine model for training priests for their major and minor seminary as prescribed in Canon 1364 of the *Code of Canon Law*. It was endorsed also in Statute 584 by the Australian and New Zealand Bishops at

---
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the IV Plenary Council in 1937. It was the approach followed by Catholic seminaries of the Latin Rite throughout the world, including St Patrick’s College, Manly, NSW, and where, until 1941, most Queensland students for the priesthood were trained. Officially the effectiveness and suitability of this Tridentine model was assumed and never challenged. Thus a speculatively chosen model remained unchallenged and unchanged until Vatican II.

Banyo was established in ecclesiastically fertile ground. In *The Foundation of the Catholic Church in Queensland*, Denis Martin recounts the efforts of its pioneer bishops, priests and religious to establish a church in this state that became favourable for the founding of the Queensland seminary. Ann McLay relates in *James Quinn: First Catholic Bishop of Brisbane* how the first Bishop of Brisbane, known both as Quinn and O’Quinn, brought priests and nuns to Brisbane to establish churches and schools. It was from these foundations that the church grew and future vocations flourished. Quinn purchased the land on which the future Banyo seminary was built. Neil Byrne indicates in *Robert Dunne: Archbishop of Brisbane* how Dunne encouraged the type of settlement of Irish immigrant families from which vocations to the priesthood emerged. In another place Byrne discusses “Dunne’s high expectations of both the choice of his candidates and the kind of

---
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training they were to receive.”

Dunne’s expectations of seminaries and seminarians indicate how deeply were embedded the Tridentine qualities of seminary training which he expected to remain permanent, no matter what local conditions might suggest changes.

Thomas Boland’s *James Duhig* is important for its background to the Archdiocese of Brisbane and the dioceses of Rockhampton and Toowoomba which produced significant numbers of students first for Manly and later for Banyo. The manner of the pioneer church’s development was conducive to producing the many vocations that followed. Boland records the substantial legacy that became available for Banyo when, in the late 1930s, Archbishop John Panico, the Apostolic Delegate, allocated the assets of the suppressed missionary seminary of St Jude at Ashgrove.

To date, no single major study of Banyo seminary has emerged. Snippets of its early history were found in a number of minor publications. In 1941 the Queensland Bishops produced a booklet, *Pius XII Queensland Provincial Seminary*, a basic document on the origin of the seminary. It contained the Queensland bishops’ letter ‘Our Seminary’ to the priests and their people, appealing for funds for the seminary, letters from Luigi Cardinal Maglione, the Cardinal Secretary of State, on behalf of

---
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Pius XII, from the Apostolic Delegate to Australia, Archbishop John Panico, as well as the text of Archbishop Panico’s address at the laying of the foundation stone of the seminary on 19 November 1939. Two similar articles, both entitled “The Pius XII Provincial Seminary” by the Very Rev. Vincent Cleary, first rector of Banyo, appeared in copies of the annual Manly magazine of 1940 and 1942. One article contains an address, “Will You Also Go Away: Talk to the Boys of Queensland” directed at encouraging vocations to the priesthood.

Facets of the early history of Banyo are found in Pianum 1945, 1946 and 1947, a Banyo publication edited by Dr Cornelius Roberts, then vice-rector and later rector of the seminary. It appealed to young men to consider the diocesan priesthood for their calling in life. Articles by Archbishop James Duhig and other Queensland bishops in these official publications expressed their expectations and hopes for Banyo. To continue and extend the recruitment drive for new students, further magazines entitled Challenge (1952) and Following in the Steps of Christ the Priest (1961) were produced to promote the seminary and to encourage young men to consider seminary entrance. Another, Seminarian (1966), marked the silver jubilee year of the seminary. In 1973, the silver jubilee year of the first Banyo ordinands, Tom Boland compiled a synopsis of Banyo history of in article for the Catholic Leader. All these publications, produced when vocations were plentiful and the seminary remained virtually unchanged, were distributed through parishes and

---
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schools throughout Queensland to widen even further the appeal of Banyo to the young men of Queensland.

Three pre-Vatican II Banyo students have composed written records of their memories of Banyo. In an address to the clergy during the opening of the new Holy Spirit Seminary Bishop Ray Benjamin, a first day student of Banyo, compiled his recollections of those early days.\footnote{Bishop Ray Benjamin, \url{http://seminary.catholic.net.au/oppening.html} (accessed 11/10/2008).} Denis Long has compiled his memoirs of Banyo which cover the last years when Cleary was rector and the first years of Cornelius Roberts as rector of Banyo.\footnote{Denis Long, \textit{Denis Long at Banyo}, Brisbane: Unpublished Memoir, 2008.} In his autobiography, \textit{This Turbulent Priest}, Jim Madden, author of this thesis, wrote of the pre-Vatican II seminary he remembered.\footnote{Jim Madden, \textit{This Turbulent Priest}. Brisbane, Self-Published, 1998, Part II. Ch4 – Ch 8, pp.65 – 127.} These provide students’ memories of the anomalies of the pre Vatican II seminary at Banyo when the monastic regime prevailed. This contrasted with the post Vatican II seminary’s attempts to adapt seminary life to a new style.

In his work, \textit{Christianity}, Hans Kung described the monastic life lived by religious for which he gives the decisive elements as communal space for routine living, work, and worship; a uniformity of clothes, meals, and ascetical practices; a written rule to safeguard order within the monastery; and, following from this, obedience to a monastery superior.\footnote{Hans Kung, \textit{Christianity: The Religious Situation of Our Time}, London: SCM Press Ltd. 1994, p. 224.}
This structure adopted by the seminary, as described by Kung, had the characteristics of what Erving Goffman identified as a ‘total institution’ which he described as “establishments designed as retreats from the world or as training stations for the religious: abbeys, monasteries, convents and other cloisters.” Goffman, described as a micro-sociologist, developed this construct through his work in asylums for the mentally handicapped and applied it to prisons, concentration camps, military academies, religious houses and similar institutions. This model offers a framework for analysing the internal life of these institutions which differed from normal life. Goffman compares a ‘total institution’ to the normal way people live in this way:

A basic social arrangement in modern society is that we tend to sleep, play and work in different places, in each case with a different set of co-participants under a different authority, and without an overall rational plan. The central feature of a total institution can be described as a breakdown of the kinds of barriers ordinarily separating these three spheres of life. First, all aspects are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member’s daily activity will be carried out in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same things together. Third, all phases of the day’s activities are scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole circle of activities being imposed from above through a system of existing formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the contents of the various enforced activities are brought together as part of a single overall

---

rationale purportedly designed to fulfil the official aims of the institution.  

From 1941 to 1964, Banyo’s monastic structure closely mirrored the first three characteristics of Goffman’s ‘total institution.’ As well, the seminary was purposely structured in this way to train priests. Ecclesiastical authorities interpreted this as training each student to see himself as an *alter Christus*, another Christ, completely surrendered to the will of God as made known to him by his superiors. Obedience to the will of God as expressed by ecclesiastical superiors, in the manner of Christ’s obedience to God, as the way of becoming ‘another Christ’ became the ‘rational plan’ of the seminary process. It attempted to bring about a change in the student’s self understanding. As a major part of this process, the seminary had a set of operational rules to be strictly obeyed. These were approved by the bishops and administered by a single authority, the rector. By Canon Law the rector had complete power in ruling the seminary. He answered only to the bishops who appointed him.

Inmates associated with a ‘total institution’ surrendered, willingly or unwillingly, the loss of their autonomy and a curtailment of their freedom. They faced the possible failure to mature responsibly and developed a tendency to nurture an ‘under life,’ a sub-culture. This thesis looks at what happened when attempts were made to achieve the aims of a seminary within an organization with the characteristics of a ‘total institution.’ It proceeds to the consideration of what happened at the Banyo seminary when attempts were made to change its ‘total institution’ character.

---
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In August 1959, the new pontiff, Pope John XXIII, issued an encyclical *Sacerdotii Nostri Primordia* commemorating the 100th anniversary of the death of St John Mary Vianney, the ‘humble Cure of Ars.’ That the aim of Banyo at that time had been to train the type of priest alluded to in this encyclical was later attested to by a former Banyo lecturer, Bishop Bernard Wallace of Rockhampton. Wallace referred to the priest’s role as a mediator between God and humanity expressed through his sacramental ministry. Wallace’s life as a long term teacher at Banyo and recognized as advanced in his theological thinking was recorded in Tom Boland’s recent publication. Long after his departure from Banyo, Wallace was still emphasising the priest’s isolation as a man set apart from others for God’s work and the reserve and ascetical manner of his life, indicating how difficult it was even for an advance thinker in an influential position to adapt to the new model of priesthood. This encyclical, thought to be the last papal document to recognize the priest as ‘a man apart’ as portrayed by John Mary Vianney, happened not to be the case as in the 2009 - 2010 ‘Year of the Priest’ Pope Benedict XVI proclaimed him as the patron saint of all priests, a significant sign of the conservative element in the Church.

The implications of the later documents of Pius XII mentioned above were taken further by the Bishops at Vatican II who, influenced by European theologians, called for an urgent renewal of the Church and produced a comprehensive review of the Church itself, defining it as ‘the Pilgrim People of God’ (*Lumen Gentium*, 1964).

---


They made declarations on other elements of Church life as its Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium 1963), the Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et Spes 1965), Bishops (Christus Dominus 1965), the Priesthood (Presbyterorum Ordinis 1965) and the Formation of Priests (Optatam Totius 1965). These decrees emphasised the role of a priest as a presbyter undertaking the roles Christ as priest, prophet and servant leader (or alternatively as priest, teacher and servant leader) in the Christian community in close union with his bishop and fellow priests. The Council directed that priests become more closely united with the laity in worship, evangelization, and pastoral care, responsive to the world, rather than continue to cultivate the eremitical model of being apart from the world for an ascetical life of prayer. This was complemented by the Decree Apostolicum Actuositatem, 1965, explaining the role of the laity in the Church. This was a more complex role for priests. In the rush to implement the changes decreed by the Council, this change in the way of seeing a priest was done hastily and imperfectly and with unforeseen and unexpected consequences.

Optatam Totius, while emphasising the need for seminaries to alter their methods to suit the changed contemporary conditions, confirmed afresh that seminaries were necessary and that this well tried path to the priesthood must be continued. At Banyo this was interpreted by succeeding rectors as having students live each day according to a regular, although modified, set of rules. With the experience of almost fifty years since the Council, whether this was the correct approach to changing seminaries is still open to question.

92 Austin Flannery ed., Vatican Council II Constitutions Decrees Declarations, op. cit.
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Optatam Totius also said: “the Seminary as a community of young men derives its primary force and fitness to train future priests from its own circumstances and way of life,”\(^94\) suggesting that each seminary organize its training to produce the type of priest needed for the local Church. Following this decree, at the request of the first Episcopal Synod in Rome in 1967, the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education produced a basic plan for priestly training (*Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis*) to guide seminary rectors and professors in reorganizing seminaries to train the kind of priests needed for their dioceses.\(^95\) The Australian Episcopal Conference consequently produced *Preparation for Priesthood*, based closely on the ‘basic plan’ for Australian seminaries.\(^96\) It did not explicitly consider the type of priests needed for Australian parishes. Priests who had been physically and intellectually isolated from Australian life through seminary training experienced difficulties in coping with the changing situation.

The reaction to Paul VI’s decisions to remove the discussion of priestly celibacy from the Council and the consideration of the morality of the use of contraceptives in marriage, particularly the contraceptive pill, in his encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, were not helpful. Paul VI’s *Sacerdotalis Caelibatus*, 1967 intensified the issue of celibacy for priests with the statement, “Priestly celibacy has been guarded for centuries as a brilliant jewel.”\(^97\) John Paul II’s *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, 1992 records papal apprehension about the priesthood in the years after the Council and provided major

\(^95\) Ibid., p. 5.
\(^96\) Ibid., pp. 5 – 6.
directives for seminary training. These documents indicate a tension between the pre-Vatican II model of priesthood the Popes wished to sustain and the post-Vatican II model they wished to advance. Pope John Paul II tended to identify the priesthood in terms close to the pre-Vatican II model of Pius XI and Pius XII.

In ‘Saints and Scholars’: The Catholic Theological Faculty in Sydney 1954 – 2004 (2004), Margaret Press reports the difficulties at Manly such as the tensions caused by the president, Mgr James Madden, when he was deemed too reluctant to relax the Tridentine seminary discipline that surfaced in post-Vatican II days. This thesis which shows similar tensions existed in Banyo during this period mirror what Press has written.

Former Banyo priests have provided written recollections of their training at Banyo Seminary following Vatican II. Terry Collins, a former student and lecturer at Banyo, discusses in Voices Crying the inability of the staff at Banyo in post-Vatican II times to deal with students’ requests and suggestions. Allan Paulsen and Greg Latimore, contributors to this anthology, discuss the tensions they experienced as students during the years of change.

100 Terry Collins, (ed.), Voices Crying, 2000. This is an unpublished anthology of stories of Catholic priests who have resigned from ministry and their partners. Collins is the compiler as well as the author of his own story.
In 1991, the staff of Banyo produced *Banyo Studies: Commemorative Papers to Mark the Golden Jubilee of Pius XII Seminary Banyo*, under the editorship of Neil J. Byrne, then a member of the Banyo staff. Each contribution comprises an article by a staff member reflecting on his or her area of involvement in the seminary. The volume provides an important indicator of how the seminary had changed and where it was at in 1991.

To commemorate the blessing and opening of the Holy Spirit Seminary in April, 2008, Denis Martin, the Archdiocese of Brisbane archivist, published *Priests for Queensland* which covered the emergence of the seminary, then a brief account of the history of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary. A highlight is a short article, ‘Banyo from the Inside,’ written by Tom Boland who, as a former student, professor and rector of Banyo and a qualified church historian contrasts the rule-based life of pre-Vatican II Banyo with the difficulties discovered in its more relaxed and flexible lifestyle after Vatican II.

During the process of the implementation of the Council decrees, many priests began to realize that seminary training had not prepared them for the changes. This served to reinforce their misgivings about seminary training prior to the Council. As priests performed their duties in Catholic parish life, they experienced additional pressures. They had to contend with the effects of increased population through the post-World

102 Denis Martin, *Priests for Queensland, op.cit.*
War II baby boom and immigration, the rise in the level of education of the population, the mobility of people through greater access to transportation, developments in the means of communication, the advent of television and the introduction of computerised technology. These pressures on Australian life in general have been outlined by Hugh McKay in his *Reinventing Australia* and *Turning Point*. Priests who had been physically and intellectually isolated from Australian life through seminary training experienced difficulties in coping with the changing situation.

Peter Kaldor, John Bellamy, Ruth Powell, Merilyn Correy, and Keith Castle, in their survey report *Winds of Change*, depict the declining state of denominational religion in Australia, another issue priests had to contend with in their ministries. Australian people remained notionally religious but many were losing their affiliation to their religious denomination. Sociologists of Religion, Blaikie and Gary Bouma, confirm this assessment of denominational religion in their research.

---

103 Hugh McKay’s *Reinventing Australia*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson 1993; and *Turning Point*, Sydney: Macmillan 1999 are retrospective social commentaries on Australian life at the times of their publication.


The works of Paul Collins, from *Mixed Blessings* to *Believers*,\(^{106}\) provide a vivid account of local and Catholic Church globally in the years following Vatican II up to the present. Collins, a former priest and historian, who takes the role of a critical friend, is an important commentator on Church life in Australia in recent and contemporary times. The rapidly changing world, the state of flux in the Church, and the condition of the Church in Australia had their implications for seminary training but people with educational and social science qualifications rather than philosophy, theology and scripture were needed to address them.

It was not uncommon to hear those in ministry speak of distress and anxiety experienced through trying to cope with changes in the Church, increased workloads as they grew older, and a declining number of people supporting their parishes.\(^{107}\) Increasingly, priests from the age of 65 took the opportunity to retire from full-time pastoral appointments, thus aggravating the shortage of priests. Literature produced for helping priests to understand the transition included: *Secular Priest in the New Church*, a series of essays edited by Gerard Sloyan;\(^{108}\) Charles Meyer’s *Man of God: A Study of the Priesthood*;\(^{109}\) Kernan Osborne’s *A History of the Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church* (1988);\(^{110}\) Paul Dinter’s *The Changing Priesthood*;\(^{111}\)

---


\(^{107}\) Anecdotal information gathered by this researcher in conversations with Queensland priests.


\(^{111}\) Paul E. Dinter, *op.cit.*
and William Perri’s *A Radical Challenge for Priesthood Today*.112 These works tried to connect the changes taking place in the priesthood with the way it previously had been understood. Such literature had its implications for seminaries.

In the turmoil, priests resigning from ministry became a new facet of priestly life and this had an influence on seminary life. Through reductions in the size of ordination classes since the 1970s, the supply of priests for Queensland fell sharply into a situation described as “deep trouble.”113 Fewer students enrolled at Banyo and an increased proportion of students left the seminary prior to ordination. From 1941 to 2000, Banyo had enrolments of 865 students. Between 1948 and 2000, 418 of these were ordained as priests.114 No new enrolments at Banyo in 1997, the first time in the history of Banyo, plus no ordinations in 1998, the first time since 1948, symbolized what was happening.115 This was only part of the trouble.

By 2001, 111 of those ordained had left the priesthood or, more officially, had resigned from ministry.116 These factors underlay the ‘deep trouble’ in the priesthood. In this, the Catholic Church in Queensland and the Banyo seminary mirrored what has happened to the priesthood throughout the Church globally.
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114 Queensland Bishops’ Pastoral Letter, “The future use of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary site, Banyo, Brisbane,” 18 – 19 November, 2001, BAA.
Resignations from ‘official ministry’ illustrate this ‘deep trouble.’ Using Vatican and other sources, Bert Peeters, former President of the International Federation of Catholic Married Priests (IFCMP), noted that in 1991 the Congregation for the Clergy, one of the dicasteries (i.e. offices) of the Roman Curia, admitted that the Pope had granted 60 000 dispensations. He noted too that by 1985 the IFCMP had been able to identify 80 000 former priests across Europe, North and South America, Africa and Asia, indicating that not all were seeking dispensations. In 1995, this same congregation announced that “about 400 to 600 applications (for dispensations from celibacy) a year were being submitted.” In addition, “a growing number of priests married without even trying to get dispensations.” On the basis of these figures, Peeters concluded that by the end of the century more than 100 000 had left ministry.  

During these years the number of priests in Queensland applying for dispensations was growing at a concerning rate.

In his discussion on the size of the exodus from the priesthood, Peeters adds: “On 22 March 1994, the Vatican announced that the total number of Catholic priests in the world amounted to 400 000: 260 000 diocesan priests and 140 000 members of an order or congregation.” These figures indicate that 20 percent, or one in every five priests, had left ministry. A former Irish Dominican priest, David Rice, who wrote about former priests throughout the world, vividly described what had happened: “Close on 100 000 simply left, that is, they resigned from formal ministry. It is a

---

118 Ibid., p. 42.
figure that expresses one of the most extraordinary religious phenomena since the
Reformation, a phenomenon as yet unexplained.”\textsuperscript{119}

This and the issues involved were discussed by former Australian priests, Michael
Parer and Tony Wilkinson, in \textit{Prophets and Losses in the Priesthood}.\textsuperscript{120} They argued
that men were leaving the priesthood because of the inability of the Church to deal
effectively with the changes. Bernard Haring, in \textit{Priesthood Imperilled: A Critical
Examination of Ministry in the Catholic Church},\textsuperscript{121} tried to find a way through the
troubled situation. Haring pointed out that the reluctance of Rome to deal effectively
with priests’ problems placed obstacles in the lives of priests that should have been
resolved.

While Donald Georgen in \textit{The Sexual Celibate} (1974) and Michael Crosby in
\textit{Celibacy: Means of Control or Mandate of the Heart} (1996) attempted to help priests
to see meaning in the celibate life, celibacy as an obligation was questioned by
McLaughlin, \textit{A Priestless People} (1998) and Ula Ranke-Heinemann \textit{Eunuchs for the
Kingdom of Heaven: The Catholic Church and Sexuality} (1990).\textsuperscript{122} The undesirable
effects on priests and the partners with whom they formed relationships are depicted

\textsuperscript{119} Rice, \textit{op cit.}, p.24. \\
\textsuperscript{120} Michael Parer and Tony Wilkinson in \textit{Prophets and Losses in the Priesthood}, Sydney: Alalla
Books 1971. \\
\textsuperscript{121} Bernard Haring, \textit{Priesthood Imperilled: A Critical Examination of Ministry in the Catholic Church},
Ligouri: Triumph Books, 1996. \\
\textsuperscript{122} Heins-J Vogel, \textit{Gift or Law: A Critical Investigation}, Turnbridge Welss: Burns Oats, 1992  p. 65, 
p.67. \\
Vincent McLaughlin, \textit{A Priestless People: New Vision for the Catholic Priesthood}, Norwich: 
in Clare Jenkin’s *A Passion for Priests* (1995) and Jane Anderson’s *Priests in Love: Australian Catholic Clergy and their Intimate Relationships* (2006). The issue of celibacy developed into a questioning of the extent of Papal authority. In a recent publication, *The Struggle for Celibacy* (2006), Paul Stanosz illustrates the difficulty of assisting seminary students to come to terms with celibacy.\(^{123}\) His work indicates a lack of awareness in students of the difficulties of celibacy as a priest.

Priests who left ministry did so for a variety of reasons but the Church showed little understanding of their plight or any tolerance of their departures from ministry. Former priests who wrote of this, each from his own perspective, include E. Boyd Barrett who, in his book, *Shepherds in the Mist* told how the ‘official Church’ was stern and distant towards ex-priests.\(^ {124}\) Anthony Kenny, in *A Path from Rome*, related his disagreements with the Church over the use of nuclear weapons and other issues.\(^ {125}\) Bishop Jim Shannon, in *Reluctant Dissenter* tells of his struggle with fellow American bishops during the debate over the birth control issue.\(^ {126}\) In *A Question of Conscience* English priest and theologian Charles Davis tells how he left the Church “because I had ceased to believe in it”.\(^ {127}\) In *Cry Out to the Church* Ed Kelly, an Irish missionary in the Philippines, expressed the anguish he experienced in dealing with a changing Church without any real support from it.\(^ {128}\) Michael Parer in


*Dreamer by Day: A Priest Returns to Life*,\(^{129}\) relates the difficulties he experienced trying to remain celibate. In his doctoral thesis, Alex Nelson expresses his disappointment with his seminary which he felt failed to equip him with the depth of knowledge and the practical skills needed for an effective priestly ministry.\(^ {130}\) These ex-priest authors reflect the problems faced and the challenges met in trying to establish themselves in a new life-path. Their stories reflect the tribulations of 111 Banyo priests, rejected by the Church, when they entered the secular world after they resigned from their ministries. They call for attention in seminaries in preparing students for the problems in the years ahead.

This 20 per cent of priests resigning from ministry is reflected in the ratio between the number of priests who studied at Banyo (418) and those who have resigned from ministry (111), a ratio just over 26 per cent. The shortage of priests in Queensland, and indeed throughout Australia, was symptomatic of the general decline of the Church in Australia about which Martin Teulian wrote in 2001:

> The Australian Catholic Church is, according to all the statistics, in significant decline. During the 1990s about 2.4% or one in forty Catholics left the Church each year. The seminaries were virtually empty. Less than one in thirty nominally Catholic men aged between twenty-five and twenty-nine are Mass attenders. Carrying those figures forward for


the next fifty years the average parish in Australia will dwindle from more than 500 attenders today to around 35 by the year 2050.\textsuperscript{131}

In this current year, 2010, there has been a rise in the number of seminarians ordained from the Good Shepherd Seminary, Sydney, and Corpus Christi College, Melbourne. According to Hari Raj, a journalist with Melbourne’s \textit{Weekly Review}, “It’s the most since 1983.”\textsuperscript{132} Whether or not this is a reversal of what has been happening in the Church in Australia since Vatican II is really not clear.

This review of literature has attempted to outline the origin, developments, understanding and practice of the priesthood within the Roman Catholic Church and the conditions in which these took place as a context for the discussion of seminary training with its focus on Banyo. The time frame of the literature and its variety illustrate the complexity of the issues raised in this thesis. It is indicative of the anxiety in the priesthood and confusion over the purpose and practicalities of a monastic style seminary training for the priesthood prior to 1965. Rather than relieving this tension and dispelling this confusion, the application of the decrees of Vatican II tended to increase this perplexity and disquiet. This was evident at Banyo and in other seminaries. This confusion and anxiety spread beyond the seminary into the dioceses and parishes of Queensland with formerly very committed Catholics publicly questioning the practices of Banyo.\textsuperscript{133} An important feature of this research project is to fill the void created by the absence of any constructively critical oral or

\textsuperscript{131} Martin Teulian, ‘The Evangelising Diocese’, \textit{Australasian Catholic Record}, Vol 78, No. 4, October, 2001, p. 409.

\textsuperscript{132} Hari Raj, email, harj@the weekly review.com.au, 18 August 2010.

social history of Banyo Seminary and the priests it produced, both of which were regarded as the heart and the life blood of the Queensland Church.

Aim and Objectives of Thesis

The aim of the thesis is to show how the monastic model of seminary life, prior to Vatican II, and its remnants, following the Council, persisted in the seminary until its cessation in 2000. The thesis seeks to illustrate how the uncritical commitment to the Tridentine style of seminary training, endorsed at the highest levels of the Church during its pre-Vatican II years, prevented the introduction of adaptations needed in Banyo’s training for ministry in a changing society. Secondly, it attempts to show how, following Vatican II, the remnants of that system, community life with a daily routine regulated by rules, caused tensions between rectors and students which diverted seminary staff from making modification of Banyo’s other programs. Finally it undertakes to point out how substantial progress was made during the last 20 years in the development of relevant programs but for fewer students.

The research project centres on the succeeding seminary rectors as the pivotal people around whom seminary stability and change gravitated. It considers the seminary in two stages: a relatively stable stage prior to the Council and a period of disruption and reformation after Vatican II. Each of these divided in two: the terms of Mgr Vincent Cleary (1941 – 1953) and Mgr Cornelius (1954 – 1964) as rectors, each in his own way presiding over the traditional Tridentine seminary in the first stage; and
the period of disruption (1965 – 1980) and the period of reformation (1981 – 2000) in the second. Each term begins by investigating students’ pathways of entrance to Banyo and their initial impressions of the seminary as the introduction to an examination of four specific features of that training, namely: spiritual formation; professional theological education; training for parish pastoral and liturgical roles; and development as human beings. The objectives for each period were to glean the following from students’ recollections and reflections in these areas:

- The life influences that fostered vocations to the priesthood;
- The initial impressions students gained of their seminary;
- An overview of the seminary’s spiritual formation program;
- An assessment of the content, pedagogical methods, and relevance of studies for the priesthood in modern society;
- A perspective of the training for the parish roles as pastors and liturgical leaders.
- A consideration of the preparation of students in developing as human beings.

The thesis discusses these in the context of the Tridentine model and then from the perspective of the innovative training adopted in the light of the Vatican II directives.

**Methodology**

Research for this thesis which is exploratory and pioneering in character relies mainly on primary sources, principally oral but also written. Focusing on the students, this thesis attempts to explore the persistence and pervasiveness of the monastic model akin to a ‘total institution’ and the effect of this structure on Banyo’s personnel and programs over two contrasting periods divided by the Second Vatican
Council. From the research emerges a range of themes that could have been the topic of investigation. However, the focus remains on an investigation of the monastic character of Banyo seminary.

The exploration is made through the recollections and reflections of its students as a means of developing the focus and, from these, an oral history of Banyo. They are interpreted through what the Catholic Church taught about the priesthood and seminaries in papal encyclicals and other documents. They are then considered in the light of how the local Church, the rectors, and staff of the seminary applied those teachings. These are explored through a perusal of official church documents, archival searches, an inspection of Banyo publications, interviews with staff, and reviews of Catholic and secular media.

Information about how the students themselves saw their seminary and responded to its regime was obtained through semi-structured interviews with former students from those 60 years. For this exercise, a clearance from the Ethics Committee of the University of Southern Queensland was obtained. The interviews, conducted in informal and conversational manner, sought information about students’ pathway to Banyo and their initial impressions of the seminary as an introduction to specific features of that training. To glean this information from students, interviews were structured around questions based on the stated objectives of the thesis. The interviewer, to ensure the adequacy and reliability of responses, frequently probed
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134 Ethics Committee, University of Southern Queensland, Approval HO8REA031, 24 June 2008.
matters further with the interviewee for deeper clarifications and explanations.\textsuperscript{135} Some interviews were supplemented by letters, e-mail and telephone conversations.

In doing this research I was acutely aware that as a former seminary student in the years 1956 - 1962 and an ordained priest I was a participant in the processes under investigation and therefore had what John Stanfield terms ‘insider status.’\textsuperscript{136} This implies that, in approaching this project, my mindset as an insider has been shaped by the facets of my own priestly and seminary experience. My respondents had similar experiences. Hence there was the possibility of reading my own biases into the responses of interviewees. My tertiary training has alerted me to the problems of misrepresenting evidence, offering unbalanced reporting of the evidence, or even presenting evidence to imply facts which were otherwise known to be false.\textsuperscript{137} To lessen the likelihood of this happening, interviews were recorded with permission of each interviewee from which a report was compiled and returned for his perusal, to offer an opportunity to make amendments to ensure accuracy and to seek approval for to use the information supplied. In some cases the approval sought was not given.

The original proposal was to interview a sample of 120 former students, two for each year, including in the sample students ordained who had continued in the priesthood and those who had left ministry as well as a number who had studied at Banyo but

had not reached ordination. The proposal was to include former students from each of the five dioceses of Queensland. The availability of former students for interviews posed several problems. There were difficulties in reaching former students in the northern dioceses of Queensland and to locate the whereabouts of many who had left the seminary or the priesthood. There was a difficulty with the earlier period as many of the students of that time are no longer alive. In the later period the low enrolments over those years meant only a small number were available for interviews. Of those contacted, 12 were not willing to give an interview and while some agreed to be interviewed they placed restrictions on the use of the information they shared. Distance and time were other constraining factors. Despite these difficulties, the author interviewed 85 former students in Brisbane, Toowoomba, the Gold Coast, and the Sunshine Coast areas and from as far away as Sydney, Rockhampton and Townsville. Interviewees representing the five dioceses belonged to the three specified categories, and were distributed over each of the four periods investigated. As most were from an Irish-Australian background, ethnicity had negligible bearing on the research.

Within the framework of the official view of seminaries at the global and local levels it considers the gathered recollections and reflections represented students’ experiences of their seminary life and training. This is inevitably subjective but it has its own value as Valerie Raleigh Yow has indicated:

Its subjectivity is at once inescapable and crucial to the understanding of the meanings we give our past and present. To reveal the meanings of lived experience is the great task of ... specifically oral history interviews.
The in-depth interview offers the benefit of seeing in its full complexity the world of another. And in collating in depth interviews and using insight to be gained from them as well as different kinds of information from other kinds of records we can come to some understanding of the process by which we got to be the way we are.\textsuperscript{138}

Trends and agreements are identified from those recollections and reflections. The collation and organization of these is taken as those students’ oral history of Banyo Seminary. Their story is not necessarily the same as that of the ecclesiastical authorities who controlled the seminary.

Discrepancies between students’ actual seminary experiences and their reminiscences did surface. This is to be expected as the oral historians Barbara Allan and Lynwood Montell explain:

Rarely is one single informant able to recount all details surrounding a specific event of years ago. But when enough people are interviewed, trends develop, patterns unfold and truth emerges. By gathering an ample number of oral accounts describing the event, the historian can likely discern the truth of the matter.\textsuperscript{139}

In determining the accuracy and consistency of the actual record, the norms they outlined were applied.\textsuperscript{140} This entailed gathering individual students’ recollections

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Ibid.}, pp 68 – 88.
and reflections and then collating and comparing them to establish core commonalities and essential shared experience. The times of the people, events and their location were established from available ecclesiastical archival material available in Catholic and secular media and other documents. Such external evidence, along with the internal consistencies of students’ recollections, assisted in establishing a practically reliable and generally accurate record sufficient for the purpose of this investigation.

However, the focus is on how these men, with the hindsight of the years in the seminary and as priests, and during the time after leaving the seminary or the priesthood, recalled their seminary experience. For this research, their recollections and reflections are all we have. According to John Tosh and Sean Lang:

> It is the very departures from faithful recall that give the oral content its full significance. … Social memory is moulded by political requirements and thus often diverges from the version of events verified by historians. Oral history can reveal that process of divergence and in doing so shed light on the political and historical consciousness of ordinary people.¹⁴¹

The focus then is on those memories of seminary life, moulded by later experiences and reflections. It is an exploration of how students saw their seminary experiences during their years as students, as priests, former priests and former seminarians, in the light of the contemporary and consequent influences of the people, events and
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situations they encountered. That perspective is the one this author believes he has accessed when the reported experiences of students were correlated to establish a collective perspective of the students interviewed.

This project, in establishing the commonalities and significant agreements in the recollections and reflections of students’ seminary experiences, was important in that a study from this perspective of students of the seminary had, to the knowledge of this author, never been undertaken. It was also significant as a lighthouse study as a beacon for guiding future planning of seminaries through the hazards of the past and the perils of the present. Training in seminaries throughout the world is under the supervision of the Vatican Congregation for Seminaries. Consequently, the principles of training for all seminaries are basically the same. This study can provide a crucible for assessing the value of the principles of training prescribed by the Roman Congregation from the perspective of those who have undergone that training.

From contacts made, this author has formed the impression that this project has given participants the opportunity to satisfy an expressed desire to ‘tell their stories’ in a credible and academic manner. Several lay people, Catholics and others, who read the manuscript in whole or in part, described what has been written as a story that ‘had to be told.’ Both groups asserted that the thesis will assist in understanding not only of the seminary but also of the Catholic Church in Queensland over 60 years.
Chapter II  Genesis of a Seminary

The efforts of the Catholic Church in Australia to provide priests for its members has been a constant theme in its history and the founding of seminaries in Australia has been an important aspect of this theme. In response to the religious needs of the increasing number of Catholics in Australia, first the laity, and then the bishops, sought priests to meet those needs for which the establishment of seminaries was one means. The establishment of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Queensland, in 1941, was a significant outcome of the endeavour of the bishops of Australia to provide priests for their dioceses. The genesis of Banyo is part of this ongoing effort from the earliest days of the colony to the actual foundation of the seminary at Banyo.

For the first 25 years of the new colony of New South Wales (1788 – 1803), the Catholics in Australia, mainly convicts from the disadvantaged socio-economic groups of Ireland, had no priests to minister to their spiritual needs. For the next 30 years priests became sporadically available but it was only after the appointment of a Catholic Bishop to Sydney, the English Benedictine Bede Polding, in 1835 that supplying priests for the colony became organized. As Irish bishops were appointed to newly-established dioceses in Australia from the time of the gold rushes, the efforts to supply priests continued through recruitment from Europe, particularly Ireland. However, as parishes developed in the Australian dioceses, the need for priests increased and attention turned to training Australian-born priests in Australian seminaries in addition to attracting priests from overseas.
The story of the Catholic Church in Australia up to World War II (1939 – 1945) tells of disadvantaged Catholics of Irish origin battling with an unfriendly English-Protestant administration to establish themselves as a respectfully recognized part of Australian society. Ken Inglis refers to Protestants fears of Catholics in Australia saying that: “Mistrust of Catholics, whether they were English or Irish, travelled to Australia on convict transports and emigrant ships ... The Sentinel, an anti-Catholic journal published in Sydney, detected by 1846 steady progress in Roman plans to capture the institutions of civil society.”¹ Cyril Hally, a Catholic priest-anthropologist, suggested there was something in their fears. He maintained the nineteenth century Catholics in Australia had two objectives, namely, to “achieve economic advancement” and to “preserve their religious heritage.”² Hally explained:

The pastoral strategy adopted to pursue both goals – economic advancement and religious integrity – was the establishment within each parish of a Catholic school financed and staffed exclusively from Catholic resources. The common effort to pursue this strategy united clergy, religious, and people at the parish level. Soon wherever Catholics went in Australia, they could find four buildings on one plot of land – church, presbyter, school, convent – all built and staffed by themselves without any public help except property tax exemption.³

For the preservation of the Catholic people’s ‘religious heritage’, the Irish bishops in Australia needed more priests for parishes as they developed. Without priests there

² Cyril Hally, “Growth Patterns in the Catholic Church,” in Dorothy Harris, Douglas Hynd, and David Millikan, The Shape of Belief: Christianity in Australia Today, Homebush NSW: Lancer Books, 1982, p. 84.
³ Ibid., p. 84
would be no parishes and without parishes Catholic people were in danger of losing their heritage. Furthermore, without parishes there would be no system of parish schools which implied that the economic advancement of the Catholic people would be put at risk. As priests from overseas could not match the growing needs, the bishops needed seminaries to train native born priests. The origin of Banyo seminary is part of the 160 year sequence of measures to provide priests for the Catholic people of this nation.

Catholic people experienced their religious heritage when they gathered for Mass, went to Confession, had their children baptised, and received the other sacraments.  

Priests who provided worship and celebrated the sacraments for the community were thus central to Catholicism. Therefore it was a basic responsibility of the Church to ensure the availability of priests for the transmission of its heritage. The bishops also decided that Catholic schools were an effective means of initiating its younger generation into that Catholic heritage and for this reason adopted a policy of establishing Catholic schools in every parish. The Catholic school, too, was an instrument by which an Irish-Catholic minority might gain the education needed to advance their status in the face of the English and Scottish Protestant ascendency ‘ruling’ Australia. Thus to have parish priests establishing and maintaining Catholic schools was an extra incentive for the bishops to establish seminaries to ensure the supply of priests.
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The Catholic Bishops’ efforts, first the English Benedictines and then the Irish, to establish seminaries have been well documented by the Australian Catholic historians: O’Farrell, Turner, Walsh, Livingston, Ayres, Boland, Martin, and others whose works are used to provide this summary background. It commences with the foundation years of the colony of New South Wales where the absence of Catholic priests meant an urgent need to obtain priests to provide religious services and pastoral care for its Catholic people. For the first 30 years, Catholic priests were not welcome to minister to the Catholic section of what was, mainly, a convict settlement administered by an ‘Anglo-Scots Protestant ascendency.’

Around 1800, three Irish priests, Fathers James Harold, James Dixon, and Peter O’Neil, arrived in New South Wales as convicts who, according to O’Farrell, had been “transported for alleged complicity in the 1798 rebellion.” Of these, only James Dixon was permitted, under sufferance, to exercise a limited ministry to Catholic convicts. When he left in 1808, James Harold replaced him, but he also left the colony in 1810. From then “the settlement was without any priest for eight years.” In 1817, Michael Hayes, an emancipated convict, later to become a leading Catholic in the colony, wrote to his brother Richard, a Franciscan priest in Rome. Richard Hayes was instrumental, through the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith (‘Propaganda’ as this Congregation having the care of missionary countries
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was referred to), in acquiring an Irish Cistercian priest, Father Jeremiah O’Flynn, for the colony. O’Flynn’s ministry was brief, for he was unacceptable to Governor Macquarie who deported him in 1818 when the assured credentials for him from the Colonial Office did not arrive. Macquarie suspected his conduct as a threat to the good order of the colony. O’Farrell noted Macquarie’s attitude towards Catholic priests behind this action:

Macquarie was no lover of Catholics, and especially not of priests. But he considered that the principle of civil authority was endangered, and his first concern was not the interests of Protestantism, but the demand of expediency. As he urged the Colonial Office, ‘If it should at any time be advisable to sanction the Ministry of Popish Priests in New South Wales they should be Englishmen of liberal Education and Sound constitutional principles.’

Macquarie’s suggestion foreshadowed the action of the colonial government in 1832 “to seek a Catholic ecclesiastical authority with whom it could treat.”

In response to a petition organised in 1820, by the same Michael Hayes, Commissioner J. T. Bigge replied “that two Catholic priests, Connolly and Therry, had been appointed by Catholic and government authorities in England.” These two Irish priests, Fathers John Therry and Philip Connolly, began to minister to the Catholic people in Sydney and Hobart. In 1820, the Catholic population numbered a
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little over 8000 and was made up of free settlers, convicts in servitude, emancipated and pardoned, as well as the native born.\textsuperscript{15} Following Therry’s loss of his official chaplaincy because of his “brushes with the government,”\textsuperscript{16} Rev. Daniel Power arrived in the colony in 1826, officially to replace him. Power died in 1830 and his place was taken by a Dominican, Father Christopher Dowling.\textsuperscript{17}

In February 1833, William Ullathorne, an English Benedictine, arrived in Sydney with the authoritative appointment of Vicar General for the colony.\textsuperscript{18} Ullathorne had been appointed in response to Governor Darling’s request for an English Catholic clergyman as he had been frustrated in trying to work with the Irish priest, Father John Therry.\textsuperscript{19} Sometime later, the Solicitor General, John Hubert Plunkett, a Catholic layman, “was responsible for bringing Rev. John McEnroe to the colony.”\textsuperscript{20}

When John Bede Polding, another English Benedictine, arrived in Australia in 1835 as the colony’s first Catholic bishop, he found a group of divided clergy consisting of one English Benedictine and four Irish priests attempting to minister to the needs of what was essentially a population of Irish-Catholics. He arrived with a vision of establishing a Benedictine monastery as the nerve centre of his Irish-Catholic community.\textsuperscript{21} Considering the dominance of the Irish Catholic people of New South
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Wales and their attitude to all things English, that intention of establishing a Benedictine style English church for a predominantly Irish Catholic population was an impossible dream. Polding had brought with him three priests and three sub-deacons nearing ordination to the priesthood. However, soon after he arrived in Australia, he wrote to Governor Bourke seeking financial support for more priests to meet the needs of his new pastoral responsibilities.

John Bede Polding continued the practice of recruiting priests from overseas throughout his episcopacy. He knew he had to rely on Europe, principally Ireland, but also England, Italy, France and Germany, for the supply of priests for New South Wales. Hypothetically, however, he had two other possibilities available to him: to send native born students overseas for training and to establish a seminary for training priests in Australia. According to Walsh: “With such needs in mind the bishop began projecting hopes for an Australian ‘seminary’ even before he reached Sydney Cove.”

Training priests in Sydney under the auspices of the Benedictines was part of Polding’s Benedictine dream. His efforts to establish a seminary in conjunction with a school, first at St Mary’s, then at Lyndhurst in Glebe, met with some success. It survived until his death in 1877. Although “he had ordained more than twenty
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students to the priesthood,”26 his seminary did not produce a steady supply of priests and “in the recruiting and education of men for the diocesan priesthood … its success turned out to be very short-lived.”27

In 1878, Polding’s successor, Archbishop Roger Vaughan, an English Benedictine as well, invited the Jesuits to open a college in Sydney. This became the Jesuits’ St Ignatius’ College, Riverview. A part of the arrangement was that the Jesuits would “educate at cost price of board and lodgings 12 church boys for the archdiocese, and be ready on the same conditions to train and prepare them for the priesthood.”28 The document was duly signed by the Jesuit, Father Joseph Dalton, in March 1878; Dalton soon after led a small party of Jesuits to Sydney to commence their work. This seemed a natural extension of the work of training priests that the Jesuits had undertaken for Archbishop Goold in Melbourne and Bishop Murray of Adelaide.29 Vaughan died while overseas before this embryo of a seminary could be taken further. Vaughan, however, was not the only Australian bishop determined to establish a seminary in his diocese. As settlement spread throughout the colonies local Catholic populations called for their own bishops as well as priests to provide the ecclesiastical structures to minister to their spiritual needs. In 1844, Bishop R.W. Wilson arrived in Van Diemen’s Land
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to discover the financial and other problems that had developed. Francis Murphy became the first Bishop of Adelaide that same year. Perth, with its long distance from any other ecclesiastical authority had its first bishop, John Brady, consecrated in 1845. The Rev. James A. Goold was consecrated Bishop of Melbourne in 1848. In 1859 James Quinn was consecrated in Ireland as Bishop of Brisbane.

Paul Cardinal Cullen, after a long association with Rome and the Irish College in Rome, was appointed Archbishop of Dublin in 1852, about the same time as the discovery of gold in Australia. Cullen exercised a major influence on the selection and appointment of the Irish bishops to the new Australian dioceses, many of whom such as James and Matthew Quinn (Brisbane and Bathurst), James Murray (Maitland), Daniel Murphy (Hobart), Timothy O’Mahoney (Armidale), and William Lanigan (Goulburn) were “relatives, friends or protégés of Cardinal Cullen.” Patrick Francis Moran, the first Irish Archbishop of Sydney was also a relation of Cardinal Cullen. Each of these bishops then had the responsibility of providing priests to minister to the people of his diocese.

In 1875, the Bishop of Bathurst, Matthew Quinn, was in the process of establishing a seminary in his cathedral town in conjunction with St Stanislaus’ College, a

---

31 Ibid., p.97.
32 Ibid., p. 104.
34 Turner, op. cit., p. 88.
secondary school for boys. The seminary was dedicated to the honour of St Charles Borromeo, the driving force behind the establishment of the first Tridentine seminaries. As well as educating students for the Bathurst Diocese, St Charles also accepted students from the dioceses of Brisbane, Maitland, Ballarat and Sandhurst. Bishop James Quinn had ‘attempted to found a seminary in Brisbane, on the present Mater Hospital site; he discontinued the project when his brother, Bishop Matthew Quinn, established St Charles Seminary at Bathurst, NSW’ All these dioceses had Irish bishops whereas, until the appointment of Patrick Francis (later Cardinal) Moran as Archbishop of Sydney in 1884, Sydney had an English Benedictine bishop. The seminary at Bathurst continued to train priests until 1894. Meanwhile, diocesan bishops continued to recruit priests from overseas and to send students overseas, principally to colleges in Rome and Ireland, for their clerical education.

When a predominantly Irish-Catholic population and their Irish bishops in Australia made their preferences for an Irish Bishop of Sydney known to the Holy See, an Irishman, Patrick Francis Moran, was chosen to succeed Vaughan. When Moran arrived in Sydney as its Archbishop he wasted no time in making plans for the establishment of a diocesan seminary. Kevin Livingston has drawn attention to the Moran’s motives that directed him in his decision to establish a seminary in Sydney. He quotes Moran’s expression of his desire for an Australian priesthood: “No nation can be said to have attained the full perfection of its growth to the religious life,
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unless its own children shall be found aspiring to the sanctuary, and devoting
themselves to serve God in the sacred ministry.” Moran emphasised the advantages
of Manly-educated Australian priests “ministering to the spiritual requirements of the
Catholic community, of having grown up around the altars and sanctuaries of their
own native land, and of having stored their minds and disciplined their hearts in an
institution peculiarly Australian.”

He proposed that it should have the role of a ‘host seminary’ for all the dioceses of
Australia and beyond. This meant that all the other bishops in Australia were
welcome to send their students to Manly but, because it was a diocesan seminary,
they would have no say in its administration. Moran’s plan for a seminary was
realized with the establishment of St Patrick’s College, Manly.

In 1889, St Patrick’s College opened with its first intake of students. While
students from throughout Australia were accepted at Manly, the Irish-Australian
bishops were not always happy to send their students to a seminary over which they
had no control. At various times some of the bishops, such as Archbishop Robert
Dunne of Brisbane and his successor Archbishop James Duhig, voiced their
dissatisfaction with aspects of Manly. The bishops continued to send some of their
students to study in seminaries overseas, principally in Ireland or Rome. Dunne, for
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example, sent James Duhig, as an aspirant for the priesthood, to the Irish College in Rome for his seminary training.\textsuperscript{49}

Attempts were made to constitute Manly as a national seminary in which all the Australian bishops would share the responsibility. However, Rome did not support such a move for this country. It favoured the establishment of regional seminaries which it considered would be more likely to increase the number of vocations to the priesthood.\textsuperscript{50} The bishops of the province of Victoria, which included Tasmania, took the road of establishing a regional or provincial seminary to serve their ecclesiastical province. Thus, when Corpus Christi College opened in Melbourne in 1923 under the direction of the Jesuits, Manly found that it had ‘a lively rival.’\textsuperscript{51}

Attention moved to Queensland in March 1939 when its five bishops met, under the presidency of the then Apostolic Delegate, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Giovanni (John) Panico, D.D., to establish a seminary to train priests for their dioceses. In making this decision they had no other choice but to accept a Tridentine style seminary with the characteristics of a monastery akin to those of a ‘total institution’ as identified by Erving Goffman.\textsuperscript{52} The monastic style Tridentine seminary, unchanged since its adoption in Europe following the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, came to Australia by way of Ireland. St Partrick’s College, Manly, NSW, was established as a Tridentine seminary. The Pius XII Provincial
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Seminary practically became a facsimile of Manly because Church authorities believed and had enacted legislation that the ecclesiastical education of priests be conducted within the regulated and celibate life of prayer and obedience as the correct method of training priests to be spiritual men separated from the world, men of knowledge, and men of self denial.

The origin of the seminary at Banyo can be traced back to 8 September 1863 when Bishop James Quinn, the first Bishop of Brisbane, purchased seven blocks of land amounting to 128 acres encompassing Beehive Hill in the Parish of Toombul, County Stanley.⁵³ This became the site for the Banyo seminary in 1939.⁵⁴ The early settlers gave the name “Beehive” to this hill. The author of ‘A Medley of Memories ….,’ in 1945 wrote, “an octogenarian who was born in the neighbourhood entertains no other explanation of the name than the resemblance of the hill in shape to a beehive.”⁵⁵ Another resident who had lived in the area for 60 years described the hill in its pristine condition as “a mass of honey.”⁵⁶ Bees had built their hives in the trunks of the many trees that covered the hill. The author of this article, most likely Mgr Cornelius Roberts, as editor of the seminary’s *Pianum* in 1945, thought the image of the working bee was most appropriate for students aspiring to the priesthood.

Beehive Hill was described as “a thickly timbered summit surrounded by virgin scrub. Aborigines still roamed through the area and a ceremonial Bora ring was
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situated nearby.”\textsuperscript{57} This Bora ring, a site of Aboriginal significance, was close to the Nudgee Water Hole and to other “sites of special importance on Dinah Island, near Boondall Wetlands.”\textsuperscript{58} These Aborigines belonged to the Turrbul language group sometimes referred to as “the Brisbane Tribe.”\textsuperscript{59}

A Beehive Hill Road, which ran between Nudgee Road and Earnshaw Road, passed over the hill and divided the property. When the decision was made to build the seminary on this hill the bishops of the province made an arrangement with the Minister for Lands, Percy Pease, and accepted by the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Alfred James Jones, to have this road moved to the Northgate side of the property at the bottom of the hill.\textsuperscript{60} It was then renamed Approach Road. Martin noted, “From 1880 until 1939, the property was leased out for farming, mainly fruit growing, pineapples and grapes. The Kreutzer family held the lease for the whole area but sub-let most of it out to three or four other families.”\textsuperscript{61}

Quinn bought other land at Nudgee on which was constructed St Vincent’s Orphanage run by the Sisters of Mercy. The Christian Brothers also obtained land in the Nudgee vicinity on which was built St Joseph’s College as a boarding school for boys. The Nudgee Catholic Cemetery lay between the future seminary site and the
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orphanage. In 1993, the *Courier Mail* reported that: “the Catholic Church owned a huge block of undeveloped land stretching almost to Sandgate.”

Over the years the Catholic Church in Queensland grew and expanded creating the need for an ecclesiastical organisation of bishops and priests. In 1877, the area of far north Queensland was designated the Vicariate Apostolic of Cooktown, that is, an ecclesiastical territory, usually in a missionary area, needing a priest in episcopal orders but not sufficiently developed to necessitate having its own local bishop. The Irish Augustinians, with one of their own members ordained a bishop, took charge of the Vicariate until it was constituted as the Diocese of Cairns in 1941. In between Brisbane and Cooktown, Rockhampton became a diocese with its own bishop in 1882. After another 50 years the Toowoomba diocese was cut off from Brisbane in 1929. Townsville became a diocese in 1930.

When Quinn’s successor, Bishop Robert Dunne, became an archbishop in 1887, Queensland became an ecclesiastical province and Brisbane a metropolitan see. Dunne was instrumental in developing Irish-Catholic communities and families from
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which vocations to the priesthood came, but a seminary in Queensland had to wait until the episcopacy of Archbishop James Duhig.

Tom Boland records that James Duhig, in a 1923 letter to one of his priests, Denis Fouhy, intimated that he had received a directive from Propaganda in Rome to establish a seminary but had neither the human nor the material resources to make it a reality. In the brief of his appointment as Bishop of Toowoomba, James Byrne was directed to establish a minor seminary in his diocese, an obligation that Byrne claimed to have fulfilled when he established Downlands College under the direction of the priests of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart in his episcopal city. Presumably the other Queensland bishops had received similar directives from Rome. During the Depression, Martin simply remarks, the bishops together considered the possibility of a provincial seminary to serve all their dioceses but given the shortage of finance and the pressing needs of their parishes they decided to defer further plans for a seminary until conditions improved. In fact, a seminary, but not for the training of diocesan priests, had been already established in the Brisbane suburb of Ashgrove.

During the 1920s, Duhig gave his support to Father Walter Cain of the English Catholic Mill Hill Missionary Society to start up a seminary in Brisbane to supply
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priests of the ‘pious association’ of the Holy Eucharist he was establishing for his Philippines mission.\textsuperscript{74} Approval from Rome was needed to erect the association into a society or congregation, an approval Duhig and Cain believed would follow in due course. Cain went ahead, with Duhig’s support, and purchased land at Ashgrove where he established not only a seminary for men but also a pious association for young women.\textsuperscript{75} However, for the growing number of Queensland young men seeking entrance to St Patrick’s College Manly and thus pushing its accommodation to its limits the need for a separate seminary in Queensland became urgent.

According to Kevin Walsh, in the late 1930s Queensland students made up nearly half of Manly’s enrolments and were adding to the accommodation problems of the New South Wales seminary.\textsuperscript{76} In one way this was good news for the Catholic bishops of Queensland because they were assured of an adequate supply of priests for the future. In another way the news was not so good. The bishops knew they had to provide alternative accommodation for the education and training of their priests.

When economic conditions had improved in 1935, Archbishop Duhig was happy to write, on behalf of all the bishops of the Queensland province, to the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Philip Bernardini, about a possible Queensland seminary. He wrote that the bishops considered that they were not in a position to establish seminaries, each for his own diocese. However, together they were prepared to commit themselves and their dioceses to the establishment of a regional or provincial
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seminary in the Archdiocese of Brisbane. However, Bernardini’s time in Australia was coming to an end and nothing further happened in the immediate future.

When Archbishop Bernardini’s term of office as Apostolic Delegate ended later that year he was replaced by the young and energetic Archbishop John Panico in March 1936. Panico was most enthusiastic about promoting the establishment of junior seminaries in Australia as prescribed by Canon Law. Walsh wrote: “He clearly pressured the bishops to give backing to the ‘new movement’ for preparatory colleges, unable to rest, it would seem, until every state in the Commonwealth, including Tasmania, began moving to establish its own.”

The new Apostolic Delegate to Australia soon made his presence felt among the Australian Bishops, especially in the matter of upgrading and establishing regional seminaries in accordance with the wishes of the Church. Panico was determined to put the current papal policy into practice in Australia as set out in Pius XI’s 1935 encyclical on the Catholic Priesthood, *Ad Catholici Sacerdotii*:

> There are some regions, where the dioceses are small, or students unhappily few, or where there is a shortage of means and suitable men. Hence it is impossible for every diocese to have its own seminary, equipped according to all the regulations of Canon Law and other prescriptions of the Church. Where this happens, it is most proper that
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the bishops of the district should help one another in brotherly charity, should concentrate and unite their forces in a common seminary, fully worthy of its high purpose.  

As the papal representative in Australia, he was intent on making sure that papal policy was implemented and determined to promote this end.

Shortly before coming to this country, Panico had been ordained a bishop at the level of archbishop, as was usual for the position of Apostolic Delegate. Panico was young and had arrived in Australia with a record of successes in minor roles in the Papal Diplomatic Corps.

Panico, very enthusiastic for the establishment of minor or junior seminaries in each Australian ecclesiastical province, became highly involved in the establishment of a Queensland seminary. In addition to Pius XI’s expressed preference for establishing regional seminaries, he was aware of Rome’s wish for regional seminaries, rather than a national seminary in Australia. He knew of the establishment of a Victorian regional seminary in 1923. No doubt he had made himself aware of the Queensland bishops’ intentions to establish a regional seminary communicated to his predecessor. As it so happened, Panico communicated, verbatim, his brief from the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda in Rome to expedite the establishment of the
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Queensland regional seminary: “Knowing well how much your Excellency has at heart the foundation of the Regional Seminary of Queensland, this Sacred Congregation trusts in your interest to have realized soon upon good principles this urgent and necessary an undertaking.”

He took this instruction seriously and zealously. In the same letter, writing in reference to the proposed Queensland seminary, he wrote to Duhig: “On the 1st March next year there will be held at the Delegation a meeting in which the Most Reverend Ordinaries of the Province of Queensland will take part to discuss and make necessary arrangements. The presence of your Grace will be needed at the meeting.” He had his eye firmly fixed on Queensland for a seminary and Brisbane for its site.

Given earlier proposals for a seminary in Queensland and no action to follow them up, Panico may have suspected some procrastination on the part of the Queensland bishops, particularly Duhig who had the payment of debts, and other projects, including the proposed Holy Name Cathedral, in the pipeline. However, John Panico, was determined to achieve, with and through those bishops, the establishment of a Queensland regional seminary.

---

86 Ibid.
87 Martin, op. cit., p. 7.
89 Martin, op. cit., p. 7.
Panico’s expressed his enthusiasm for establishing a minor seminary in Queensland when he revealed he had the means of facilitating his project at the expense of St Jude’s Seminary at Ashgrove. Duhig had quickly fallen into disfavour with Panico, who accused him of maladministration in his diocese. Among other complaints, including Duhig’s investment in oil exploration in the Roma area, Panico was able to single out St Jude’s Seminary and Mission House along with its founder, Father Walter Cain. Cain did not succeed in obtaining canonical approval to raise his pious association to the status of a religious society. In spite of this, his work was admired and respected. A Melbourne contributor to Brisbane’s Catholic Leader wrote: “St Jude’s is a vital fact in the Catholic life of Australia – the first religious Order for foreign missionary service ... a work of enormous importance.” It was where students were trained in a devotional spirit and learnt correct doctrine from capable theological instructors.

Cain was very successful in raising funds and gaining recruits, both male and female, for his missionary project but there were complaints. Many questioned ‘the … methods used in his magazine Filipinas’ and ‘the number of candles ablaze in St Jude’s Chapel.’ His ability to raise money in a time of depression attracted the jealousy of many of his clerical contemporaries. Archbishop Bernardini had concerns about Father Cain and his seminary and missionary activities, but Panico, in 1937, informed Duhig that Rome had suppressed the seminary and the male section
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of the association. A similar letter from Panico to Duhig followed declaring that the female branch of the pious association was to be disbanded. 96

This news did not escape the notice of the sectarian Protestants of Brisbane. The Protestant Clarion: A Paper of General Interest to All Protestants, whose producers were far from friendly towards anything Catholic, indicating that sectarianism was still very much alive, brought to the attention of its readers the closure of Father Cain’s seminary in an article, ‘Brisbane Priest’s Case, Rome Takes Action, Filippinas Suppressed.’ The article began:

Father Cain founded in Brisbane with the approval of Archbishop Duhig an Order of priests and nuns for the work in the Philippine Islands. He also published a newspaper which had the imprimatur of the Archbishop.

The paper was called the ‘Filippinas’ and it was circulated freely even among Protestants. It was through the instrumentality of this weekly journal that Father Cain got funds to build a large monastery at Ashgrove and to finance his ambitious missionary scheme.97

The article reported that Smith’s Weekly, a regular production of that time, claimed that Filippinas had practically offered to sell miracles from five shillings to one pound. It added that there was some doubt that Father Cain could deliver the goods but Filippinas published thanksgivings for the birth of calves and the coming of rain for which lamps burnt before the altar in the chapel of Father Cain’s seminary. The
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article concluded that Rome had intervened to close the seminary and suppress the paper.\footnote{Ibid.} Sectarian attacks such as this annoyed Duhig and the Catholics of Brisbane but they were not seriously damaging.

At the meeting of the Queensland bishops called by Archbishop John Panico on 1 - 3 March 1939, a decision was taken to establish a regional seminary,\footnote{Minutes of Meeting of Bishops of Queensland, 1, 2, & 3 March 1939, BAA.} one to serve the five dioceses of Queensland, rather than individual diocesan seminaries. As well as Archbishops Panico and Duhig, this meeting involved Bishops Romauld Hayes of Rockhampton, Basil Roper of Toowoomba, Hugh Ryan of Townsville and John Heavey, the Vicar Apostolic of Cooktown. This decision was made just a few years after the 100th anniversary of the arrival in Australia of John Bede Polding and about 80 years after James Quinn had arrived in Brisbane.

Their decision implied the launching of an institution where the focus was on obedience of the rules of its daily regulated system as compliance to the will of God. It was a system that uncritically accepted assumptions about the spiritual formation program for seminary students and their theological education. It was likewise a system that neglected the need for the pastoral formation of future priests. Young men were encouraged to seek entrance to seminaries and had been accepted on the condition that they would accept complete conformity to the seminary order. No provision was made for individual differences and personal autonomy was reduced to a minimum. Those who found seminary life unacceptable would be directed to leave...
if they had not done so of their own accord. Seminarians made four decisions: to come to the seminary, to live the life of prayer and obedience of the seminary, to accept a celibate life for the present and future, and to be ordained if the student’s bishop approved. All other decisions were made by Church authorities.

The minutes of the bishops’ meeting record several important stages of the progress of their deliberations. The delegate himself ‘informed the bishops that the Holy See had placed the Queensland regional seminary under the care of the Apostolic Delegate who sought the cooperation of the Queensland bishops in such an important undertaking.’ With the backing of Rome, Panico was taking over the direction of the seminary project. With tension already existing between Panico and Duhig, on Duhig’s part, such an intrusion would have been unwelcome. Most likely, the bishops including Duhig, out of respect for the Papacy, would have tolerated but not welcomed this interference of Panico.

The Vatican had suppressed Father Cain’s seminary but, in addition, it had taken charge of its funds. The minutes continue: “His Excellency further stated that the Holy See had graciously permitted the funds of the suppressed institutes of the Missionaries of the Holy Eucharist, to be used in the erection and endowment of the said regional seminary.” The resources of St Jude’s paved the way for the establishment of Banyo. This ensured that the bishops could not be excused from supporting the project because of the lack of funds. In fact, the Apostolic Delegate
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was handing to the Queensland bishops a site, a building and the facilities ready-made for their new seminary. However much the bishops were agreeable to the establishment of a seminary for Queensland, the decisions they made and the actions they took indicated they did not want their seminary established at the Ashgrove site.

Those present discussed the requirements of Canon Law for a preparatory seminary in each diocese, the type of seminary they wanted to establish and the experiences of a number of Religious Institutes with their Juniorates in Australia, their equivalents of a minor or preparatory seminary for a religious order. They then agreed: “A preparatory and philosophical seminary be established in Brisbane for the province of Queensland”. 102

This seminary would take its students to the secondary schooling Senior Matriculation standard and on to the first three years of their post school training for the priesthood. In deciding to establish a minor seminary in Queensland the bishops were breaking new ground. Until this time, established seminaries such as Manly and Werribee offered assistance only to students who needed to develop and upgrade their Latin skills before progressing to philosophical studies. The new seminary, the Delegate and the bishops decided, would begin as a full secondary school where the students, from as young as 13, would live, pray, and study under seminary conditions. Kevin Walsh wrote:
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Where the Pius XII College broke fresh ground was in undertaking to prepare youths in some numbers for Queensland’s Junior and Senior University Exams. That is to say, part of Banyo became what was called at the time ‘a minor seminary’ – a boarding school for boys of secondary school age who believed they had a vocation to the priesthood.103

Panico had been busy elsewhere. His efforts to establish minor seminaries in Australia were not confined to Queensland. At the official opening of Banyo he told the assembled gathering of the hierarchy, clergy, religious and laity, “In 1942, other seminaries of the same kind will be opened in Sydney, Adelaide and Perth.”104

In a letter to Archbishop Panico, consequent to the making of this decision, Luigi Cardinal Maglione, Papal Secretary of State, wrote, on behalf of the pontiff, Pius XII, an exuberant commendation of the bishops on their decision and paid special attention to the establishment of the future minor seminary;

While a good beginning has been made in equipping Australia with major seminaries, heretofore there had been no provision for the education of the aspirant to the Priesthood during the critical years which precede his entrance upon the study of philosophy. As an inevitable result, many vocations, awakened in the holy precincts of good Catholic homes, were weakened or lost for want of careful nurture and by the debilitating influences of secular contact. It is a source of profound spiritual joy ... that in Queensland, through the far-seeing wisdom and
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zeal of the bishops who have set their hand to the building of Australia’s first preparatory Seminary, this wastage of precious vocations is now at an end.\textsuperscript{105}

Maglione, like Panico, was expressing the faith of the Church in minor seminaries to attract young men in sufficient numbers and at an early age and train them as suitable priests for the future. To have minor seminaries accepting students from the age of 12 or 13 to protect any budding vocations from the temptations of the world was a custom of the Church that was not questioned. Their suitability for training young teenagers and the suitability of teenage boys for such training was not an issue for the Church, at least officially.

Further discussion led to the staffing of the seminary. It was a choice between finding diocesan priests to administer the seminary and teach there or inviting a religious order to do so. Much was said in favour of having diocesan priests but the fact remained that at that time there were no diocesan priests available to teach in the preparatory seminary. In view of this a further decision was made: “That the seminary be entrusted to the care of a religious congregation, and that the Society of Jesus be asked to undertake the work.”\textsuperscript{106}

The Jesuit Provincial, Father John Fahy, was summoned from Melbourne to the meeting the next day to discuss this possibility. He gave the Delegate and the bishops no reason to believe that the Jesuits could, with their present commitments, oblige the

\textsuperscript{105} Letter of L.Card. Maglione, on behalf of Pius XII to John Panico, 29 June 1939, BAA.

\textsuperscript{106} Minutes of Meeting, Bishops of Queensland, March 1, 2 & 3 1939, BAA.
gathered prelates. The meeting agreed to take the matter further to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda in Rome and to the Superior General of the Society of Jesus.\textsuperscript{107} The Superior General of the Jesuits later in 1939 replied that the Jesuits could not possibly staff the new seminary.\textsuperscript{108} The bishops then decided to staff the seminary with diocesan priests with the assistance of the Christian Brothers ‘pro tempore.’\textsuperscript{109}

The bishops also made an approach to the Vincentian Fathers’ Provincial, Father Richard Macken, to explore the possibility of this order providing staff for the seminary. According to Bishop Hayes of Rockhampton, then secretary of the bishops’ committee, “Father Macken said that his Congregation would be overjoyed to undertake such a work; that he thought they could supply priests to staff the Seminary fully in March 1941.”\textsuperscript{110} For whatever reason, possibly because some of the bishops favoured having diocesan priests for their seminary,\textsuperscript{111} despite the difficulties in supplying them, and the fact that Archbishop Panico had already obtained the acceptance of the Christian Brothers to staff the minor seminary, the Vincentians offer was not accepted. However, a report appeared in the \textit{Melbourne Advocate} that “the Vincentian Fathers are to take charge of the new Seminary in Brisbane.”\textsuperscript{112}

Father Macken, in an endeavour to put distance between his Congregation and the article in the \textit{Advocate}, wasted no time in writing to Archbishop Duhig denying the Vincentians were the source of information for the article.

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{108} Minutes of Meeting, Bishops of Queensland, 11 April, 1940. BAA.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110} Bishop Romauld Hayes, Letter to Bishops, 12 July, 1939, BAA.
\textsuperscript{111} Bishop Romauld Hayes, Letter to Bishops, 12 August, 1939, BAA.
\textsuperscript{112} Father Macken, Letter to Archbishop Duhig, 4 September, 1939, BAA.
On 23 April 1939, less than two months after this meeting, the Apostolic Delegate wrote to Bishop Hayes, Secretary of the Bishops’ Committee for the seminary, asking him to inform the other bishops that the Provincial of the Christian Brothers had responded to his request, made on behalf of the bishops, that “they should take care of the little seminary for what regards the secondary studies.” The Provincial of the Christian Brothers “expressed his pleasure for the great honour conferred on the Christian Brothers.” He added that he would write to the Brother General in Ireland to inform him of the proposal, assuring the Apostolic Delegate that this was a mere formality. “His Excellency may consider the answer already to be in the affirmative”. In a letter to his Superior General, Brother Provincial wrote: “Now it is the special wish of the A. Delegate and all the Bishops that our Brothers teach the Juniors. In fact I am to regard this as a command. So the A.D. put it.”

However, the road ahead was not all that smooth. The contract went through at least four drafts before it was actually signed to the satisfaction of the Bishops and the Christian Brothers. The Brothers were agreeable to providing four Brothers to teach the secular subjects of English, Latin, Italian, History, Mathematics and Science with the possibility of adding other subjects to prepare students for the Junior and Senior Examinations of the University of Queensland and to travel from nearby Nudgee College each day to the seminary to do so. The Brothers requested £150 per annum for each Christian Brother in response to the Bishops’ offer of £100. Eventually £120 was agreed upon with an agreement by the Bishops to raise this amount when
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sufficient funds became available. The Brothers were also requested to supervise students during their afternoon recreation period but they felt that they were unable to consent to this request. Possibly, the Brothers informed the bishops that the need to fulfil their religious and community responsibilities would preclude this. The agreement came into force when the Brothers commenced at Banyo in 1941.

A third issue discussed at the initial meeting of the Bishops with the Apostolic Delegate was the suitability of the existing property of St Jude’s Seminary for their purposes or whether another site should be found. Several matters relating to St Jude’s had to be clarified before any decision about the site of the new seminary could be determined. When St Jude’s had been suppressed the Redemptorist, Father Eric Dwyer, and two Sisters of Mercy had been designated as trustees of the property. Now that the Apostolic Delegate had given the Queensland Bishops access to this property, they decided to replace Father Dwyer and the two Sisters of Mercy with themselves, excluding Bishop Heavey, Vicar Apostolic of Cooktown, as the new trustees for their proposed seminary. That the bishops discussed the possible sale of the Ashgrove site to a religious order suggests that they were not in favour of establishing their seminary within the land and facilities of St Jude’s. The fact that they made plans to inspect other sites for their seminary confirms this. This was reinforced when Archbishop Panico wrote in the same letter to Bishop Hayes in

115 Queensland Bishops, Minutes of Meeting, “Wynberg”, No. 10, A., 16 April 1940, BAA.
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connection with the Christian Brothers’ willingness to teach students at the seminary, that the Marist Brothers had agreed to buy the Ashgrove site for £15 000.117

On the third day of their meeting they were greeted with the news of the election of Eugene Cardinal Pacelli as the new Pope who had selected the name of Pius XII. There and then they composed and sent a message to the new Holy Father. On Sunday, 9 March 1939, the Catholic Leader carried the following article under the headline: ‘Pius XII Seminary to Honour New Pope.’

The new seminary for the education of students for the Priesthood to be established in Queensland in the near future will be dedicated under the name of the new Pope Pius XII, said the Apostolic Delegate (the Most Rev. J Panico, DD), in a broadcast from 2FC on Friday night last.

Only a few days ago, he said, it had been decided at a meeting of the Bishops of Queensland, under the presidency of the Apostolic Delegate, to establish next year in Brisbane a regional seminary for Queensland.

… He announced … the following cable was sent to Rome:

… The election of Your Holiness as Supreme Pontiff has given unbounded joy to ourselves, our clergy, and our people. We pray God that your Pontificate be long, blessed and fruitful. With filial homage we implore the Apostolic blessing upon the new seminary, and humbly beg

117 Apostolic Delegate Letter to Bishop of Rockhampton, 23 April 1939, BAA.
the privilege of naming the institution the Pius XII Regional Seminary for Queensland.\textsuperscript{118}

In response to their cable, the Apostolic Delegate received a letter from Cardinal Maglione on behalf of the Pope congratulating the bishops on their decision to establish a seminary, in particular, a minor seminary, the first such seminary in Australia, for the “provision of the education of the aspirant to the Priesthood during the critical years preceding his entrance upon the study of philosophy.” The letter was dated the “Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul,” that is 29 June 1939. Fortuitously, Peter and Paul, saints and apostles, became regarded as the patron saints of the seminary and it was on their feast day or on a day near it, that, for many years, Banyo students were ordained to the priesthood. Maglione went on to indicate the spiritual benefits the new seminary would bring to Queensland and concluded: “From His heart of Priest and Pontiff, the Holy Father blesses the seminary which is to bear his name; He commends it in particular to the priests of Queensland; in suppliant prayer, He invokes upon it long and fruitful years of service to Christ and His Holy Church.”\textsuperscript{119}

At the end of their meeting the Apostolic Delegate and the Queensland Bishops resolved to meet again in Brisbane to inspect new sites for the seminary; and to interview a representative of Hennessey & Hennessey, Architects, at ‘Wynberg,’ the official residence of the Archbishop of Brisbane, at 10 am on 14 March.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{118} Catholic Leader, 6 March, 1939.
\textsuperscript{119} L.Card. Maglione, Letter on behalf of Pius XII to John Panico, 29 June 1939, BAA..
\textsuperscript{120} Minutes of Meeting of Bishops of Queensland, op. cit.
As regards the site, Duhig wrote to Archbishop Panico to inform him that “the bishops inspected two sites – one a particularly fine site commanding a magnificent view of the city, the bay and the river. This is the site likely to be approved of, and if so I shall be in a position to have it secured for seminary purposes as I have control of it.”  

On 27 March 1939, four Brisbane priests, Fathers Frank Burton, John English, Edward Barry, and James Kelly, wrote to Bishop Hayes telling him that in accordance with his directives in a letter of 18 March, “we have inspected several prospective sites, entailing travel over a distance of some eighty miles, and we are unanimously of the opinion that we have seen no site more suitable than at Nudgee.” On this recommendation and on the proposal of Archbishop Duhig, the Nudgee site was chosen. However, in gaining access to the property there were some minor complications.

The site belonged not to the Archdiocese of Brisbane but to the Estate of the late Bishop James O’Quinn. A map of the site obtained from the Queensland State Archives, includes the names of the following: E.M. Conlan, H. Griffin, B Murphy, M. Potter and J. Byrne, priests of the Diocese of Brisbane, as Trustees of the Estate. Solicitors for the estate, Thynne & Macartney, in a reply to a letter from Archbishop Duhig, a later and then the sole surviving trustee of the estate, wrote:

“...The lands forming part of the Estate of the late Bishop can only be used and applied
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as determined by the Trusts of the late Bishop’s Will, and in our opinion the lands belonging to the Estate which have been inspected can only be transferred to any other Trust or Order by way of ordinary sale and purchase.”

Following discussions between the solicitors and the bishops at their meeting on 28 March 1939, arrangements were made to transfer the property to the Bishops’ Committee as the Episcopal Corporation of Trustees of the Queensland Regional Seminary.

John Kelly, solicitor for the bishops, was commissioned to prepare documents for the Episcopal Corporation. One document set down that the Corporation consisted of the Archbishop of Brisbane and the Bishops of Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Townsville, that three of these were required to form a quorum and that the signatures of at least two members were needed for all legal documents (exempting cheques). The far north had to wait for formal representation on the Corporation of Trustees until the Vicariate Apostolic of Cooktown was established as the Diocese of Cairns. A second document directed the investing of the seminary site at Nudgee in the Corporation, while a third document covered investing all the Queensland properties of Father Cain’s pious association in the Corporation – from the former Trustees.

Later, at that same meeting, a representative of Hennessy & Hennessy, Architects, submitted a ground plan for the seminary. The architects’ representative estimated that the construction of the complete front of the building, one wing and the chapel would cost about £50 000. The Bishops discovered that they had nearly £60 000
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available for the seminary. On the advice of the estimated price of building, the bishops instructed the architects to prepare plans for presentation to the bishops for their next meeting in Sydney on Friday, 14 April.\textsuperscript{129} Progress was being made at a rapid rate. Within a month, the bishops had decided on a site and had commissioned plans for the buildings of the new seminary. Even a date, 13 August 1939, was selected for the laying of the foundation stone.\textsuperscript{130}

An unidentified extract, very likely from the architects’ notes for the bishops, provided a pre-construction description of the seminar that illustrates the bishops’ desire to make a notable contribution to the architectural environment of Brisbane:

The site for the New Seminary is 128 acres of elevated land, eight miles to the east of Brisbane, between Nudgee and Banyo. It overlooks the Bay, the city and the surrounding hills.

The building is designed to accommodate 100 students. It will be mainly of two stories, and will be constructed of cream brick with a green tiled roof. It has a frontage of 540 feet to complete the right wing, making the final overall frontage 680 feet.

The main front is distinctive for its colonnade, its tower and porte cochere. All the rear elevation at ground floor level is cloistered. The whole length of the building is not more than two rooms deep, so light and air are assured throughout.

\textsuperscript{129} Ibíd.
\textsuperscript{130} John Panico, Letter, No 516/39m Apostolic Delegation, 23 April, 1939 BAA.
The chapel is at the rear of the main building, and is on the main axis. It runs through two floors, and it has six small chapels arranged in chevet form around an ambulatory which separates the sanctuary.

The main ground floor is devoted to entrance, vestibule, parlour, class rooms, libraries, refectory, kitchen and cloisters. The whole of the upper floor is designed for professors’ and students’ rooms.

The building will be soundproof, and will be almost fireproof. All the materials in the structure are Australian, and mostly from Queensland.

Altogether the seminary is modern in its layout and is completely self-contained. It is being erected to the plans and under the supervision of Messrs. Hennessy and Hennessy, Architects, of Brisbane.

In response to a tender for £53 765, the contract for the construction of the seminary building was awarded to the firm of J. Hutchinson & Sons and a condition of the contract was that the building be completed by October 1940. Archbishop Duhig, unavailable at the time of the signing of the contract, wrote in a letter to Bishop Hayes, Secretary of the Corporation of Trustees of the Regional Seminary, that he was displeased that Hutchison and Sons had been given the contract. Duhig wrote: “I deeply regret that the contract was not given to Mr. E.J. Taylor, an exemplary Catholic young man.” Duhig suggested in the same letter that an architect working

---

131 Anonymous Document, Banyo File, BAA.
132 Web Site of Northgate Ward, Brisbane City Council in Madden, op.cit., 2008.
133 James Duhig, Letter to Bishop Romauld Hayes, 4 October, 1939.
134 Ibid.
for Hennessey & Hennessey had unduly influenced the decision in favour of Hutchinson & Sons.\textsuperscript{135}

The bishops’ announcement that the seminary was to be built on Beehive Hill at ‘Banyo’ was causing some consternation in the local Nudgee community. On 13 November a letter appeared in the Brisbane \textit{Telegraph}.\textsuperscript{136} The author, using the name, ‘Fairplay,’ wrote: “The Nudgee State School adjoins the site on which the Roman Catholic authorities are building their £53 000 seminary, yet in Press accounts the site is represented as belonging to Banyo and Toombul from which places it is distant some $1\frac{1}{4}$ and 3 miles respectively.” Another letter written directly to Archbishop Duhig, from J. L. Russell of Cameron St Nudgee read:

> The laying of the foundation stone of the Regional Seminary to be erected on Beehive Hill, Nudgee, is naturally causing widespread interest. To the hearts of the pioneers of the district and their descendants, the knowledge brought pride and joy, which has since been turned into dismay by the intended adoption of ‘Banyo’ as the ‘place’ name of the Institution. The site is in the district of Nudgee which goes back to antiquity; Banyo is of comparatively recent origin and has nothing historically to commend it.

> The noble and imposing edifice to be erected on the wonderful site with its beautiful panorama will worthily signalise the Pontificate of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. By attaching the rightful name Nudgee, will mean the association with it of the memory of that venerable prelate, the

\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Ibid.}  
\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Brisbane Telegraph} 13 November 1939.
late Bishop O’Quinn, who by the exercise of remarkable foresight and sagacity was instrumental in securing the Seminary site and that of the other Catholic Institutions.\(^{137}\)

To Archbishop Duhig, the Nudgee Postmaster wrote: “With reference to the enclosed letter to the *Telegraph* of 13 instant in referring to the new Seminary on Beehive Hill, some misunderstanding seems to have arisen as to whether the site is in Toombul, Banyo or Nudgee. I am in charge of the mail and telegram delivery of Nudgee and the seminary on Beehive Hill is within the Nudgee Postal delivery.”\(^{138}\)

These letters were written after the *Brisbane Telegraph* had published the following explanation of the use of ‘Banyo’ for the location of the new seminary: “The Roman Catholic Church authorities give Banyo as the place name of the seminary because it will be in the Banyo parish of the Brisbane Archdiocese and also to avoid any confusion with St Joseph’s College, Nudgee, and St Vincent’s Orphanage, Nudgee.”\(^{139}\) Whether this allayed the displeasure of the local population is not known but it does explain how the seminary acquired its ‘Banyo’ location.

On behalf of the bishops, Panico had approached the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary with the request that the order undertake “the material upkeep of the regional

\(^{137}\) J L Russell, Letter to Archbishop James Duhig, 16 November 1939, BAA.

\(^{138}\) Postmaster Nudgee, Letter to Archbishop Duhig, 17 November 1939, BAA.

\(^{139}\) *Brisbane Telegraph*, 13 November, 1939.
The author of this document quoted the ‘Memoirs’ of their foundress, Very Reverend Mother Mary of the Passion, where she wrote in 1892: “We began in Asia, and then went to Europe, Africa, America, now only Oceania remains.” Panico had become acquainted with this Institute during his terms as Secretary at the Nunciature of Argentina and Colombia. He knew they were seeking an opportunity to establish a foundation in this area of the world and approached their Mother General with a request for six sisters.

Panico was able to inform the Queensland Bishops in a letter of 1 December 1939 that the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary had agreed to come to Australia provided that they had “a small chapel in which they could have exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in accordance with their Rule.” This rule required each sister in every convent to spend time in prayer each day before the Blessed Sacrament exposed in a monstrance on the chapel altar. The Apostolic Delegate thought that this might seem incompatible with their seminary duties. However, the Mother General conceded that the time and length of the Exposition could be arranged to harmonize with the sisters duties at the seminary. Provision was consequently made in the planning and construction of the convent chapel and in designing the daily timetable so that the sisters at the seminary could daily carry out this spiritual exercise.

[140] Anon, Foundation at Banyo – 12 March, 1941, FMMA.
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The original intention was to send out the sisters from Rome but this became impossible at the time for 1940 war had broken out in Europe. “Mother General (M. Marguerite du Sacre Coeur) sent word to M. St. Michel, Provincial of South China, to send three sisters to start the work”.\textsuperscript{144} Arrangements were made to send three sisters from their houses at Nanking and Macau, part of their Chinese mission, to get this work under way.\textsuperscript{145} In a collection of notes gleaned from journals and letters made by Sr Madonna Purcell, the institute’s archivist in Australia, there is this remark in relation to Banyo: “This work was not our work as missionaries or according to our Constitutions, but taken as a means of gaining entry to Australia.”\textsuperscript{146}

An agreement between the Mother Superior of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary and the Episcopal Trustees of the Seminary was duly drawn up and signed. The sisters agreed to provide six sisters to undertake the domestic care of the Seminary. They were to take control of the affairs of the kitchen, laundry, nursing of sick students in the infirmary, and attending to kitchen, garden and poultry run. On their part the Bishops undertook to provide a suitable convent for the nuns where they were to have a chapel with the arrangements needed to have daily exposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament. They also agreed to pay £25 per year for each sister as well as medical care, board and material for making their habits. These payments were to commence from 1 September 1940. Provision was also made for the sisters to be assisted by reliable lay women.\textsuperscript{147} The agreement stipulated that priests on the staff

\textsuperscript{144} Anon. \textit{op.cit.}  
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had to approach the sisters through the rector, a situation likely to cause difficulties for the bursar in obtaining supplies for the kitchen and laundry.

In November 1939, Bishop Hayes of Rockhampton, acting on behalf of the Queensland Bishops, advised Dr Vincent Cleary, then a professor at St Columba’s College, Springwood, of his appointment as the first rector of the new seminary. In responding to his notification, Cleary wrote:

I need scarcely say that I am deeply interested in the noble work that the Seminary is, under God, destined to perform. I am also well aware of the heavy responsibilities that the position of rector will carry with it, and, in accepting this post of high honour, I pray that I may be given the guidance and courage that I need in order to carry out my duties fittingly.¹⁴⁸

Cleary, who had been on the staff of Sydney’s junior seminary, St Columba’s College, Springwood, had the best credentials for this position. For this reason Cleary was likely to know how to organise and relate to secondary school seminary students.

Vincent F. Cleary was born in Roma, Queensland in 1899. He was the son of Cornelius Joseph Cleary and his wife Mary (nee Gaffney) and he had one sister who became a member of the Brisbane Congregation of the Sisters of Mercy, taking the name of Sister Mary St Vincent. Cornelius Cleary was a policeman who held country

¹⁴⁸ Vincent Cleary, Letter to The Most Rev R Hayes, Bishop of Rockhampton, 16 November, 1939, BAA.
appointments, including one at Proserpine where the young Vincent attended the local state school.\textsuperscript{149} In 1911, Vincent Cleary went to board at St Joseph’s College, Nudgee, where he distinguished himself as a student and as an athlete.\textsuperscript{150} Vincent had a competitive spirit and was very fond of sport, especially cricket. His sporting competitiveness became very pronounced at Banyo when he captained students’ cricket teams. Following the completion of his schooling at Nudgee he went to St Columba’s College, Springwood, then on to St Patrick’s College, Manly, to study for the priesthood as a student of the Brisbane Archdiocese.

Following his ordination in 1921, Father Cleary worked in the parishes of Maryborough and Toowoomba before being appointed Diocesan Inspector of Schools. As a priest, Vincent Cleary became a man of many parts. In 1931 Cleary went, with the approval Archbishop Duhig, to the Catholic University in Washington to further his studies. While at the university he attended lectures in Economics, Sociology, and Philosophy. At the end of three years he was awarded the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy and later attended lectures in Economics, Sociology and Philosophy at Louvain. When he returned to Australia he was appointed to the staff of St Columba’s College, Springwood.\textsuperscript{151} From there he was often sought out as an occasional speaker to lecture on such topics as “The Church and the Worker” and “The Failure of Communism,”\textsuperscript{152} but he was not at the forefront of Church endorsed activities to fight Communism in the unions.

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Manly Magazine}, Manly Union: St Patrick’s College Manly,1940, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{152} Vincent F. Cleary, \textit{Catholic Leader}, 30 September, 1937.
In April 1940, the Bishops decided to pay Dr Cleary £200 per annum with an additional £100 per annum for expenses.  

Cleary spent 1940 travelling throughout the dioceses and parishes of Queensland where he spoke to parish congregations in churches on Sundays, and to boys in the scholarship and secondary school classes during the week. The text of his talk to boys, “Will You Also Go Away?” is found in a booklet produced by the Queensland Bishops on the occasion of the opening of the new seminary. Cleary made this appeal to the young men of Queensland:

> With your young lives opening out before you, have you no nobler ideals and no loftier ambitions than to spend your days in pleasure and amusement, while there are tens of thousands of Catholic people who need your spiritual aid, and hundreds of thousands of non-Catholics awaiting your help? Lift up your eyes and see the harvest before you – the most glorious work you can do for God and your State, and your beloved Australia.  

Today this style of appeal, accepted at the time, is regarded as hyperbolic and quaint. The results of his appeal show his style of rhetoric motivated its intended audience.

In asking his audiences of young men to think about the priesthood he told them:

> Many boys think they have no vocation because God does not make known His will to them in some visible outward sign. They think, also, in
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all humility, that “they are not good enough” for such a holy calling. No one is really worthy of such a great grace.

A boy has a vocation –

If he has a desire to be a priest – a desire which is strongest when the soul is in a reflective mood, for example, after Holy Communion or during a retreat.

If he has the right intention; if his motives are worthy, such as ‘I desire to be a priest to save souls; or to save my own soul more securely, or to be nearer to God.’ It is a right intention as long as it excludes selfish and unworthy motives.

If he is fit in soul and mind and body. The soul must have a certain degree of holiness – which will be perfected in the seminary. There must be some taste for prayer and holy things, and the boy’s character should be docile and open. There must be also ordinary intelligence. Hence a boy who passes his examinations with a good average, need have no doubts on this score. There must also be good health, a normal constitution, and the absence of any deformity.156

These were, what would be called today, the standard selection criteria for entrance to the seminary. Today selecting young men for a permanent life calling with such high demands for commitments to celibacy and obedience have been questioned, but in that era they were accepted and used. When Dr Cleary advised the Bishops

156 Ibid. pp. 10 – 11.
that he had gathered almost 60 students to commence at the seminary at the beginning of 1941, they expressed their joy and satisfaction with his work and offered him congratulations and gratitude for his efforts.

Because he had received instructions to go to the Dutch Indies in early August 1939, the Apostolic Delegate requested the postponement of the date of the laying of the foundation stone for the seminary building until 3 September.\textsuperscript{157} Eventually, “the foundation stone of the new Seminary was blessed on November 19, by His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, the Most Rev. J. Panico, S.T.D., J.U.D., in the presence of the Bishops of Queensland, the Most Rev. P. Farrelly, D.D., Coadjutor Bishop of Lismore, a large gathering of priests and a crowd of around 2000 people.”\textsuperscript{158} This was to be no ordinary occasion as is indicated by Archbishop Duhig’s announcement of 16 November 1939 sent to all parishes to be read out at Masses the previous Sunday:

This afternoon at 3.30 o’clock, on the site chosen at Banyo near Nudgee Orphanage, His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate will bless and place in position the Foundation Stone of the Pius XII Regional Seminary.

Trains will leave Central Station at 2 o’clock stopping at Brunswick St., Eagle Junction, Nundah and Banyo; and at ten minute intervals past 2 o’clock, stopping at all stations.

Buses will meet the trains on arrival at Banyo and convey visitors to the Seminary site.

\textsuperscript{157} John Panico, Letter, No 516/39m Apostolic Delegation, 23 April, 1939 BAA.

\textsuperscript{158} V.F. Cleary, “The Pius XII Provincial Seminary,” Manly Magazine, 1941.
Trains will leave Banyo for Brisbane, at 5 p.m. stopping at all stations; at
5.14 p.m. (express to Brunswick St.); and at 5.30 p.m. stopping at all
stations.

Buses for Banyo will leave Eagle Street every ten minutes from 1.45 p.m.
to 2.15 p.m. Return fare 1/6.

All our Catholic people are invited to attend this historic ceremony.
Members of the Holy Name Society, the H.A.C.B. Society, the Legion of
Mary and the Children of Mary are requested to be in regalia to form a
guard of honour for the Apostolic Delegate.

Donations will be received during the ceremony and will be
acknowledged duly in the “Catholic Leader.”

This was to be a momentous event for the Catholic Church of Queensland. It was the
occurrence of an ‘historic ceremony’ and the Archbishop issued to the Catholic
people of Brisbane what must have been the closest thing to a ‘command
performance.’ Those who knew Duhig would have suspected that it was the
Archbishop who organised buses to leave from Eagle Street every ten minutes and
who obtained the information about the trains, perhaps even organising Queensland
Railways to provide those trains. A crowd of 2000 people assembled at the seminary
site on that Sunday.

---

159 Archbishop James Duhig, Notice to Parishes for Announcement at Sunday Mass, 16 Nov 1939,
BAA.
160 Catholic Leader, November 23, 1939.
In his welcoming address, Archbishop Duhig spoke of the future seminary: “Of beautiful design and standing on this magnificent site, the seminary will be a notable addition not only to our Catholic institutions, but also to the architectural beauties of the city.” He then invited the Apostolic Delegate to bless and lay the foundation stone. “Before the stone was lowered into position, sealed vessels containing documents and papers were put into prepared cavities beneath it”. After the blessing and the laying of the foundation stone, Archbishop Panicho addressed the assembly. His address was followed by several other dignitaries present at Banyo on this occasion.

The inscription on the stone, under the coat-of-arms of Archbishop Panico, read:

THIS FOUNDATION STONE OF
THE PIUS XII REGIONAL SEMINARY
UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF ST PAUL THE APOSTLE
WAS BLESSED AND LAID
BY
HIS EXCELLENCY MOST REV. JOHN PANICO, D.D., J.UD.
APOSTOLIC DELEGATE
19TH NOVEMBER 1939

+JAMES ARCHBISHOP OF BRISBANE

161 Ibid.
162 Editor “The Origin of the Pius XII Seminary” Pianum: The Pius XII Seminary Annual, 1945, p. 54.
In his address on this occasion, Archbishop Panico expressed his high hopes for the seminary to be built on this spot:

There is not in my mind the slightest doubt that the whole Catholic Church in Queensland, the episcopate and clergy, both secular and regular, the religious communities, both men and women, the entire body of the faithful, will respond to the invitation of the Holy Father and provide tangible proof of their appreciation of the privilege of having here in Brisbane the first Regional Preparatory Seminary to be erected in Australia, the first Seminary in Australia honoured to bear the name of the august Pontiff.

The scope of this new Regional Preparatory Seminary, of which a beautiful Chapel will be the first part to be completed – as it should be in every Seminary – is to prepare in the most effective manner possible aspirants to the Priesthood in Queensland, so that they may be as worthy as human beings can be for this most sublime dignity that God confers on me … The Seminary should be called by all the Catholics of Queensland “Our Seminary.” Its welfare should be the personal interest of all, its
progress the desire of all, its success, unqualified and continual, the
prayer of all.\textsuperscript{165}

Bishop Hayes of Rockhampton outlined the proposed arrangements for the seminary
and publicly announced the appointment of Dr Vincent Cleary as its first rector.\textsuperscript{164}
After Bishop Ryan of Townsville and Bishop Roper of Toowoomba added their
felicitations, a letter from Luigi Cardinal Maglione, written on behalf of Pius XII, was
read to the assembly. Part of that letter read:

The Holy Father rejoiced to learn of the decision recently taken by the
bishops of Queensland to provide for the early training of ecclesiastical
students for their dioceses by the establishment of a regional seminary at
Brisbane.

It is a decision which is full of the fairest promise for the future of
Catholicity in the State of Queensland, and His Holiness devoutly hopes
that the good example which it sets may, as circumstances permit, be
followed in other parts of the great Commonwealth of Australia.... for
indeed in the plan of salvation given us by the Divine Master, the role of
the Priest is of such vital importance that it must ever be a prime concern
of the Church to ensure in every country a supply of wise and holy
ministers adequate to local needs. A long and varied experience has
shown that this end is achieved by means of the Seminary.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{163} Cleary, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Catholic Leader}, 23 November, 1939.
\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Ibid.}
In what was said and done that day, triumphalism, in the style of ‘church speak’ in vogue, prevailed. The laying of the foundation stone at Banyo meant that soon Queensland would be able to train its own priests for its own dioceses. This was the point they had reached after 160 years. Those who spoke were sincere in what they said. They fully believed that their expectations would be realized. They were not wrong in the short term but in the long term their confidently expressed vision came apart. After exploring the history of the Catholic Church in Australia that led to the founding of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, what follows in the chapters ahead is the exploration of its coming apart.

Following the laying of the Foundation Stone until March 1941, preparations for the opening of the seminary continued. Originally it was hoped that the seminary would be ready by 1 March 1941 but, because of delays in the construction of buildings that had to be put off for three more weeks. The first intake of students arrived on 22 March 1941 to commence living each day by the rules that regulated their prayer and study as well as their personal and student lives. They were the results of the continued efforts in this state and this country to provide Australian priests for the Catholic Church in Australia and, in this case, for the dioceses of Queensland.
In his seminary recollections, Father Bernard Kane, an original Banyo student in March 1941, recalled: “We went to Banyo to become priests. What that meant then we did not know. That is why we went to Banyo, so the priests there could tell us.”

Bernie Kane implied he expected to undergo a personal transformation so that he could be identified as a Catholic priest. He and his fellow students believed that through a process they accepted as ‘seminary formation’ they would change from just being Catholic young laymen to seeing themselves and having others see them as Catholic priests. An examination of what this seminary formation entailed, by what means it took place, and how effective and appropriate was that process of formation during these beginning years of the seminary with its first rector constitutes the focus of concern in this discussion of Banyo’s first 14 years.

It commences with a tentative definition of formation in contemporary settings. What is considered as ‘formation’ can be better thought of as ‘transformation,’ and in this context as a person moving from one ‘concept of self’ to another. In a consideration of what occurs in formation programs, formation itself is seen as a complex process taking place within an individual through guided individual and social activities and through critical reflection on previous life experiences, education, and training to shape and reshape the beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviours of the person being

---

1 Bernard Kane, Interview, 4 August 2007.
formed towards a specified ideal. This was not the process of Banyo in 1941 and for 25 years after.

The inherited, monastic style, Tridentine seminary formation was a mechanical type process administered by people not fully aware of what was involved or required to effect the transformation envisaged. Those who administered the process assumed that seminarians, kept under careful supervision while immersed in this system, would emerge with the necessary personal qualities of a priest by complying with what the system demanded. Close supervision and self examination were the means of identifying and removing those who did not conform. Through examining the way the spiritual and theological studies programs were offered, the miniscule training students received in skills for worship and pastoral care, and the human development activities that took place informally and incidentally, it became evident that this mechanical style process of formation was only partly successful. Evidence of this emerged during the term of the first rector, Dr Vincent Cleary.

On their arrival at Banyo, first day students were immediately introduced to the seminary’s daily, rule-regulated regime to which they were expected to conform. One month later, on the day of the official opening of the seminary, the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Panico, impressed on them the necessity of ‘keeping the rules’ when he presented each student with a copy of *The Seminary Rules*, reminding them that the rules were “drawn up by your Bishops after mature study and have

---

furthermore been approved by the Holy See.”³ As he did so, he added: “For you ... they represent the voice of your Bishops and the voice of the Holy Father, and the voice of God himself.”⁴ Panico thus placed a heavy and an exacting obligation on those students and those to follow them to obey those rules. Such obedience was an important sign of their progress in holiness.

He also presented them with another little booklet, Esto Fideles, compiled from the ascetical writings of Monsignor Vincent Tarozzi. In these two booklets, Archbishop Panico said: “You will find the way to sanctify your seminary life in the various actions of your day: in them you will find a sure path that will lead you to perfection and holiness.”⁵ The Apostolic Delegate gave them to realize that demonstrating they had the ability and willingness to persistently observe seminary rules was one of the most important features of their seminary formation. Erving Goffman regarded living in isolation from mainstream society and conforming to rules as administered by the rector as the conditions of a ‘total institution.’⁶

The students had come to Banyo to test their vocation to the priesthood and to have it tested, hoping one day to be ordained as priests. They had come with a sense of being called by God to the priesthood. They believed that if students lived apart from society in the regulated life of the isolated seminary and successfully kept its rules, seminary authorities would deem them suitable for ordination. The system was the instrument of formation. Seminary authorities intervened to make adjustments in

³ Archbishop John Panico, Catholic Leader, 1 May 1941.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
applying the system as they thought necessary. The ability to persevere in this life signalled that the seminarian had been formed in a manner that enabled him to successfully live the life of a priest.

Seminary life entailed working, playing and sleeping under the same roof where all activities were carried out at the direction of the rector; everything was done together according to a strict daily schedule; all were subjected to the same treatment in accordance with a system of rules formally imposed by the rector; and, theoretically, all were treated alike. Everything was done according to the action plan underlying those rules to achieve the aim of the institution, namely, to produce obedient young men for ordination to the priesthood.7

Young men at Banyo, pursuing the common goal of the priesthood, accepted to live an isolated life apart from their families and friends and without newspapers, radios and other contacts with the outside world. They accepted rules of observing silences and following the same daily program. They gave up their individual clothing, agreeing to wear the clerical dress of soutane and collar. Recollections indicated that students began their seminary days with a realization and contentment in being on the road to the priesthood and most regarded the wearing of clerical attire as a privilege. Living voluntarily in isolation was not easy but if this was what was required for the priesthood they were prepared to accept these conditions.8 Students of those first years at Banyo committed themselves in faith to that system in the hope of becoming ordained priests.

7 Ibid., p. 17.
This type of life in the seminary closely resembled that of a monastery for monks and a convent for nuns. Their daily life was organised around prayer, study, and recreation which often took the form of work. This approach to seminary training was not unlike the method of training used in military and police academies of that era. In fact, these institutions had much in common with prisons and asylums for the mentally ill. All displayed the basic characteristics of isolation, a communal life, a programmed day, and strict obedience to a superior found in a ‘total institution.’

Queensland Catholic people had great hopes for their new seminary. In response to “a cordial invitation to be present,” extended to “all interested in the Seminary and its work,” issued through the Catholic Leader and parishes, an estimated crowd of 10,000 gathered at Banyo on Sunday, 27 April 1941. That day, His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, Most Rev. John Panico, in the presence of the Queensland bishops, the Archbishops of Sydney, Hobart and Adelaide, and seven diocesan bishops from interstate, officially blessed and opened the new seminary. The tremendous support given by the Catholic people of Queensland for the new seminary had been demonstrated in total donations of £24,215, collected before the opening. Special trains and buses, including a special train from Toowoomba, were organised to transport all who wished to attend the opening ceremony.

---

9 Goffman, op. cit., p. 15.
11 “Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Formal Blessing and Opening,” (Advertisement), Catholic Leader, 10 April 1941.
12c Pius XII Provincial Seminary,” Catholic Leader, 1 May 1941.
13 Editor, “The Origin of the Pius XII Seminary,” Pianum, 1945, p. 55
14 “Pius XII Provincial Seminary Appeal for Funds,” Catholic Leader, 10 April 1941.
In 1941, all students commenced their studies as secondary school students in the minor seminary. During the official opening, Archbishop Panico declared: “The aim of minor seminaries ... is to prepare in the most effective way, youths who are aspirants to the Priesthood, so that they may be as worthy as human beings can be for the sublimest dignity that God confers on men.”\(^\text{15}\) Panico then expressed his confidence that Banyo, as a minor seminary, would realize this aim: “The minor seminaries will contribute to increase the number of priests, will improve the formation of priestly virtues in the candidates for Priesthood, and will thus, with God’s kindly help, furnish the Church with a clergy marked by holiness and learning in a high and excellent degree.”\(^\text{16}\) In the contemporary ‘wisdom of the Church,’ innocent teenagers with leanings towards the priesthood should be taken into isolation to protect them from the worldly influences of lust, greed, and power that could divert them from the ‘priestly calling.’ For Panico the ‘total institution’ monastic structure of the Tridentine seminary entrusted for its development to its rector, Dr Vincent Cleary, was the ‘most effective way’ to train young and innocent teenagers from the commencement of their secondary schooling to become holy and learned priests.

The original group of 56 young students were made up of 17 for the Archdiocese of Brisbane, 13 for the Diocese of Rockhampton, 19 for the Diocese of Toowoomba, and 7 for the Diocese of Townsville. The group included two New Zealanders, Brian and Des McMullen. As students at Nudgee College they had been preparing to join St Jude’s missionary seminary, Ashgrove, to train as priests for the Philippine

\(^{15}\) Archbishop John Panico, ‘Address at the Opening of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary,’ 27 April 1941, reported in the Catholic Leader, 1 May 1941.

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
Islands. When Roman authorities closed down St Jude’s, they chose to train at Banyo. Brian for the Archdiocese of Brisbane and Des for the Townsville Diocese. Students were not recruited for the Vicariate Apostolic of Cooktown, still a missionary territory under the care of the Augustinian Fathers whose bishop, the Vicar Apostolic, was also a member of the Augustinian order.\(^\text{17}\)

The new students had arrived at Banyo from Brisbane, Ipswich and Toowoomba and further away places such as Emerald, Rockhampton and Townsville on Saturday afternoon, 22 March, 1941.\(^\text{18}\) That morning, a group of Toowoomba young men had boarded the Brisbane train, travelling in a carriage reserved for them, most likely by Michael Garrrahya, a Queensland Railway guard, whose two sons, Dan and Frank, were members of that group.\(^\text{19}\) Away from their homes and through the life they had now subjected themselves to in the loneliness of a strict seminary, all new seminarians commenced the process of discerning whether their attraction to the priesthood was a calling from God.

Most of the original Banyo students were school boys, some as young as 12, but others, like Mick Lanigan, Neil O’Donohoe, and Bernie Kane, had spent several years in the workforce. In a speech given during the launching of the Holy Spirit Seminary in 2008, Bishop Ray Benjamin, a first day Banyo student, recalled:

---

\(^\text{18}\) List of First Day Banyo Students, 1941, TDA.
\(^\text{19}\) Toowoomba First Day Students, Brian O'Dwyer, Interview, 28 February, 2008; and Bernie Kane, Interview, 4 August 2007.
What a strange group the 56 were. Some were grown men who had previously worked for a living; two from New Zealand had earlier tried their vocation in Father Cain’s ill-fated seminary in Ashgrove. There were ex-farmers, ex-butchers, and we were from all corners of the State of Queensland. Most, like me, were straight from school; but at so many different age levels, right down to the youngest who had just completed primary school. A few were as young as twelve years old. And here we were, thrown together as one community, sharing a totally unfamiliar lifestyle, because we all felt called by God to this place, on the road to the goal of the priesthood.²⁰

That group of young men embarking on seminary held the hope of being ordained within the next eight to 11 years.

Their paths to Banyo and the path of those who followed in subsequent years had been similar. They came from strong Catholic, mostly Irish working class, homes where parents took their children to Sunday Mass. Many went to Mass on weekday mornings as well when as altar boys they served Mass for the priests of the parish. Their families regularly recited the Rosary and other prayers together in their homes. Their parents were members of parish sodalities and societies. They assisted at parish fetes and balls as well as other parish and school functions. They had known the priests of the parish through the parish visitation of homes and through the Catholic schools they attended. Many admired their priests because of those priests’ interest in

their families, schools and communities, especially the sporting communities. All these influences came together in a way that told them that God could be calling them to the priesthood and suggesting to them to apply for entrance to the seminary. In a time when authority was accepted and respected they had learnt to obey and conform. 21

The new seminarians were the first fruits of Dr Cleary’s recruiting drive throughout the Queensland dioceses. At the end of 1939, he had been directed by the Queensland bishops to conduct this recruiting drive. 22 About the results of his efforts in Toowoomba, Cleary proudly wrote that he was most gratified with the results of his appeal to young men to give their lives to the service of God, results that had exceeded his highest expectations. 23

Surviving first day students and several who entered the seminary in those early years remembered how Dr Cleary’s visits to their schools to speak to them about the new seminary had prompted them to seek entrance to it. 24 While some of Cleary’s recruits had left school and reached a mature age, not one had completed his secondary education, then a requirement before commencing the prescribed course of studies for the priesthood. Many were very young and had only completed primary
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22 V. F. Cleary, Letter to Bishop Romauld Hayes, December, 1939, BAA.
23 V. F. Cleary, “The Pius XII Seminary,” Toowoomba Parish Notes, June, 1940, TBA.
schooling. Of the 56 that arrived at Banyo, only 26 were eventually ordained priests. Ray Benjamin was ordained and later became Bishop of Townsville.25

Originally the students had expected to take up residence on 1 March, but could not because the seminary building was not ready for occupation. Denis Martin explained that with the war already declared in Europe and with so many young men enlisted in the armed services, both labour and building materials were in short supply. Work continued but the slow rate meant the seminary could not accommodate students until 22 March 1941.26

While the effects of the war in Europe impeded progress in the construction of the new seminary, an article critical of the official opening of Banyo appeared in The Protestant Clarion – A Paper of General Interest to all Protestants The Protestant Clarion – A Paper of General Interest to all Protestants, often called ‘The Clarion,’ which suggested that its sectarian sponsors would have preferred to have had the buildings stopped completely. The article entitled: ‘Banyo Seminary opened by an Italian – Wanton Waste in Time of Crisis.’ read:

Dr Panico, Papal Delegate, a full blooded Italian, enjoying complete freedom and action under special privileges granted such legates from the neutral Vatican State, headquarters of the Pope of Rome, who claims spiritual and temporal kingship over thousands of Catholics in this

26 Martin, op.cit.
country ... opened the new Catholic seminary at Banyo on Sunday 27 April. ...

The seminary is not an educational or cultural institution, but a training ground for priests of the Roman Catholic Church. It has been built at the cost of £80 000 of Australian (mostly Queensland) money. Dr Panico announced to the thousands present, amongst whom were prominent Protestants, that it intended to build five or six of these £80 000 seminaries in Australia for the purpose of training men to care for the spiritual lives of the people of Australia ...

This country, as a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, is facing the gravest crisis in the long history of the British Empire. Our leaders are crying out for every available penny to feed, clothe and equip our men at the front, or those in training and will eventually go overseas or be called upon to defend these shores against the German and Italian hordes. Yet while this cry goes up for money and more money the Roman Catholic Church, under the spiritual and temporal heel of an Italian, is spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on seminaries.27

‘The Clarion’ claimed thousands of pounds had been sunk into bricks and mortar when “Australia’s very existence as a free, democratic country hangs in the balance.”28 While these protests of ‘sectarian’ Protestantism may have annoyed but not deterred Duhig, some people still admire the way the Queensland Bishops ignored this opposition and proceeded successfully with establishing their
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27 The Protestant Clarion – A Paper of General Interest to all Protestants, Brisbane: Clarion Press, 1 May 1941.
28 Ibid.
Banyo students, because of their isolation, remained ignorant of this opposition to their seminary as they had no access to ‘The Clarion’ or any other media sources.

On their first day, many new students arrived accompanied by their families and gathered in the seminary grounds that afternoon. As it was then exceptional to own a family car, most had come as far as the Banyo railway station by train. From there they walked up to Beehive Hill site to see the unfinished seminary buildings. A seminary employee, with horse and dray, collected their luggage for transportation to the seminary. This was an occasion for new students and their families to meet one another. Around five o’clock, the rector, the Very Reverend Dr V.F. Cleary, M.A., Ph. D., appeared, greeted them and ushered them into the seminary building. He directed them to farewell their families and guided them on a short inspection tour of the seminary buildings. In that short event they became separated from their families and the rest of their world, confined themselves in isolation, and submitted to the rector’s authority.

After the inspection Dr Cleary took them to dormitories that would be home for many of them for the next few years. Within a few days they were organised into an order of seniority and their beds in the dormitory, their places in chapel, in the refectory, and in class were allocated according to that order. With pride they changed into their soutanes and collars for the first time for they were now clerical
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29 During the course of the research, the author was reminded of this several times. One of these reminders came from Michael Sullivan, a former Banyo student (1958 – 1959).
students preparing for the priesthood. They then proceeded to the refectory for their first frugal evening meal.

As rector, Dr Cleary (1941 – 1953) guided every facet of the lives of seminarians. Student recollections of his manner of exercising his authority indicate that, in every sense, he was a commanding man. He was the boss, he wanted everyone to know it, and indeed, everyone did know it. They learned too that he was an ardent cricketer, even an obsessive one, who obliged every student to play in the weekly seminary matches. When he became rector of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary he had been ordained twenty years and had recently celebrated his 42nd birthday. Three other priests, Dr Ray O’Donohoe, as vice rector and bursar, Fathers Kevin Skehan, as spiritual director, and John Rossenskjar, a priest ordained only the previous year, as the dean of discipline, had been appointed to the seminary staff.

Cleary was clearly aware of the qualities he was commissioned to develop in the future priests under his guidance. His thoughts are contained in his 1946 Annual Report and are based on Pius XI’s Encyclical Letter, Ad Catholici Sacerdotii (The Catholic Priesthood), containing the Church’s doctrine on the priesthood and its implications for practice. He believed the task and duty of the seminary was to bring about changes in its students that would form them according to the model set down

33 Denis W Martin, Priests of 1928, Brisbane: Brisbane Catholic Archives, p. 189.
by Pius XI. Thus, in the words of Goffman, as a ‘total institution,’ a seminary was a ‘forcing house for changing persons,’\textsuperscript{37} for which it had a rational plan embedded in its system for bringing about the specific changes required in students for the priesthood. Without any awareness of the seminary being a ‘total institution,’ Cleary believed that the seminary was structured towards the purpose of changing its students and that system was made effectively operational by its staff, especially its rector and, to some extent, the spiritual director.

In that report Cleary said, “the greatness, the dignity and the duty of the Christian Priesthood are expressed by St Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians: ‘Let a man so account of us as the ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God’ (I Cor. 4: 1 - 2).\textsuperscript{38} He continued: “The priest is a minister of Christ, an instrument in His hands, and hence perpetuates His work and is fittingly and in a special sense called alter Christus, meaning ‘another Christ.’”\textsuperscript{39} Cleary described the priest as a “Homo Dei, that is, a man of God or a man entirely dedicated to the service of God.”\textsuperscript{40} As ‘another Christ’ and as a ‘man of God’ the priest, in dispensing the mysteries of God, was required to work in compliance with the teachings and discipline of the Catholic Church. Priests, as agents of the Church, had to be obedient men supporting the Pope and the bishops. As ‘other Christs’ they needed to be trained with a willing commitment to act in this manner.

\textsuperscript{37} Goffman, op. cit., p. 22.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., p. 22.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid. p., 22.
To be ‘another Christ’ and a ‘man of God’ devoted to God’s service, Cleary declared that a priest must cultivate certain virtues, namely: Godliness as a creature of God and, as such, offer God worship and service;\textsuperscript{41} chastity, described as “the most precious treasure of the Catholic Priesthood” but not explained;\textsuperscript{42} and zeal with which we must burn “to bring the truths of faith and the life of grace into the reach of all.”\textsuperscript{43} Finally, Cleary identified obedience, emphasising the obedience of Christ to the will of his Father, the same Christ who was obedient even unto death.\textsuperscript{44} Regarding obedience, Cleary said, “The example of Our Divine Model shows how even the greatest zeal should be tempered by obedience, obedience to God as manifested by the voice of our immediate superiors.”\textsuperscript{45} For a priest, obedience, and in the seminary obedience to him, was in Cleary’s view the foundation virtue.

The acquisition of knowledge and the development of intellectual skills were important for students for the priesthood, but Banyo was more than just a boarding school. Students were there to learn how to be obedient to the Pope, their bishops and those who take their place, especially their future parish priests. Accepting and undertaking the duties and activities of the seminary in a spirit of obedience was seen as essential to the cultivation of their priestly obedience. This task of supervising the observation of the rules and the carrying out duties belonged specifically to Cleary.\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[41] \textit{Ibid.} p., 22.
\item[42] \textit{Ibid.} p., 22.
\item[43] \textit{Ibid.} pp., 22 – 23.
\item[44] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 23.
\item[45] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 23.
\end{footnotes}
Cleary did not share authority easily with fellow members of staff which included Dr Guilford Young, Dr Bill Smith, Father Tom Armstrong, Father Morgan Howe, Father Lex Carroll, Father Bernard Wallace, and Father Dave Hawe. Two young priests from among those from Banyo ordained in the early years, Father Neville Grundy and Father John Clarke, later joined the staff to teach in the minor seminary. In his “Report of 1948 Episcopal Visitation to Banyo,” Bishop Basil Roper identified Cleary’s autocratic leanings: “The rector believes that it is the policy of the Church to have a strong rector, with little in the way of democratic control and that the Church has the same general ideas about the control for a seminary as about a parish or a diocese.” When, at the beginning of 1942, Dr Cornelius Roberts arrived at Banyo as its vice-rector, he found there was little for him to do in the management of the seminary except during those periods when Cleary was not in residence. Cleary’s relationships with his staff were constantly under strain. Some students believed he was jealous of the flamboyant Dr Guilford Young’s popularity with students and students’ appreciation of the way Father Morgan Howe presented his classes on Catholic Social Teachings so interestingly. Morgan Howe’s area of teaching coincided with the area of study Cleary had pursued for his postgraduate qualifications. Here again it was a case of Cleary not wanting to be seen as being outshone by any of his subordinates.

Cleary differed in the view he took of his task of supervision from that generally accepted at the time. According to Bishop Roper, “He firmly believed that a display of police powers or a coercive spirit would be undesirable. The students should be urged to keep the rule because their observance is important for character building

---

49 Doyle, op.cit.
and for the formation of virtue.” However, Cleary does not seem to have realised that his manner of ‘urging’ did not have the desired effect on the way students complied with the rules and his directives.

While Cleary tried to encourage self-discipline in his students, there were times when he had to directly confront those who broke rules. When they were caught Cleary was ready to forgive some but quite harsh on others, something students saw as favouritism and lack of impartiality. This approach tended to undermine him as a disciplinarian. Cleary could not match his practices with his ideals, thus lacking the charisma for inspiring responsible behaviour in students. Nor did Cleary realize that young people can be adventurous and willing to take risks to see how far they can extend behaviour boundaries without being checked. Some students tried to take advantage of Cleary’s style of supervision.

Another function of the rule-based, highly regulated monastic lifestyle of the seminary was to form seminarians with a spirit of humility. Like Christ, students were to become humble men, a quality which, if firmly established in the seminary, would support and strengthen them as priests. To do so a student had to strip himself of his ‘old self’ and become ‘another Christ’, a man formed in ‘the image of Christ.’ Basic to such a formally administered life for bringing about its desired outcome were stripping and mortification processes.

50 Bishop Basil Roper, “‘Report of visitation of Pius XII Seminary, Banyo,” 22 November 1948 BAA.
53 Bill McKewon, Interview, 18 August, 2008
In the seminary, the stripping process entailed losing one’s individual identity through the removal of personal identity items and dressing in the prescribed seminary clerical attire of soutane and collar. This was a reminder that they were ‘putting on Christ.’ It likewise demanded the mortification of self through the series of abasements and humiliations, a dying to self, built into the regulated life.\(^{54}\) The elimination of individual decision making and the exercise of personal autonomy in the regulated daily life of doing all things together at the same time constituted the principal mortification. Restriction of movement to the seminary site, sending and receiving personal mail opened, and foregoing access to newspapers, radio and telephones were among other mortifications built into the seminary system.

In the way he related to students, Cleary gave the impression that humility was learned through humiliation and that he was the one to do the humiliating. He could be harassing towards students who had broken rules. According to John Buckley: “His was a rule of fear and for most of us he was unapproachable. He was always stressing the need for obedience and humility. Sometimes I felt that he regarded humility as the virtue to be practised by others rather than himself.”\(^{55}\)

During the morning and evening meals, students ate in silence while they took it in turns to read from a set book. The rector and students listened for inappropriately pronounced words which he duly noted. It was a case of priests not being just men of learning but being seen as men of learning. For most students, having to read in the refectory in the presence of the rector and professorial staff was an ordeal in itself.

\(^{54}\) Goffman, \textit{op.cit.} pp. 27 – 28.
\(^{55}\) Buckley, \textit{op. cit.}
Knowing that their reading was being scrutinised for the words they mispronounced only added further stress. No formal preparation or support was given for this task; it was a case of learn by doing. In time most did become effective readers and, in retrospect, many were grateful for this exercise. However, being singled out by Cleary for mispronouncing words was a humiliating experience. Bill McKewon knew what this was like when Cleary confronted him after he had read in the refectory. “Man, man, man,” he shouted at him, “you can say ‘again and again’ or ‘agin and agin’ but you can’t say ‘again and agin.”’

Cleary behaved in a similar manner when a student upset him during a cricket match.

After lectures each day, as well as Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons were recreation times. Everyone except the sacristans who looked after the altar and the priests’ vestments was expected to be involved in sport. Students could play cricket, football, tennis, basketball and become involved in athletics. Work in the garden growing vegetables and attending the fowl house were other activities. A small tightly knit group collected firewood for the boiler room from across the road. Students enjoyed their recreation times and activities. But, cricket was another thing.

Brian O’Dwyer recalled: “In Cleary’s time at Banyo, it was essential to be involved in sport, especially cricket. Mgr Cleary loved sport generally and cricket specially, and found a way of mixing with students by playing cricket with them.” Col Hickey remembered, “Monsignor Cleary was a great sporting enthusiast. He was almost fanatical about his cricket and about students playing cricket.”
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thought: “Good cricketers seemed to get on very well with the rector.” Matches were played on Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday afternoons. Cleary captained his own hand-picked team. He was very competitive, always out to win, and never ready to concede defeat. Students incurred his ‘wrath’ if they failed to take a catch. “Man, man, man!” he would shout, “if you can’t catch a cricket ball, how can you expect to be ordained a priest?” Many years later Denis Martin wrote: “The one thing former students of his time as rector remembered is his love of cricket. It was like another seminary subject and those who were not passionate about it always felt out of favour.” Cleary was keen on athletics and arranged an annual athletic competition for Banyo students with St Joseph’s College, Nudgee and St Columban’s College, Albion Heights.

Dr Cleary’s relationship with the Franciscan sisters was not always harmonious. At times he was over demanding with and somewhat neglectful of the pastoral care he was expected to extend to them. The three Sisters of this order M. De la Merci (Henriette van Oost), M. Madeline de St Victor (Eulalie Campain), and M.Phillomene de St Gisbert (Virginie Debyyn) had come by boat from China via Hong Kong to Sydney and then on to Brisbane by rail where they were met in person by Archbishop James Duhig. After staying with the Sisters of Mercy at All Hallows
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until their own convent was ready for occupation, they took up residence at Banyo on 12 March 1941, ten days before the students arrived.65

In early April, Hilda Neaves, an ‘associate sister,’ joined the Banyo community and on 26th May, M. Clarella and Sister Dorena arrived from the United States. Sister Dorena, a happy Irishwoman later known as Sister Anne Feeney, became the best known of the Banyo sisters to the students. She looked after the dining room until 1943 then the kitchen as the seminary cook until 1972.66 The sisters remained as housekeepers for the Banyo seminary for 35 years from its opening in 1941.67

Sr Madeline who was first assigned the cooking duties had no experience with the kind of work she had to do and had to learn to use a wood and coal stove by trial and error. Dr Cleary made out a weekly menu for her in which he included steamed pudding. Not having any idea of what a steamed pudding could be she avoided making one until Dr Cleary pointed out the twelve shining new moulds for steam puddings in the kitchen. Following this she did manage to make the steam puddings with the help of some jam but the custard had to wait until a few weeks later.68

On at least one occasion, Archbishop Duhig’s intervention was needed. Then he had reported to the Apostolic Delegate:

65 “Foundation at Banyo – 12 March 1941,” undated, FFM Archives.
66 Ibid.
68 op.cit. FMM Archives.
Questioning the Reverend Mother I found the relations between the Rev. Rector of the Seminary and herself are rather strained. She said that although the Sisters and herself have constantly endeavoured to render the best possible service to the professors and students, Dr Cleary seems never to be satisfied. ... The Mother Superior further said that the rector is constantly objecting to the amount of the House Accounts and to the volume of water used for domestic purposes. About these matters he wrote notes which she has shown me.\footnote{Archbishop James Duhig, ‘Canonical Visitation of Franciscan Missionaries of Mary,’ Banyo, Undated, BAA.}

Notes written in Cleary’s hand were found in the Brisbane Archdiocesan Archives. They are concerned with the kinds, the amounts, and the prices of foods purchased. Cleary’s plea was, “Please help us to keep our bills down.”\footnote{Rev Dr Vincent Cleary, ‘Notes to Franciscan Missionaries of Mary,’ Undated, BAA.} Following this period of tension at Banyo between Cleary and the nuns a letter was sent from the bishops to the Mother Superior of the Banyo Convent in June 1943, expressing “their sincere pleasure and deep satisfaction with the work of the Franciscan Sisters of Mary at the Pius XII Seminary.”\footnote{Secretary of the Bishops-Trustees. “Letter to the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary,” 9 June 1943 BAA}

Although committed to his role and the tasks entailed as rector of the Banyo seminary, Cleary did not have the skills to effectively manage seminary personnel, especially the students. This was made worse through the use of the impersonal and mechanical style monastic system to regulate the daily life of the seminary. Cleary was able to keep the daily order under control mainly because the students through their home and school training came to Banyo as compliant young men ready to accept whatever was laid out for them. They ‘obeyed’ as actors performing a role
rather than from any deep inner conviction. Disorder did emerge when students latently demonstrated their readiness to be unwilling to comply.

Underlying spiritual training the motif of obedience continued in the regulation of the prayer life of the seminary. Each day, students as a community, were obliged to participate in a series of devotional activities called spiritual exercises. The spiritual director, Father Kevin Skehan, simply encouraged students to be faithful, to the best of their ability, in the daily observation of the routine of spiritual exercises. That spiritual training commenced each year on the very first evening almost straight after they had eaten their evening meal.

On the very first evening of the new seminary, new students assembled in the temporary chapel to commence the opening retreat marking the beginning of their preparation for the priesthood. Of what happened that night, Bishop Ray Benjamin, 67 years later, could recall:

The first night began with a meal in the refectory followed that very night by the beginning of a three day strictly silent retreat. What an experience that was. Three days of dormitory accommodation, in silence, among total strangers, set places in the temporary chapel and in the refectory with reading at meals. They were the three loneliest days of my life so far, as I recall clearly that first evening kneeling to say night prayers beside my dormitory bed, saying no prayers but doing mental arithmetic. I would
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be there for nine years, which meant I would have to live like this 3285
times before I finished. 73

The young Ray Benjamin expressed his first reaction to the denial of his human needs
in the seminary system. He and his fellow students were more than willing to accept
what commenced that evening because they believed that this was the way their
Church prepared men for the priesthood.

For the first few months while the seminary chapel was still under construction the
students used what became their common and meeting room for a chapel. There
students assembled for their first three day retreat and, afterwards for some weeks,
for Mass each morning. The conferences, the seminary word for a spiritual lecture,
and the other spiritual exercises were held in the chapel. Those first day students
interviewed could remember little of this retreat, but Des Kingston, a first day
student, still had this copy of the retreat daily program: 74

Retreat Time-Table - Banyo - early 1940s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>Prayer and Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Holy Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Visit to the Blessed Sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73 Benjamin. op.cit.
74 Des Kingston, Notes made available to author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>Spiritual Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>Way of the Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>Spiritual Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Particular Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Visit to the Blessed Sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Rosary in Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Spiritual Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Examination of Conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Private Rosary in Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Visit to the Blessed Sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Benediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This retreat program was used practically without variation for all seminary retreats until changes were introduced in the middle 1960s. As well as the opening of the year retreats, there were retreats for the ordination to the priesthood, the end of the year retreats for those to receive tonsure marking their entrance to the clerical status, and for ordination to the minor orders and the sub-diaconate. In due course, the opening of the year retreat also became a retreat in preparation for the ordination to the diaconate. During a retreat a person could commune with God in silence but no one directed or guided him how to commune with God. In many ways the retreat was also a student’s introduction to the programmed day, a common characteristic of a ‘total institution.’

Most retreats for students at the seminary were directed by priests from outside the seminary, usually priests from religious orders and, frequently, from the Redemptorist Congregation. Some students who left the seminary before ordination
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recalled that some priests who conducted retreats set such a lofty ideal of priestly perfection that they felt incapable of attaining and sustaining it.\textsuperscript{77} As well they remembered how some retreat directors made it seem so easy for priests to fall into hell fire after death if they had failed in living up to this ideal.\textsuperscript{78} For students, a retreat, depending on the retreat director, could be a frightening time.

Kevin Skehan’s role was to direct and guide students in the development of their spirituality. According to many students there was no formal introduction to the spiritual life.\textsuperscript{79} Brian O’Dwyer commented: “the routine of seminary life was there with its daily round of spiritual exercises and it seemed that through these the personal spiritual life of the students would be developed.”\textsuperscript{80} O’Dwyer added that he was grateful because, “we were fortunate in having a spiritual director who could simplify what could have been a complicated spirituality.”\textsuperscript{81} Hal Ranger, a student towards the end of Cleary’s time, reflected that the spiritual exercises of the seminary resembled and extended the religious practices he and many others had learnt at home and at school.\textsuperscript{82} Thus the spiritual life of a student became an extension and an intensification of the Catholic life he had learned growing up. In students recollections there was little reference to the teaching of Pope Pius XI’s encyclical letter on the priesthood, referred to by Dr Cleary, for seminarians to use as a basis for their spirituality. It was as if spirituality was not connected with other facets of seminary life and was to be developed without reference to them. The efficacy of the

\textsuperscript{77} Pat MacGinley, Interview, 13 August 2007.
\textsuperscript{78} Kingsford, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{80} Brian O’Dwyer, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{81} Pat O’Dwyer, Interview, 19 August, 2007.
\textsuperscript{82} Hal Ranger, Interview, 18 November, 2008.
set of spiritual exercises as the ‘forming’ activity of seminary life was taken for
granted. Whether the daily routine of spiritual exercises were influential in forming
the minds and hearts of students as ‘other Christs’ and how this was happening were
never critically investigated.

It was assumed that a student would learn to pray at the seminary through his fidelity
to the prescribed life of prayer and his personal devotions. These included daily Mass
and Holy Communion, community prayers, meditation and examination of
conscience. In addition, days of recollections and silent retreats, the spiritual
director’s weekly conferences, weekly confession, and a regular interview with the
spiritual director were regarded as the means of assisting each student develop a
prayer life of his own. This was supposed to be the context through which students
gained a deep understanding of their relationship with a benevolent and almighty
God and his Son, Jesus Christ, who saved mankind from eternal separation from
God, his loving Father, through his death and resurrection. As a way of cultivating
his response to God through his prayer life, a student was supposed to commit his
life to God through the practice of the virtues, again with an emphasis on obedience
and humility. A difficulty lay in the absence of any attempt to bring these spiritual
exercises together in a way that they were connected to this orientation and took their
meaning from it. Colin Hickey believed that students were left to their own devices
to work out how they could relate to and use the spiritual director.\footnote{Hickey, op. cit.}
What was lacking in the process was a means of facilitating the effective engagement of students in these considerations. A student could develop a daily round of external practices without the engagement of the mind and heart in what he was doing. It was taken for granted that piety, obedience and zeal developed through the faithful observance of the daily routine of spiritual exercises and obedience to the rules of the seminary. Encouragement and guidance from the spiritual director was expected to develop the virtues of godliness or piety, obedience, zeal, and chastity and the rector played a significant role in fostering the acceptance and style of obedience. There was something very mechanical about it all. Pat MacGinley recalled that he often thought there was more to the spiritual life than this simple dedication to the daily completion of the spiritual exercises. According to Des Kingsford, “no real assistance was given in developing an understanding and acceptance of the daily spiritual practices. The presumption seemed to be that our spirituality would be developed automatically through the system.”

Over the years students grew to know Kevin Skehan as a sincere, humble, friendly, but shy and scrupulous person. He was always readily available to assist students with their problems but some thought his shyness and scruples became barriers when he was dealing with them. He often brought a newspaper to class to read the sporting results. However, he would become scrupulous and worry if he thought he had given them too much information from the ‘banned’ newspaper. Some students thought he was intimidated by Cleary and was ever wary of him. He had a number of
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eccentricities and mannerisms such as tapping his foot and was often noticed fidgeting and yawning, mannerisms that emphasised his shyness and made students lose confidence in him.\textsuperscript{87}

The main thrust of the spiritual life at Banyo was gaining salvation in a future life. The life of prayer and devotion kept a person on the path to salvation and there was the threat of hellfire if one did not keep his orientation towards God through prayer. It was a simple faith cultivated through prayer. Nothing was ever done to develop that faith as it remained practically unrelated to the defensive style theology as it was then presented for study. This devotional style of a spiritual life did sustain some; others, using theologically based spiritual reading, grew in faith and meaning in a life oriented to God; while still others, left to their own resources, floundered. For students left to the resources of the system at Banyo, the possibility of developing a mature and meaningful spirituality capable of sustaining them as priests in their years of ministry ahead was, at least, uncertain.

In appointing Father Skehan to the role of spiritual director, the Queensland Bishops were following a tradition of appointing older and friendly priests renowned for their piety and devotion who related well with people. A weakness of this approach was its lack of scrutiny of the appointee to make sure he had an acceptable and practical understanding of spirituality and a realistic approach to initiating students into a spiritual formation process suitable for a future priest. Another was the attempt to

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
encourage students to develop their spirituality through a routine succession and repetition of pious devotions with a minimum of personal intervention. This meant the neglect of engagement and guidance of each seminarian in the spiritual formation process. Progress in spirituality depended on the student himself.

Another was the differences, particularly the age difference, between the spiritual guide and the spiritually guided, the danger being the ability of an older man to relate effectively to seminarians still in their youth. The spirituality program embedded in the ‘total institution’ monastic system at Banyo and the way it was administered were little suited to stimulating and guiding an appropriate spiritual formation of students.

Preparation for the celibate life as a priest was almost ignored. There is no indication that the rector or spiritual director tried in a formal way to guide students during those first thirteen years to an understanding of celibacy as a requirement of the life of a priest. Through their study of Canon Law they knew that celibacy meant never getting married.\(^\text{88}\) Through their study of Moral Theology they learnt that celibacy meant never being sexually active in any way.\(^\text{89}\) Struggling with the sex appetite or concupiscence as the Moral Theology text referred to this human function was a difficulty that could be overcome by recourse to God in prayer. His grace was

\(^{88}\) Codex Iuris Canonici, (CIC), 141. § 1.
sufficient. Advice was given that they should avoid temptations against chastity by treating women with reserve and respect and keeping their distance from them.

Students during Kevin Skehan’s years as spiritual director recalled that he would become embarrassed when asked questions dealing with sex, celibacy or how a priest in a pastoral situation should relate to women. But this was not the memory of all. John Maguire related that Kevin Skehan was an intelligent man acquainted with the psychological developments of his time in matters of sexuality. On the basis of this knowledge, he gave the broadest possible interpretation to the strict teaching of the Church on sexual matters which was that even a passing glance at an object that caused sexual thoughts was a mortal sin if it was not rejected immediately. Banyo lacked someone officially commissioned on its staff with the competence, versatility, and sensitivity to relate to students in order to assist them in gaining an understanding of what the obligation of celibacy entailed and an appreciation of credible reasons for it. Such a person was also needed to be available to students who sought help in accepting this obligation or, given the nature of sexual urges, to comply with its demands.

Colin Hickey has given his recollections of those early days in the minor seminary at Banyo where students were required to live each day according to a timetable of the prescribed programmed day.:
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In those first few weeks we soon settled into the standard routine. We were woken by the sound of the bell at six o’clock in the morning, dressed and went to chapel for morning prayers followed by meditation at half past six. Mass followed at seven o’clock. After Mass students had time to make their beds before breakfast. Classes followed breakfast. Classes started around nine o’clock and went until lunch time, with a short break around the middle of the morning. Classes resumed after lunch until tea time at four o’clock. Then there was time for sport or some other recreation before the recitation of the rosary and other devotions in the chapel before the evening meal at six o’clock. Between two and three hours were allocated for study in the evening and this ended with night prayers. We went to bed at ten o’clock. Overall it was a fairly unexciting routine.92

Wednesday and Saturday afternoons and Sundays were free of lectures. On Sunday afternoons students could go for walks in groups to Nudgee Beach, Northgate and other nearby locations within three to five kilometres from the seminary. On longer afternoons, such as during the mid-winter holidays, they walked to Sandgate, Chermside and other places.93 Going on walks was optional and not everyone bothered. In 1945, Pianum reported: “Those who have really caught the spirit of this form of recreation need no inducement beyond the prospect of walking itself.”94 A visit to a shop for a drink or an ice cream was never officially part of the outing.

92 Hickey, op. cit.
93 ‘Walking,’ Pianum: the Pius XII Seminary Annual 1945, p.45.
94 Pianum 1945, op.cit. p. 45.
Those who went walking enjoyed the opportunity to get away from the seminary for a short while.95

Picnic days, an occasional variation of routine, were different. These were all-day outings, taking the form of a trip by boat from Hamilton wharf to one of the Moreton Bay islands,96 or a bus drive to places like the Petrie River and Cash’s Crossing where students could swim.97 On these days students could buy food which they fried up for a picnic lunch. Picnic days were those few special days when students could dress in mufti, although the dress code imposed by the rector was fairly restrictive.

Martin Doyle recalled a special picnic:

A memorable picnic was the one Gilli Young provided when he was appointed Auxiliary Bishop of Canberra-Goulburn. On that occasion we went to the Gold Coast where we made the house of Miah McSweeney’s family our base for the day. This was the longest distance we ever travelled from the seminary and it was only the occasion of the appointment of a bishop from the seminary staff that made it possible.98

Students looked forward to and enjoyed picnics when they could buy chocolates and the like from shops but smoking and drinking alcohol were not allowed.

The four visiting days each year, also breaks from routine, were anticipated with enthusiasm. On these days, students’ extended families, including their grandparents, uncles, aunts, and cousins along with their immediate families were allowed to visit

95 Hernon, op.cit.
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the seminary. Each student joined his visitors for a picnic lunch in the seminary grounds around eleven o’clock and could spend time with them up to five o’clock. The joy of seeing one’s family was well complemented by the opportunity to enjoy, once again, some real home cooking.

Following the retreat at the beginning of each year, new students who had not passed their Senior Examination were allocated to secondary school classes in the minor seminary. They were placed in the class above the one they had been in their last year of schooling. After one, two, three or four years of secondary school studies in the minor seminary they could then proceed to the major seminary for the study of Philosophy, Theology, and Scripture, the prescribed studies for priestly ordination.99

In his biography of Archbishop Daniel Mannix of Melbourne, Nial Brennan described a minor seminary as a junior seminary where students commence their training for the priesthood during their secondary school years. Secondary schooling takes place in the context of spiritual formation and seminary discipline. Students live in the seminary, wear the soutane and take part in all the spiritual exercises of a major seminary. 100 This description applied to Banyo.

To be admitted to the major seminary a student was required to complete his secondary education and pass the Senior Public Examination.101 Colin Hickey and
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Bill McKeown indicated that, in addition, a pass in Latin was a requirement to proceed to the major seminary.\textsuperscript{102} This was confirmed by Des Kingston who failed the Latin exam at senior level and was required to repeat the year.\textsuperscript{103} However, a later student, Denis Long, who passed Senior, but not Latin, and was allowed to proceed to the major seminary in 1952 when the minor seminary was being phased out at Banyo.\textsuperscript{104}

Four Christian Brothers, namely, Brothers W. Power, C. Rieck, S. O’Donoghue, and J. Brown, described by Colin Hickey as ‘excellent teachers,’\textsuperscript{105} travelled from Nudge College each school day to teach most of the secular subjects. The rector taught the elective subject of Logic to the Seniors and Sub Seniors.\textsuperscript{106} Tom McVeigh, who began to study Logic with Dr Cleary and later went on to win the prize for gaining first place in Logic in the Senior Examination, highly praised Dr Cleary as a teacher.\textsuperscript{107} Dr Ray O’Donoghue, a priest on the staff, taught Geography at Senior level. Unfortunately, when he joined the army as a chaplain after a year in the seminary, students of Geography in preparing for the senior examination were left to their own resources.\textsuperscript{108}

\hspace{1cm}

secondary schooling were not accepted unless they had passed the Senior Examination or were prepared to accept a place in the minor seminary while they did so.
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Bernie Kane believed that the brothers who taught at Banyo had been hand-picked for teaching students for the priesthood. They conducted their classes in a calmer manner than that found in the ordinary school and, of course, there was no corporal punishment. He further recalled that the classrooms on the ground floor were still in a fairly basic condition due to the building construction on and that the noise of the builders often interrupted classes. Pat MacGinley recalled that when he and another classmate, Frank Conarty, showed potential in Mathematics, Brother O'Donoghue gave them more challenging work in this subject.

According to Pat O'Dwyer, the standard subjects studied for Senior at Banyo were English, Latin, Mathematics I & II, Physics and Chemistry. There was the option too of choosing from such subjects as Greek, History, Geography, Economics and Logic. Pat felt that his own senior results were fairly ordinary and put this down to the fact that students had only limited time to study. There were regular times for study each day but these had to fit in with the spiritual exercises and other activities of the seminary day. Despite the lack of time for study the brothers taught at Banyo with considerable success. In 1943, two students, Neville Grundy and Bill O’Donnell, won open scholarships to the University of Queensland for their results in that year’s Senior Examination. However, as seminary students they were not permitted to take up their university scholarships.

---

109 Bernie Kane, *op. cit.*
110 Ibid.
111 MacGinley, *op. cit.*
112 Pat O'Dwyer, *op. cit.*
113 Ibid.
Father Tom Murphy, who began studies at Banyo in the sub junior class in 1941, described Brother Rieck as “a great teacher and a saintly brother.”\textsuperscript{115} As a teacher he was a “perfectionist in every way, and with the rare gift of getting the message across without confusing you with asides and trivialities.”\textsuperscript{116} A former Banyo student, Barry Conaty, wrote to Brother Dynes shortly after the death of Brother Rieck: “Of all the excellent teachers I have had, you and he stand out prominently not only for your knowledge and teaching skills but also for your unfailing patience and courtesy.”\textsuperscript{117} With this high quality of teaching at Banyo, those who left the seminary, at least benefited by the education provided.

During the years of the Christian Brothers’ commitment, other brothers who taught at Banyo were P. Brennan, P. Costello, J. Dwyer, B. Dynes, N. Landener, W. Sterling and J. Trevlin. Not all junior seminarians were model students. Some, by holding private conversations during classes, reading novels and other books instead of the required text books and annoying brothers with their antics, placed their teachers in many difficult situations.\textsuperscript{118} The brothers continued at Banyo until 1950, while Brothers Rieck and Costello stayed on until the end of 1951. Diocesan priests took over teaching classes in the minor seminary until 1954 when it was discontinued.\textsuperscript{119}

Until the end of 1965 the programmed day as described earlier was the standard routine at Banyo. These programmed days were advantageous for some student giving them the organization of time to study that brought success in examinations.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{117} “Brother B. Dynes,” *Necrology of the Christian Brothers*, In-House Publication, 1991, CBQA.
\textsuperscript{118} McKewon, *op. cit.*
\textsuperscript{119} Long, *op. cit.* P. 10.
Others, still being immature school boys, tried to see how far they could extend the seminary behaviour boundaries.\textsuperscript{120} Classes continued after lunch so that the brothers could finish their daily teaching tasks and return to Nudgee at four o’clock.

In many ways Banyo functioned like a secondary school with the typical variety of student behaviour expected at that time. The subjects taught provided students who left the seminary before ordination a wide choice of courses at the University of Queensland and qualified them for entrance into a wide range of occupations and professions. Banyo exhibited the educational successes that Catholic schools were achieving in moving Catholic young people up the educational ladder. However, those who left the seminary were often treated as social outcasts by Church authorities when, if they had so desired, they could have been integrated into the work of the Church at parish and diocesan levels.

At the end of November each year students went home for their Christmas vacation. Except for weekday Mass and keeping up the daily round of spiritual exercises, it was a time of freedom from the rules and regulations of the seminary. Students attended Mass each morning in their home parish church, spending time in meditation before or after Mass. Depending on the parish priest they assisted with some parish tasks.\textsuperscript{121} During the holidays, when the rules of avoiding close friendships and entering another student’s room could not be applied, some went off together for a beach holiday or in pairs or in groups to destinations within Queensland and beyond.

\textsuperscript{120} McKeown, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{121} Buckley, \textit{op.cit.}
They returned to the seminary in mid-February to commence the next year. At the beginning of 1942, Banyo seemed to be in the middle of a war zone with military planes using the Eagle Farm aerodrome and warships sailing in and out of the Port of Brisbane.\textsuperscript{122} An American Army unit made camp on the flats opposite Banyo. The Americans intruded into the seminary playing amplified recorded music, both military and civilian, through a public address system, during the early morning while students meditated before Mass.\textsuperscript{123} It was paradoxical for seminary students to be prayerfully meditating while the words of the latest love song floated through the air. Because of their proximity to defence installations, students were strongly advised to be careful about what they wrote in letters.\textsuperscript{124} Some students mentioned that during the war years a concern arose that the seminary buildings could be taken over by the government for defence purposes but this never eventuated.\textsuperscript{125}

The Banyo students who had passed the Senior Examination in 1941 were joined by another six students to form the First Philosophy Class and commence studies in the first year of the major seminary. Joining the staff that year were Dr Cornelius Roberts, former dean of discipline at Manly, as vice-rector at Banyo and Bernard Wallace, a subdeacon belonging to the Rockhampton Diocese, also from Manly. Mr Wallace, as he was then addressed, was ordained a deacon and then a priest later in 1942. Until he was appointed Bishop in Rockhampton in 1973, he remained on the seminary staff except for a short time in the Mount Morgan parish in the 1950s.

\textsuperscript{122} Kane, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Ibid.}
The seminary program of studies consisting of Philosophy, Theology and Sacred Scripture was prescribed by the Code of Canon Law.\textsuperscript{126} The Philosophy course spanned the first three years during which students studied Scholastic Philosophy and a History of Philosophy along with Biblical Introduction, Latin, English Literature and Expression and Modern History. Pope Pius XI endorsed the study of Scholastic Philosophy when he wrote:

\begin{quote}
Priests should have a learning adequate to the requirements of the age. For the attainment of this ... there is required both instruction and training in scholastic philosophy ‘according to the method, and the mind and the principles of St Thomas Aquinas’... It will help him to a thorough understanding of dogma. It will effectively forearm him against modern errors of whatever sort. It will sharpen his mind to distinguish truth from falsehood. It will form him to habits of intellectual clearness, so necessary in any studies or problems in the future.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

Pius XI made obligatory this philosophy based on the work of the medieval Dominican theologian and philosopher, St Thomas Aquinas, who had developed it from the writings of the ancient Greek philosopher, Aristotle. Scholastic Philosophy, commended for study in Catholic universities and by implication in seminaries by Pope Leo XIII (1878 – 1903) in his encyclical \textit{Aeterni Patri},\textsuperscript{128} became an essential part of the course of seminary studies.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{126} CIC\textsubscript{17}, Can. 1366 § 2. \\
\end{flushright}
With wartime restrictions and shortages, text books were not readily available, in particular, the philosophy text books which came from Rome. Professors did their best by providing students with notes they made to supplement their lectures. The study of Philosophy was never popular. The comments of Pat O’Dwyer on this matter provide a balanced reaction to this area of study:

I had mixed feelings about the Thomistic Philosophy we had to study. From a positive angle it provided the basis for a good general education. During the three years we touched on a wide range of topics which introduced me to spiritual values although I am not now aware of what specifically these were. On the negative side I felt that it was a very cut and dry approach, leaving little room for independent thought. ... I would be inclined to question the level of its suitability as a course of formation for priests who were destined to work in parishes. Further, I failed to see what this study did for those students who would leave the seminary. Contending with the Latin in the text book and the intermittent use of oral Latin was hardly of any great value. Overall I enjoyed Philosophy although I feel that some of its sections ... were a waste of time.

This and other reports by students suggest that Scholastic Philosophy was regarded as only a minor influence in the priestly formation of students.

Theological studies began in 1945, the year the war ended. Text books were still not available and when they did become available the reading of Latin texts remained a...
major obstacle to successful study. Professors complained to the bishops that the students were very poor in their ability to handle Latin. Bishop Roper had earlier reported that in 1948 Dr Cleary was teaching Moral Theology and Canon Law. Bill McKeown echoed the recollections of several students to these two subjects: “We had to do Moral Theology and Canon Law. These were Cleary’s subjects. Cleary’s main thrust was to make sure we could translate the Latin of the Moral Theology text book and the Code of Canon Law into English.” Others said that by making sure they could translate the Latin of their textbooks, Dr Cleary made them familiar with them so that they could readily refer to them if, in the future, they were presented with a moral or a canon law problem to solve.

Dr Roberts, who had taught Dogmatic Theology at Manly, had established himself as a reputable theologian through the articles he wrote for the Australasian Catholic Record. John Maguire, one of his students who studied in Rome for a higher degree in Theology after ordination, assessed his contribution to Banyo as follows:

As a teacher of Dogmatic Theology, Con Roberts was as good as you get. He had an intellectual scholastic approach to teaching theology and was mostly very cut and dry. Given Con’s personality, it was evident that he could not be anything else. However, he could sometimes be enthusiastic.
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on such themes as the doctrine of Grace and the Divine Adoption of
human beings as children of God.\textsuperscript{134}

Kevin Skehan, whose training was a university Arts degree, taught Biblical
Introduction to the Philosophy students and Biblical Exegesis to those in Theology.
Bill McKeown did not regard him as a good teacher but excused his lack of teaching
effectiveness on the grounds that “the Scripture course then was not important as the
Bible was something for the Protestants to read. The attitude of the Church which
influenced our approach to Scripture was that by paying too much attention to the
Bible on our own we could go the same way as the Protestants and fall into error.”\textsuperscript{135}

Overall, students saw little relevance in the subjects studied for future parish life. Dealing
with the subject matter in Latin meant that they had to remove this barrier to get to what
they were to study. For some this never happened but those who succeeded discovered
what they had to learn was dry and practically unrelated to their experiences. This lack of
appeal of the subjects was reinforced by the poor quality of teaching of most lecturers.
Some had not wanted to teach in the seminary and this lack of commitment to what they
were doing became obvious to students. Their approach of reading, translating and
commenting on the contents of the textbooks added to the dryness of the subject matter.
Only a few were able to put a class presentation together in a way that was attractive,
appealing and stimulated learning. Some instructional training was sorely needed. Yet a
myth evolved around the seven years’ length of the seminary course that by the time priests
were ordained they had become highly educated men. They became formed by the myth

\textsuperscript{134} Maguire, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{135} Bill McKeown, Interview, 18 August 2008.
rather than the reality of the studies. Achievement in studies was secondary, a situation reinforced by the example of St John Mary Vianney, the Cure of Ars, a rather unsuccessful seminary student who became an effective and saintly parish priest.\footnote{136}{“St. Jean Baptiste Marie Vianney,” Catholic Encyclopedia, \url{http://www.newadvent.org/cathen.08326c.htm} (accessed 28/07/2010).}

Preparation as a leader of worship was rather limited. Under the directions of the rector and the vice-rector, students in their second, third, and fourth years of Theology prepared and delivered sermons on designated topics. Dr Cleary and Dr Roberts supervised the process of preparation and delivery of these sermons through their various stages.\footnote{137}{Ibid.} In his 1950 Visitation Report, Archbishop O’Donnell expressed his concern that sacred eloquence and the use of gestures were not receiving sufficient attention.\footnote{138}{Ibid.} Former students of this period expressed their appreciation of the assistance of the Literary and Debating society in helping them to develop public speaking skills through speechmaking activities at its meetings.\footnote{139}{Selected Students1 941 - 1953, Interviews 2007 – 2008.}

The rector gave students instructions on participation in sacred ceremonies, but Dr Roberts and Dr Smith, described by Archbishop O’Donnell as ‘an excellent M.C,’ expressed more than once their dissatisfaction with the lack of finesse in students’ actual performance.\footnote{140}{Archbishop O’Donnell. \emph{op.cit.}} During the months prior to their ordination students received instructions on the rubrics of the Mass.\footnote{141}{Missale Romanum (Roman Missal officially approved by the Church for liturgical use).} They then practised those rubrics alone and under supervision. In those pre-Vatican II days, much emphasis was given to the

\footnote{136}{“St. Jean Baptiste Marie Vianney,” Catholic Encyclopedia, \url{http://www.newadvent.org/cathen.08326c.htm} (accessed 28/07/2010).}
\footnote{137}{Ibid.}
\footnote{138}{Ibid.}
\footnote{139}{Selected Students1 941 - 1953, Interviews 2007 – 2008.}
\footnote{140}{Archbishop O’Donnell. \emph{op.cit.}}
\footnote{141}{Missale Romanum (Roman Missal officially approved by the Church for liturgical use).}
necessity of complying exactly with the rubrics of the *Roman Missal* when celebrating Mass.

Father Skehan was the seminary Master of Ceremonies, a role which had the opportunity to demonstrate to students the solemnity with which liturgical ceremonies should be carried out. However, he was unsteady on his feet, at times tripping and stumbling around the altar. This became an occasion of mirth for students. Most students were tolerant of his foibles and appreciated his kindness and sincerity. Others were not so accepting and at times showed this in his presence, a situation to which he reacted quite sensitively but good naturedly.  

At the end of 1952, he moved from Banyo to take up a position as Pastor of a Brisbane parish.

A Brisbane parish priest regularly visited the seminary to take the ordination class for Pastoral Theology. Apart from these weekly sessions there was no other formal preparation for pastoral life. These sessions were developed around the registers that according to the Code Canon Law had to be kept in parishes and the activities that take place in parishes. For those in the ordination year classes in Catholic Action were introduced. These were based on papal teachings and contained very little about what was happening in parishes and dioceses. The fight against the spread of Communism by the Catholic Social Movement led by B. A. Santamaria practically went unmentioned, an indication of the remoteness of the seminary. Pastoral training, they found, had to wait until after ordination. Training for pastoral and
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liturgical duties in parishes was minimal, hardly related to any formation for the priesthood they underwent, and devoid of any intended attempt to foster the personal and social development of students to aid them in their work as priests.

To meet the need for more accommodation in 1946 an extra building was added to the seminary. Originally it was planned to erect a northern wing for the main building to complement the southern wing but war-time shortages of labour and materials did not allow this.\textsuperscript{144} A United States Army medical unit building at ‘Stuartholme’ convent became available when the American army moved north.\textsuperscript{145} The Queensland Bishops acquired the building and had it transported to the seminary.\textsuperscript{146} For many years it became the home of students in their first, second, and third years of Theology. Father Howe, at first, and then Father Wallace, occupied two rooms on the ground floor. It was renamed St Aloysius’ House, but it was affectionately known to students as ‘the Barracks,’ a name disapproved by seminary authorities who did their utmost to stamp it out. Referring to the building as ‘the Barracks’ was directly contrary to the directives of the rector and treated accordingly.

Michael Lanigan and Neil O’Donoghue who had already left school, Brian O’Dwyer, Patrick Kelly, Pat (P.J.) Carroll, Brian and Des McMullan had been in the first senior class. All had passed their Senior Examination at the end of 1941 and all were later ordained in 1948 along with six others who had joined them to commence their studies in Philosophy at the beginning of 1942. Another student, Pat (P.S.) Carroll

\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Ibid}.
who had completed the major part of his seminary studies earlier and had been on active service in the Army during the war, joined them when he was discharged to bring this class up to 14 students.\footnote{147}

In November 1947, these 14 students in the Third Theology Class, the first class to reach that stage, were ordained to the Subdiaconate. This was the first of the four major orders, the others being the Deaconate, the Priesthood and the Episcopate.\footnote{148}

Ordinations to the Diaconate took place early in the following year. In June they were ordained to the priesthood. Prior to this they had received tonsure, a ceremony during which the presiding bishop clipped a small piece of hair from the candidate’s head thus admitting him to the clerical state.\footnote{149} This occurred at the end of a student’s first year in Theology. The next morning they were ordained to the minor orders of porter, or doorkeeper, and reader. At the end of the following year they received the orders of acolyte and exorcist.\footnote{150} These were minor orders or ministries exercised in the early Church but over the years fell into disuse and retained only as steps to the priesthood.

Ordination to the priesthood took place in the student’s home diocese and often in his home town on or about the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul on 29 June. After ordination new priests were required to return to the seminary for the rest of that year to complete their studies. On the occasion of the first Banyo ordinations 13 of the 14

\footnote{147} Thomas Boland, “A Distinctive Seminary Has Developed in Queensland,” \textit{Catholic Leader}, 1 July, 1972
\footnote{148} CIC\textsubscript{17}: Can. 949.
\footnote{149} CIC\textsubscript{17}: Can.136.
\footnote{150} CIC\textsubscript{17}: Can. 949.
deacons were raised to the priesthood, five for Townsville, three each for Brisbane and Toowoomba and two for Rockhampton. A fourth deacon was ordained for Toowoomba at the end of the seminary year. In regard to these ordinations, the Editor of the *Toowoomba Parish Notes* wrote:

> On ordination day we could all feel that spiritual resurgence and renewal which seemed to surround us as Youth received its highest exaltation in the Christian Priesthood. We could feel the warmth of that spiritual ray of hope and happiness which seemed to touch and to adorn even the daily cares and worries of life as Youth stepped forward to become ‘Dux in Israel,’ a leader of the people.\(^{151}\)

The other Queensland dioceses were just as excessive in their jubilation. It was the day Banyo first began to feel that it was achieving its purpose. Until this time, Banyo kept in touch with ordinations each year when newly-ordained Queensland students from Manly visited the seminary.\(^{152}\) Now Banyo had its own priests. This was a high point for Dr Cleary and another high point in his life as rector soon followed.

By an Apostolic Brief of 15 December 1950, the dignity of Domestic Prelate was awarded to Dr Cleary by Pope Pius XII. This honour was conferred on the Right Reverend Monsignor V.F. Cleary, Rector, Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Banyo, by Archbishop Duhig on 28 March 1951. However, his years as rector were coming to an unexpected close. Towards the end of 1952, Archbishop O’Donnell in an official visitation of the seminary raised questions of discipline with the seminary staff and
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the head student, Maurice Walsh. Among those matters raised were smoking by students, drinking alcohol on picnics, unauthorised leaving of the seminary grounds at night time, the possession of radios and obtaining newspapers and magazines,\(^{153}\) indicating students had attempted to develop a covert ‘under life.’ Most professors said that their general impression of the level of discipline was good, although some were aware that a few students had broken bounds. A former student in an interview and others during clerical conversations confirmed this.\(^{154}\) Dr Roberts said he was aware of them but added that his knowledge was only hearsay.\(^{155}\)

When asked for opinions about the rector, members of the professorial staff indicated dissatisfaction with his administration of the seminary and his exercise of authority. Father Morgan Howe said the rector was not a leader.\(^{156}\) Father Frank McKinley described the rector as “a difficult man,” one whose reaction you could not predict “when you cross his path.”\(^{157}\) Dr Bill Smith described the rector as “very autocratic.”\(^{158}\) Dr John Clarke remarked on the tensions between Cleary and his staff.\(^{159}\) O’Donnell reported to the Queensland Bishops that “discipline could be more effectively maintained by the appointment of a dean for all of the students.”\(^{160}\) A motion “that Rev C. Ballard, J.C.D. be appointed dean of discipline for all seminarians” was proposed and carried.\(^{161}\)
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During 1953, according to students’ reports, Dr Ballard commenced his duties as dean of discipline by thoroughly investigating the state of seminary discipline. Students, aware of what had happened in the U.S.S.R. under Stalin, despite the ban on news media, named Ballard’s investigation, the ‘Purge.’\textsuperscript{162} There was nothing in the documented sources available regarding Ballard’s duties and manner of procedure. Students said Cleary remained in the background while Ballard literally interrogated students one by one. Students detested this approach with its emphasis on the duty to tell the truth but accepted it because it could not be avoided if one wished to remain in the seminary.\textsuperscript{163} Ballard required students to come to his office and reveal to him what rules they had broken. When what a student said involved another student who had not made this known, Ballard brought this to his attention. Students objected to what was happening but were powerless to oppose it.\textsuperscript{164}

The outcomes were threefold. It was established that some students identified had persistently broken serious rules. They were directed to leave the seminary or not to return the following year. Students disobeying minor ordinances were reprimanded and warned that their future conduct would be closely watched.\textsuperscript{165} Thirdly, at a meeting of the Queensland Bishops on 9 November 1953, Archbishop O’Donnell successfully moved a motion that Cleary’s term as rector be terminated and that he be replaced by Dr Roberts or Dr Smith.\textsuperscript{166} Cleary was appointed Parish Priest of Wooloowin and Dr Roberts was appointed to replace him. The importance of keeping the rules was not lost by Roberts.

\begin{footnotes}
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\end{footnotes}
Mgr Vincent Cleary’s approach towards observing seminary rules forced him to ‘fall on his sword.’ He aimed to cultivate the development of personal responsibility in students by keeping the rules ‘for the highest motives.’ He shunned any assistance offered by his vice-rector and staff in the supervision of students. Nor does it seem that Cleary had the charisma to motivate students according to his ideals. The outcomes of Dr Cecil Ballard’s investigation of discipline indicated that personal responsibility for self discipline happened far below the level expected. Under Cleary, the Tridentine seminary system had not worked. In such circumstances the Queensland Bishops changed the rector, hoping for a new rector who could manage this system more effectively.

Through this system students were scarcely being formed into responsible, obedient, and humble young men according to the image envisaged as suitable for the priesthood. Rather they tended to ignore the system and the authority of the rector. The program of studies had serious defects in content and pedagogy to produce ‘educated men’ as priests, and the lack of a real pastoral formation program meant that little was being done to cultivate the zeal of future priests. That the system itself had serious flaws and needed radical reform was ignored as it was outside their competence to review it. The management of a flawed system was transferred to another autocrat, albeit with a different style.

---

Chapter IV  
Tyranny of Rules

When Dr Cornelius Roberts (1954 – 1964) took charge at Banyo, he continued to administer the monastic style Tridentine system with seminarians prepared, much like earlier students, to accept and conform to its requirements. He displayed complete confidence in the Tridentine system of seminary training. He acted as if he believed that seminarians complying with the demands of the system would emerge with the necessary personal qualities of a priest but, much more than Cleary, he intervened in the working of the system to sort out the students he deemed as ‘unsuitable.’ This he did through constant supervision of students and through reacting to situations of non-compliance by continually tightening the rules. Nor did he and his staff indicate any awareness of the need to review Banyo’s spiritual, studies, liturgical, and pastoral development programs for their suitability and relevance. Roberts had a definite but conservative view of how a priest should present himself and, with this image in mind, he directed ‘human development’ activities oriented towards producing that likeness of a priest in students. This he did without any consideration of the life of a priest in a contemporary parish. Consequently, the seminary continued with an imperfect formation system and inadequate programs. As discussions of seminaries at the Second Vatican Council proceeded with calls for the modernization of seminary practices, the Queensland Bishops decided that a more flexible and less severe rector was needed at Banyo.
Archbishop Duhig confirmed Dr Roberts’s appointment by letter in early 1954 stating that “the Bishops present at the meeting unanimously nominated the vice-rector, Rev. Cornelius Roberts, DD, to succeed Mgr Cleary as rector of the Seminary.”1 The new rector, the Very Rev. Dr Cornelius Roberts was born in Charleville on 11 June, 1900, the son of Bartholomew Roberts and Margaret Skehan.2 He had a younger brother who became a priest and another who had studied for the priesthood.3 Little else is known of his family. Even his funeral notice makes no mention of relatives.4 After receiving his early education from the Christian Brothers at Gregory Terrace and Nudgee he commenced studies for the priesthood at Springwood and Manly, before moving to Rome to complete his studies. Cornelius Roberts was ordained a priest at the St John Lateran Basilica in Rome in March 1924. Before returning to Australia in 1926 he completed double doctorates in Divinity and Philosophy.5 His Catholic family life and school education cultivated his vocation to the priesthood and his overseas studies and qualifications suggested a role as a seminary lecturer for him.

Back in Australia he was appointed to St Patrick’s College, Manly, as the dean of discipline.6 He assisted the rector, Mgr Tom Hayden, to carry out episcopal directives “to weed out the ‘delicate’, the ‘oddity’, the ‘crank’, and the potential ‘drunk’, along with the ‘lazy and indifferent.’”7 He was a stern man and undertook his role seriously. How well he did his job was questioned. According to Hal Ranger, the late Father
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Tom McCormack, a student at Manly in Roberts’s time, had said Con was “always kicking out the wrong people.” Manly students questioned the aptitude he had for his role of dean of discipline in a seminary.

In 1942 Dr Roberts relinquished his position at Manly to become vice-rector of Banyo, where for twelve years, he was, administratively, almost a non-entity. He was not appointed as dean at Banyo. He taught his classes, spent time gardening around the grounds, and exercised authority only in the absence of the rector. As a skilled observer during this time, he was cognizant of the misdemeanours of students’ behaviour but bided his time. He taught the philosophical subjects of Ontology, Cosmology, and the History of Philosophy as well as English Literature. When the first students commenced their study of Theology in 1945, Roberts was relieved from teaching Philosophy and appointed to teach Dogmatic Theology, the main Theology course, but retained English Literature. He also assumed responsibility for New Testament Greek.

When he became rector, Dr Roberts was invested by Archbishop Duhig with the papal honour of Domestic Prelate and accorded the title of Monsignor. During his term as rector he continued to teach Dogmatic Theology but relinquished English
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and Greek to other professors. In his eleven years as rector he is best remembered for the stern and uncompromising way in which he imposed his style of seminary discipline. Students, who referred to him as ‘Starch,’ found his stern severity unreasonable and overbearing.

Young men from strong Catholic homes, educated in Catholic schools and strongly influenced by the priests in their home parishes, continued to enter Banyo. Reared and educated in homes and schools where authority was a part of life they came to Banyo ready to comply with seminary conditions. New students, on average, were older as in 1954 new students were not accepted for the Sub Senior secondary school class and, from the beginning of 1955, Banyo’s minor seminary was phased out. The low retention rate in the minor seminary and the difficulties younger students experienced in settling in to seminary routine had raised the question of the worth of continuing with this level of seminary training.

Another difference was that several late vocations, those students who had spent time in the work force, had belonged to the Young Christian Workers Movement (YCW). This was a lay apostolic organization for Catholic youth where its members engaged in apostolic activities. That involvement attracted them to the priesthood. John Quinlan said that when he finished school he had no intention of becoming a priest. It was his involvement in the YCW that moved him to decide to train for the priesthood. As a priest he would work full time in the way he had become engaged in
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the lay apostolate. Late vocations were admitted directly to the first year of the major seminary without having their matriculation.

The separation from the community, isolation, and the mortifications experienced in a ‘total institution’ commenced from the day they began. Students entering the seminary were not sure what to expect. Most had heard from priests that seminaries were similar to monasteries. At Banyo they found themselves isolated and subjected to a routine of strict discipline. While some students found the isolation with its prayer life, silences, and routines conducive to their spiritual development, for Bill O’Shea, “it had too much of a monastic flavour to be real for a pastor in a busy parish.” According to Tony Carroll, “In this isolation we were completely divorced from the normal experiences of an adolescent at that stage of life. We had no opportunity to make friends, neither male nor female, that young people make at this time of their life.” John Quinlan remarked. “If you were going to a monastery for life and never expected to meet other human beings again in a church or a civic setting outside the monastery then the setting was almost perfectly organized for such a life. However, seminary life had nothing to do with a community of real people in a real life situation such as a parish.” The majority of students accepted the monastic character of the seminary as a phase they had to accept as best they could if they
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wished to be ordained. They consoled themselves saying, ‘He who desires a goal, necessarily desires the means for achieving it.’

There was no orientation for new students. On arriving, each new student, with the help of returning students, found his dormitory and the bed and locker allocated to him. For some moving into a dormitory, it was a continuation of the lifestyle they knew at boarding school but for others who had attended day schools it was a new experience. Bill O’Shea said that moving into dormitory accommodation was not new for him, although he thought that the Banyo accommodation was more Spartan than the accommodation at Nudgee College. Pat Cassidy, who had worked for a year before going to Banyo, said he was used to dormitory living from boarding school but it then seemed unusual. Students on arrival learnt that they would be living in dormitories until they commenced their theological studies. They then dressed in their clerical soutanes and collars and went to the refectory for what seemed a rather frugal meal. Alan Sheldrick said that his first meal of cheese, beetroot, bread and butter came as quite a shock.

After a rushed unpacking of personal belongings and the evening meal, students went to the chapel to commence the three-day silent retreat. Brian Connolly’s remarks reflect the memories of most students:
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I found the three days of silence overwhelming especially when I did not know anyone, nor my way around the seminary. Wearing a soutane and collar around in the hot February summer of Brisbane was quite uncomfortable but I was awed by the opportunity to wear the clerical dress. Contending with the mosquitoes was also another challenge.

During the three days I was able to get some idea of the physical outlay of the seminary.31

A story was handed down annually to new students that one year a new arrival had followed every student he saw in the hope of finding a toilet.32

Like his predecessor, Mgr Cleary, Mgr Roberts, by acting without any assistance from any of his staff, tried to be his own sole master of discipline. Unlike Cleary, he had little faith in students accepting responsibility for acting ‘for the highest motives.’ He expected students to break rules and was ready to take action when they did so. To counteract threats of rule breaking he orally reiterated the rules, kept a strict surveillance on students and took strong action when faced with non-compliance. Through the imposition and policing of rules, Roberts became the imposer of the mortifications, of a Goffman style ‘total institution.’

Rules were part and parcel of seminary life the world over but for Roberts they were practically the essence of a seminary. Unlike St Patrick’s College Manly, Banyo

---

31 Connolly, op. cit.
commenced with a set of rules printed in a pocket-sized booklet entitled *Rules of the Pius XII Queensland Provincial Seminary*.\(^{33}\) The Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop John Panico, stressed the importance of the faithful observance of the rules,\(^ {34}\) an emphasis he renewed by directing that “the Rules shall be read once a month.”\(^ {35}\) For Cornelius Roberts in 1954, this was superfluous as ensuring that students kept the rules was his highest priority. He was in charge and the professors as well as the students owed him obedience. In a letter to Archbishop Duhig, he quoted the Code of Canon Law\(^ {36}\) and the Seminary Rule book\(^ {37}\) to reinforce his view: “Two duties of professors and officials are clear, namely (1) to obey the rector in all matters pertaining to the guidance and government of the seminary, and (2) to support his authority.”\(^ {38}\) This is how Con, as he was so also referred to, used the rules in the management of this ‘total institution’ seminary.

At the beginning of each year he personally interviewed each new student to present him with the seminary rule book with the admonition, “You keep the rules and the rules will keep you.” Almost every past student interviewed from this time mentioned this.\(^ {39}\) Throughout the year he was often observed literally spying on students. He also had a system of personally appointed prefects who reported to him regularly about what had happened in their areas of responsibility. Referring to this seminary culture of rules, Alan Sheldrick remarked, “I was given the distinct


\(^{34}\) Archbishop John Panico, “The Delegates Address to Seminarians”, *Catholic Leader*, 1st May 1941.

\(^{35}\) Archbishop John Panico, Letter to Bishop Romauld Hayes, No. 662/41,13 May 1941, BAA.

\(^{36}\) *Codex Iuris Canonici* (CIC), Can. 1358, and Can. 1360. Par. 2.

\(^{37}\) *Rules of the Pius XII Queensland Provincial Seminary*, No. 97, 1940.

\(^{38}\) Cornelius Roberts. ‘Memorandum Prepared at the Request of Archbishop O’Donnell,’ 1956. BAA.

impression that I was there to keep the rules. No matter what I thought, whether or 
not I prayed, or even whether I believed in God, I was there to keep the rules.”

Roberts expected a serious observance of Rule 41: “The seminarists shall regard their  
Superiors as God’s representatives, and shall cherish towards them sentiments of 
great respect, of deep gratitude, of humble submission, and of filial confidence. They 
shall never judge or criticise them.” In the way he required their ‘humble 
submission’ and ‘great respect,’ students sometimes thought that Mgr Roberts took 
the view that he wanted to be revered as ‘God himself.’ Con never succeeded in 
gaining those sentiments “of great respect, of deep gratitude … and of filial 
confidence.” In their conversations away from the rector’s hearing, students were 
prone to ridicule and mock him.

A perusal of the Rules of the Pius XII Queensland Regional Seminary reveals that 
most of the 98 rules concerned the observation of routine seminary procedures which 
were automatically followed. Included in the rules was a stipulation for the 
observance of silence in the dormitories, the study halls and the refectory, and an 
insistence on punctual attendance at all seminary activities. Roberts exercised what 
could be called ‘snoopervision’ to make sure students were always punctual for these 
daily exercises. He made frequent visits to study halls and the corridors of students’ 
rooms to ensure they were keeping the silence and applying themselves to study, as 
set down in Rules 34 and 35:

---
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All are obliged to observe with exactness the daily rule, which is not to be changed except by order of the rector. Punctuality, necessary for the preservation of order and for the wise use of time, is an efficacious means of training the will to exact sense of duty.

Great importance will be given to silence, since it is a special help to recollection, a salutary exercise in mortification and self conquest, while at the same time it nourishes piety, aids progress in studies and helps to avoid many occasions of distraction. Silence is prescribed in the lecture halls, study, dormitory, refectory, and when entering and leaving them in a body.43

The rector was keen to enforce Rule 36: “Smoking is forbidden – also whistling, as well as the singing of profane songs and the use of slang expressions.” Whatever concerns he had about smoking, whistling was condemned. Students heard whistling were chided for producing ‘spontaneous wind music.’44 But some rules were practically ignored. Rule 38: “Seminarists are not permitted to retain money without the consent of the rector” was never enforced and Rule 39: “No one is permitted to have food or drink in his possession, except under medical orders and with the consent of the rector” was never really policed, something all students appreciated. Otherwise he was rigid especially with directives for visiting days. Peter Kennedy was in serious trouble when his fat her drove the family car over one of the rector’s

43 Rules of the PiusXII Queensland Provincial Seminary, Nos. 34 & 35, 1940.
44 Anthony Carroll, Interview, 13 October, 2008.
lawn areas. Brian Bird was rebuked when his parents waited in the seminary grounds for a taxi that was late in coming.

Rule 27, that “During the first week of the Scholastic Year the students shall give the vice rector an exact list of all their books (including study books) and they shall not be allowed to receive any other books without his permission” was practically ignored until the rector discovered a student reading one of Graham Green’s novels, a book he deemed undesirable. The vice rector directed each student to make up a list of his books for him. When that was done, nothing more was heard of this rule, so difficult for ensuring its compliance.

The assumed objective of some rules was to limit the possibilities of students being tempted by homosexual attractions. Many young students, fresh from the protected environments of the Catholic home and the Catholic school, had never heard the term “homosexual,” and could not understand why the seminary had these rules. They were not allowed to develop particular friendships. There were strictly imposed additional rules. Students had to wear dressing gowns to the bathrooms and were strictly forbidden to enter another student’s room. One student was directed to leave the seminary almost immediately after the rector spied him breaking this rule to catch sight of a new jet aircraft flying into Eagle Farm airport.

45 Peter Kennedy, Interview, 24 April, 2009.
46 Brian Bird, Interview, 29 April, 2009.
47 Mgr Cornelius Roberts, “The Rector’s Annual Report to the Hierarchy of the Queensland Province on the Provincial Seminary, 1961” BAA.
48 Rules of the Pius XII Queensland Provincial Seminary, 1940, No..61.
49 An incident frequently spoken about by students in the following months and vividly remembered.
Several former students interviewed noted that Mgr Roberts strongly disapproved of people who did not conform to his expected standards of behaviour.\textsuperscript{50} Tony Carroll recalled how he branded one student a “yahoo” and dismissed him from the seminary almost immediately after he heard this student mimicking the way the rector spoke to seminarians. According to Tony, “He held another student in suspense for about a fortnight when he overheard that student calling him a ‘bastard’ after he had refused permission to visit a dying uncle in hospital.”\textsuperscript{51} Tony considered, “Con’s rule as rector during the eight years I spent under him seemed like a ‘reign of terror.’ To me he seemed to be a control freak.”\textsuperscript{52}

During his investigation, Cecil Ballard had used Rule 49 to try to find out what was happening. This rule stated: “Seminarists should answer with complete frankness when questioned by the rector or vice-rector. Those who came to know anything that could be a danger to the virtue of their companions or the good name of the seminary shall report the matter to the superiors. The common good of all as well as charity towards the souls of others demands this.” Con never explicitly referred to this rule or the obligation of students to observe it. However, students always had a strong suspicion that Roberts was a willing listener if anyone offered to share such information with him.

Banyo students of those years detested this system used in seminaries worldwide, but accepted it to the extent that compliance was an unavoidable means to the

\textsuperscript{50} Bernard Wilson, Interview, 28 May, 2009.
\textsuperscript{51} Carroll, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid}.
priesthood. Cardinal John Heenan, Archbishop of Westminster, prior to his episcopal ordination, tried to justify this system:

In the seminaries of most English speaking lands there is a healthy disapproval of espionage. A system based on suspicion produces a completely undesirable type of student. If men are not trusted they tend to become untrustworthy. But refusal to spy can degenerate into a refusal to be watchful.

There was strong disapproval of the Robert’s spying system at Banyo. What Heenan said about the need for vigilance was accepted up to a point. However, Banyo students and priests who had heard stories of Roberts as dean of discipline at Manly considered their rector to be unreasonably severe and overbearing in his supervision of the seminary rules. According to Bill O’Shea, Mgr Roberts directed grown men as if they were immature school boys.

The rector’s approach to breaking rules was swift and severe. He would conduct a one-sided discussion with the student about the matter, admonish him and impose a penalty. He also reminded the student that he was not ordained and by breaking rules he placed his ordination in jeopardy. That would be a serious consideration next time he was ‘caught breaking a rule.’ At the next student assembly he would say, “Certain students have been breaking rules.” Who those students were and what rules they had broken no one knew, at least officially. Con would tell the students that in
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future the rule concerned had been extended to cover other areas as well. Paul Hewitt, a student towards the end of Con’s tenure at Banyo, referred to the hurtfulness of this approach:

A mechanism perpetuated at Banyo was victimization in a most extreme manner. It was done with a kind of anonymity. No names were given but innuendos were made. Those who heard accusations of faults and misbehaviour being made were forced, in these circumstances, to ask did this apply to them. Worst of all, it was done in the name of God and in the name of religion.  

According to Jim Hynes, “Con never eased out on the rules but attempted to tighten them more if he could.”

The rector’s method of imposing and supervising seminary rules ran counter to the following guidance Pope Pius XII offered to seminary directors only a few years earlier in his 1950 encyclical on the priesthood:

Particular attention must be paid to character formation in each boy by developing in him the sense of responsibility, the capacity to use his judgment concerning men and events, and the spirit of initiative. For this reason directors of seminaries must use moderation in the employment of coercive means, gradually lightening the system of rigorous control and restrictions as the boys grow older, by helping the boys themselves to stand on their own feet and to feel responsibility for their own actions.
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Directors should give a certain liberty of action in some kinds of projects habituating their pupils to reflect so that the assimilation of theoretical and practical truths may become easier for them. Let directors have no fear in keeping them in contact with the events of the day which apart from furnishing them with the necessary material for forming and expressing a good judgment can form material for discussions to help them and accustom them for judgments and reach balanced conclusions.⁵⁹

The use of the term ‘boys,’ [pueri in the original Latin], suggests that when Pius XII wrote this encyclical he was thinking of students in minor seminaries. If this was his advice for minor seminaries, it would have been much more applicable to major seminaries such as Banyo. For Roberts, discipline was there to impose limitations and keep students under restrictions. There was no development of responsibility as they grew older, nor any giving them ‘a certain liberty of action,’ nor any effort for ‘keeping them in contact with the events of the day.’ Roberts was out of touch with the current papal directives on seminaries or he simply preferred to ignore them.

The severity of Roberts was expressed in his outlook on those who left the seminary. Some students left of their own volition, while others were directed to leave by the rector. Speaking of what happened in his time, Bishop Ray Benjamin wrote:

“Students who left the seminary disappeared from view. They went at night and next day there was just a vacant place in chapel, refectory and lecture hall: no comment from anyone. But it was worse than that … They were strictly forbidden ever in their

lives to return to the seminary.” Mgr Roberts went further than this. According to John Maguire, head prefect at the seminary during Roberts’s first year as rector, Con told students before they went home for holidays at the end of the year: “During the holidays no present student was to have anything to do with anyone who had left during the year.” John added, “Not only was this outrageous, for some it was an impossible command where a brother of a student had already left the seminary.”

Students who entered the Banyo seminary from 1954 to 1964 soon gained an impression of their rector. Terry Hickling summed up Robert’s expectations of future priests; “Always and everywhere do everything as the seminary rules require and the rector directs.” He added that his basic assumption was that if you were a good student, meaning a compliant student, you would be a good priest. Eddie Colwell described him as a reserved person who had very definite ideas on what a priest and a student for the priesthood should be. Don O’Brien said that the rector adopted a very authoritarian approach to the development of students who had to do what he said without question.

As a reaction to the rector’s severity, a sub culture or and ‘under life’ developed among students. Young men described as the cream of Catholic youth who went to the seminary were annoyed when they were continually treated as ‘naughty children’
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62 Ibid.
63 Hickling, op. cit.
64 Colwell, op.cit.
65 O’Brien, op.cit.
bent on non-compliance with the rules and experienced a higher than normal level of tension caused by the rector’s reaction to minor infractions of the rules. To relieve that tension students with artistic skills produced cartoons of ‘tense’ seminary situations that were surreptitiously passed among students for a laugh. For the same reason other students composed parodies set to the tunes of popular songs to satirise seminary situations. Humorous sketches based on seminary situations for dramatic society productions presented in the absence of the rector and staff also helped to ease the tension. In what they did there was some resentment for the way they were treated but never was there any malice or threat to the rector.

All letters had to be sent, unsealed, through the rector or vice-rector, and incoming mail was opened by the vice-rector before students received their letters.\(^6\) The only exception was a student’s letter sent to his bishop. At times students avoided sending mail through the seminary authorities by getting a fellow student to post a letter when he went to visit a doctor or a dentist. There was no easy way to avoid the procedure for incoming mail. Students were “not allowed to read newspapers. Only some chosen periodicals and reviews of a religious character shall be permitted according as the Rector deems advisable.”\(^7\) As a concession, students were allowed to receive a limited number of newspaper cuttings of articles of personal interest through the mail. On picnic days students purchased the *Courier Mail*, the *Bulletin* and even *Time Magazine*, but were aware of the need to avoid ‘being caught.’ Rather than prevent the breaking of rules the strictness of the rector acted as a challenge to students to break rules without the rector finding out. The norm and challenge of this
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\(^6\) *Rules of the Pius XII Queensland Provincial Seminary*, 1940, Nos. 47 & 48.
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subculture was ‘Don’t get caught.’ Father Bill McGoldrick, the spiritual director, in
his own quiet way tried to ease the anxieties Mgr Roberts aroused through the
importance he placed on the rules.

Father McGoldrick was an original student of St Mary’s Christian Brothers College,
Toowoomba, in 1899 and the second student to be ordained in the long list of
priests educated in Toowoomba by the Christian Brothers. William McGoldrick had
entered St Columba’s College, Springwood, as a student of the Archdiocese of
Brisbane to study for the priesthood. He proceeded on to Manly and later to
Innsbruck, Austria. After his ordination he returned to Brisbane and served the
diocese in several appointments including that of secretary to the Archbishop. He
then joined the newly-established Columban Irish Missionary Society and was sent to
China where he spent almost 30 years that spanned the Japanese occupation and the
Chinese Communist takeover in 1949. Like other Western missionaries in China he
was arrested, interred and expelled in 1951. Sometime after his return to Australia
he was appointed to the position of spiritual director at Banyo.

Goldie, as he was affectionately called by students, was a very likeable person, highly
respected and greatly admired as a priest because of his pleasant disposition and
friendly manner. Students admired his zeal and dedication to duty as a missionary and

68 Kevin Dwyer. *St Mary’s College Toowoomba: A Century On 1899 – 1999*, Toowoomba: St Mary’s
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also for the way he bore his humiliation at the hands of the Communists. He was respected as a man who lived a life that was human but obviously close to his God. John Quinlan spoke for many when he recalled:

The spiritual director was a saviour to the development of our spiritual lives. His presence and manner of life inspired us for Bill never expressly taught us anything. … We were edified by his life of prayer and example ... although he never taught us anything, I feel I caught a lot from him.

Everyone at Banyo was edified by his life. And happy in his company. He was a person students could not help liking.

Some felt that McGoldrick’s greatest contribution to the development of spirituality in their lives was the opportunity to meditate each day on a passage of the Gospels. For this he delivered prepared points at the end of night prayers. Others felt he was too fundamental in his approach to the Scriptures. He could be quite sentimental particularly in matters relating to Mary and Jesus, her Son, and the relationship students should develop towards Mary. Jim Hynes expressed his gratitude to Father McGoldrick for the direction he gave to his spiritual development as follows:

“Through our daily meditation on a passage of the gospels I was able to develop a personal dimension as a Christian and develop a much better understanding of the
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Christian life.” Alan Sheldrick, who later gained a Scripture degree, endorsed ‘Goldie’s approach’: “He led us to Jesus - something I appreciated.”

For Tony Carroll, McGoldrick “lived on a spiritual plain that was well above me.” However, students looked forward to an occasional chat with him in the name of spiritual direction. Tony recognised one of the best ways in which he assisted students: “He quickly recognised the difficulties students experienced with the rector and to show us that we were not the only ones feeling the strain … he sometimes gently criticised him.” Others were not so ready to accept their spiritual director. Kerry Costigan found it difficult as a young student to relate to McGoldrick, a man well into his sixties when he came to Banyo in 1953. He did not understand students as young men and did not appreciate their problems. Bill O’Shea found him good company but his approach to concerns about his vocation were limited and simplistic: “He would suggest that any doubts I had about my vocation had been planted in my mind by the devil and that I should not give in to the devil as this would imply that the devil was overcoming God”. Barney Wilson said that he could never get on Fr McGoldrick’s wavelength. He was an admired person, an affable friend but, in the perception of many students, limited as a spiritual director.
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Father McGoldrick’s efforts at instructing students on how to go about their spiritual development were not always successful. He used the many opportunities he had to speak to students to encourage them to develop a deeper interior life. He certainly encouraged students to do their best with the spiritual exercises each day and gave them deeper meaning by suggesting that they use them, particularly the meditation, to develop a personal relationship with Jesus. He proposed a friendship relationship with Christ and Mary that had strong overtones of sentimentality. This was eagerly accepted by some but did not go over with all.

Father McGoldrick frequently encouraged students to use every opportunity to gain “more and more grace.” The basic Catholic teaching was that a human being received grace through Baptism and the other sacraments. The Catholic understanding was that in receiving the grace, won by Jesus through his Death and Resurrection, a person became a child of God as grace was a sharing in the life of God. This life of grace in the soul gave him or her power to live forever with God. As well, this life of grace, like natural life, had the capacity to grow through the cultivation of all good human actions directed to God. A better action would attract a greater share in grace. Thus the further the soul had grown in grace during this life the greater became that person’s capacity to enjoy the life of God in Heaven. The aim of the spiritual life then was to gain ‘more and more grace.’

Several students, including Jeffrey Scully, took all of this quite literally. In making his decision to go to the seminary, Jeff reminded himself that the purpose of life was
getting to heaven and if he was serious about this he would be better off working for God as a priest.\textsuperscript{86} He recalled, “Goldie’s, endorsement of my beliefs about life, grace and heaven made me look for the opportunities to gain more grace. When, on retreat Sundays at Banyo, Sr Dorena made cake for afternoon tea, I would offer my slice to another student believing that such self denial would mean more grace for me.”\textsuperscript{87} While what McGoldrick had to say about grace was not basically incorrect, it was simplistic and was not always conducive in helping all students develop a broad and balanced approach to the development of their spirituality.

Included in Fr McGoldrick’s role was introducing new students to the spiritual life with the use of a prescribed text on the spiritual life written by Adolphe Tanquerey,\textsuperscript{88} a text widely used with seminarians and religious novices in Australia. He asked students to read ahead and then comment on it in class. Students interviewed branded it as a most unsuitable book.\textsuperscript{89} Bill O’Shea’s comments sum up how most students felt about it:

Trying to read it was like trying to find my way through a foreign language. I do not know how the others handled it. I know I could not and I was supposed to be one of the brighter students. It expounded the spirituality of another time and place, possibly French with a touch of Jansenism. It was a densely packed book full of jargon such as the purgative, illuminative and unitive ways of the spiritual life. Like the

\textsuperscript{86} Jeffrey Scully, Interview, 3 March 2009.
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\textsuperscript{89} Selected Students 1954 – 1964, Interviews, 2008 - 2010.
atmosphere of Banyo and the spiritual exercises, it had the characteristics of a monastic approach to spirituality about it.  

Pat Cassidy recalled how “Bill often drifted away from it and took us to other places.” As each year wore on the use of Tanquerey was ignored and forgotten both by Father McGoldrick and by the students.

McGoldrick recommended many books for spiritual reading. Students found the books of the Abbot Marmion, *Christ the Life of the Soul* and *Christ the Life of the Priest* quite useful, if a little on the theoretical side. Bill O’Shea echoed the sentiments of other students with his comment: “He also recommended other spiritual books that were more practical such as S.M. Shaw’s *Salt of the Earth*, Frank Sheed’s *Theology and Sanity* and Eugene Boylan’s *This Tremendous Lover*. Such books could be purchased through the seminary. A student appointed for this work ordered books directly from the overseas publishers.

Don O’Brien paid this tribute to Father McGoldrick: “In many ways Bill McGoldrick was the gentle side of the authority at Banyo. He treated everyone as a special and unique person. His manner of acting towards us as students seemed to be totally in opposition to that of the ‘official regime.’ In spite of his sentimentality, his tendency to be fundamental, and his age difference, he assisted most students in some
way with their spiritual development. In 1964, Father McGoldrick, getting older and finding it more and more difficult to carry on, retired from the seminary. While everyone agreed that he had made a major contribution to the development of their spiritual lives, they also thought that more serious consideration by seminary authorities needed to be given to the kind of person appointed to this position.

Along with obedience and prayer, ascetical self-denial in the form of a celibate life demanded by the Church was a part of a priest’s life. Compulsory celibacy for priests had a long and stormy history. Father Oliver McTerman pointed out that celibacy was voluntary in the early Church:

The validity of celibacy as a Christian way of life is to be found not so much in biblical texts but rather in the example of Jesus’ own life. In the 300 years immediately following his death and resurrection, Christians chose to live a celibate life as a sign of their evangelical commitment, but no one was obliged to do so. Marriage certainly was not considered an impediment to priesthood.

When the threat of martyrdom passed, Christians began to search for more radical ways of expressing their commitment to Christ. It was then that the ascetical practices of monasticism and celibacy grew in popularity.
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Although efforts were made by local churches and the Church worldwide to impose celibacy on priests as a condition of ordination, it was made a universal obligation for the priests of the Latin Rite only in 1139. Of this legislation, David Rice writes:

In 1139, at the Second Lateran Council, the Church resorted to drastic means: it forbade altogether the marriage of priests, and declared such marriages null and void. The vow of abstinence had become the vow of celibacy. And, again, ritual purity was the decisive motive. ‘One does not approach the altar and the consecrated vessels with soiled hands’ had been the pagan view, now enshrined by the Christians in their law of compulsory celibacy.97

What this obligation meant in practice was summed up by Kerry Costigan: “Students of my time went to Banyo accepting that being a priest meant never getting married and consequently never having a romantic, and certainly not a sexual relationship with a woman.”98 This obligation was brought to students’ attention during their course in Canon Law in the Theology years, immediately prior to their ordination to the Subdiaconate at the end of their sixth seminary year, and in their study of the morality and immorality of sexual behaviour during their seventh year. However, how to manage the hazards of living a celibate life was practically ignored. Kevin Ryan could not remember having any formal preparation for the celibate life.99 Tony Carroll recalled, “We were to regard sexuality as not being part of our lives and to
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ignore any sexual tensions that arose. In such situations we should resort to prayer for God would give us the strength to overcome all temptations.”

Kerry Costigan also said, “There was no training in the need to respect women and how to relate to them. If there was any message, it was, ‘Beware of women. They are always attracted by a Roman collar.’” Kieran Dalton said that the only relationship a seminarian or a priest could have with a woman was with Our Lady. Alan Sheldrick approached Father McGoldrick on behalf of his class prior to making their vow of celibacy for an explanation of this obligation, because “we wanted some practical directions on living a celibate life.” His response was, “Don’t even think about it. Just sign on the dotted line.” Alan concluded, “All we could do was agree that this was the price we had to pay for being a priest although at the time we had no idea of what that price, the price of living on your own, was.” Kieran Dalton believed the preparation for celibacy was grossly inadequate because students did not get an opportunity to negotiate the celibacy obligation for themselves.

When he took up parish responsibilities as a young priest, Barney Wilson felt unprepared for the implications and demands of a celibate life.

In parish work I met attractive, intelligent, and practical young women, single and married, belonging to parish groups. Since leaving school in
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Year 12, I had had next to nothing to do with women and girls and in the situations that arose I found sharing the company of these young women a pleasant experience. When this happened without any warning and without any training I found it most difficult to get a balance in the way I related to them. There was no real support available for this situation. In addition, priests had a tendency to be condemnatory of any fellow priest who became romantically attached to a woman.105

Priests ordained prior to the pontificate of John XXIII were forbidden to marry. The Code of Canon Law identified doing so as a sin of sacrilege, a sin of misusing or abusing a sacred person or object. They also knew that once ordained and given permission to return to the lay state, they were still bound to a celibate life.106 The celibacy obligation was exactly spelt out. Apart from the advice to pray for help in difficulties, little other help in how to be faithful to this obligation was offered. Yet, in spite of the defective preparation for the life of celibacy, those aspiring to the priesthood were still prepared to commit themselves to this lifestyle.

Although a lot of emphasis was placed on studies by Roberts, students in retrospect expressed a lot of dissatisfaction with the content and teaching methods of the seminary studies program. Many believed seminary studies failed to fully prepare them for the situations of their future priestly life. Contents of the Banyo course of philosophy, theology, sacred scripture and other related subjects, laid down in the
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armed students with a defensive orientation only to Catholic teachings. Teaching methods were uninspiring, exposing those who taught their subjects as seriously lacking effective instructional skills.

Most lecturers based their lectures on a single set text, written in Latin in the subject taught. They simply read out the text in Latin, translated it, and then commented on it in ways that were “neither interesting nor attractive”. Students were expected to study the text before and after the lecture and, at the end of the section, answer questions on the section studied in what was called a ‘repetition.’ Students spoke of this rote method of teaching and learning as the “Jug to the Mug and Mug to the Jug Model.” This exposed lecturers to criticism of their teaching styles and incompetence in their lecturing delivery methods.

Pius XI’s insistence on scholastic philosophy continued to hold force. This was endorsed by Pius XII in 1950. Given the distance of nearly eighty years later, it seems an extravagant claim for the value of that philosophy because its Aristotelian framework and language bore little relationship to the contemporary world. Banyo, like other contemporary seminaries, was obliged to follow this school of Philosophy.
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Philosophy was studied at Banyo during the first three years. An Introduction to Philosophy and Logic (the criteria established by Aristotle for valid arguments) were studied in the first year. During years two and three the topics of Neo-Scholastic Philosophy, namely Epistemology (issues related to the status and value of knowledge), Metaphysics (literally, “beyond the physical” discussing possibilities existing beyond the observable world), Cosmology (questions about the world in which people live), Psychology (or a rational understanding of human nature), and Natural Theology (what can be known about God through reason) were included in the course of studies. Also running over the two years were the History of Philosophy and Ethics or Moral Philosophy.

The academic approach and abstract character of the study were obstacles to progress for many students. Tony Carroll described it as being “removed from anything practical.”\(^{112}\) Alan Sheldrick thought that the abstract nature of the study “added to our isolation from the world.”\(^{113}\) Terry Keliher thought the course was rather sterile.\(^{114}\) Terry Hickling gained only a “superficial grasp” of the subject.\(^{115}\) For Pat Cassidy, it was “a lost cause,”\(^{116}\) “hardly relevant,” for Don O’Brien,\(^{117}\) and it was “completely out of my depth,” for Geoff Scully.\(^{118}\) While Philosophy was supposed to be “a method of training in logical thinking and stressed the importance of language,” Kerry Costigan wondered how dated concepts in an ancient language
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could be useful.\footnote{Costigan, op. cit.} Bill O’Shea summed it up saying, “the Scholastic Philosophy we studied had a language and meaning all of its own. For most students it seemed to go over their heads. So much time and energy had to be used in translating the Latin text that there was little time left for reflection.”\footnote{O’Shea (Student), op. cit.} While Eddie Colwell claimed that Philosophy helped him to develop a logical approach to his studies and challenged him to read and think deeply,\footnote{Colwell, op.cit.} he encountered difficulties in studying the various sections of the course. Kevin Ryan recalled the place of Philosophy at Banyo in these words:

Brighter students might have made something of Philosophy but for most of us it meant hanging on to some Latin phrases and sentences that would help us through repetitions and exams. Through these bits and pieces we thought we were learning something but we really took away very little from our study of Philosophy.\footnote{Ryan, op. cit.}

Kevin Ryan also recalled his course in the History of Philosophy:

In a two year period it covered from the ancient Greek philosophy of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle: Albert the Great, Aquinas and Scotus in the Middle Ages; Descartes, Kant and Hegel to the Existentialists and Phenomenologists of the 1950s. It was like a telephone directory of the philosophers through the ages and those who disagreed with Catholic
thought were set up to be knocked down with the accusation that they had committed ‘grave errors.’\textsuperscript{123}

Modern and contemporary schools of Philosophy received scant attention. Apart from mentioning the names and principal exponents of those schools that at that time and subsequently had a major influence on disciplines in the Humanities and the Behavioural Sciences as well as Theology very little of that influence was discussed.

While Allan Sheldrick thought this study was worthwhile for its introduction to the insights of human thought through the ages,\textsuperscript{124} and Kieran Dalton found the review of thought very interesting,\textsuperscript{125} Terry Hickling found the study, which hardly dealt with important themes in modern thought, cut and dry and not very inspiring.\textsuperscript{126} Eddie Colwell believed that with so much to get through it was possible to dwell on the key concepts of the more important philosophers only. He believed that this meant gaining little depth of understanding into their works.\textsuperscript{127}

For many who had little Latin, the language of the texts was an obstacle to learning. Don O’Brien commented: “When I first opened my Philosophy textbook in Latin, I did not know whether it was upside down or back the front. It was just a mystery to me.”\textsuperscript{128} John Quinlan recalled: “Most of my study time was taken up with translating Latin into English and English into Latin. I really learnt very little Philosophy,
Theology or Scripture.”\(^{129}\) Bill O’Shea believed, “Instead of having a prescribed Latin text we would have gained more by following Frederick Copplestone’s History of Philosophy, published in English.”\(^{130}\)

The main professor of Philosophy was an Irish priest, Father David Hawe. Don O’Brien described him as being intellectually bright, learned, and well read, but someone who rarely came down to the level of his students.\(^{131}\) Bill O’Shea described him as the best Philosophy teacher who had his limitations. He followed a single text which he supplemented with notes dictated in Latin, stuck rigidly to his own style of teaching, and was not the easiest person to get along with.\(^{132}\) He displayed a deep understanding of his subjects, but taught at a level that was too abstract for most students.\(^{133}\) He was a demanding teacher and was scathing in his comments when students failed to give the answers he sought to his questions. His put-downs were nasty and frightening.\(^{134}\) Brian Bird described him as being “socially inept.”\(^{135}\) Even students with above average ability found it difficult to make a great deal of progress with Fr Hawe. He also taught Latin at an advanced level in the same demanding way. Jim Hynes did not consider Dave Hawe to be an attractive model for his students.\(^{136}\)
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However, some students saw another side of Fr Hawe.\textsuperscript{137} Kieran Dalton regarded Dave as an enigma. Kieran had an Irish father that he felt was very much like Dave Hawe. He believed that such Irishmen meant the opposite to what they said. “Dave’s rigorous attacks on people did not really affect me. I could laugh at them.”\textsuperscript{138} Brian Connolly said that he could be happy and humorous one day and sarcastic and cutting the next.\textsuperscript{139}

During their second and third years students were required to study Ethics, known, too, as Moral Philosophy, a course taken by Father Tom Sweeny. His treatment of the natural moral law was far from clear and topics on economic and political philosophies such as Liberalism, Capitalism, Socialism, and Communism sounded as if they existed only in textbooks. Students learnt very little of Communism in the unions in Australia, Bob Santamaria and the Catholic Social Studies Movement in these lectures. The tension between Cardinal Gilroy and Archbishop Mannix over the Catholic Social Movement was hardly mentioned.\textsuperscript{140}

Sweeny exhibited little inclination and ability as a teacher. Not having a suitable text he compiled notes,\textsuperscript{141} taken from Latin authors and poorly translated into barely intelligible English.\textsuperscript{142} Jim Hynes, a self trained typist, said that he made a mistake in volunteering to type and duplicate these notes on a basic spirit duplicator. The notes
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were bad enough, but his limited typing skills and the poor equipment available only added to the confusion.\textsuperscript{143}

Tom’s good points outweighed his deficiencies.\textsuperscript{144} Often he was the human face of Banyo. He was always friendly. He was always ready to keep students informed, at a superficial level, about what was going on outside the seminary, especially in the church, in sport and in politics. In this way he mitigated, if only a little, the isolation in the seminary. Later, in the role of seminary bursar, he earned the students’ appreciation for the efforts he made to improve the food at Banyo.

Paul Crittenden, a former priest of the Archdiocese of Sydney, a seminarian during these years, an Oxford graduate in Philosophy and a one-time Professor of Philosophy and Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Sydney, expressed the following thought on the place of Philosophy in studies for the ministry:

Philosophy … remains important in the studies taken by members of the clergy of whatever denomination. For a start, they need a course in critical thinking or informal logic, to get a sense of the structure of arguments and to be able to spot (and avoid) fallacies in their teaching and preaching. They need to study ethics, including the history of ethics and the main systems of ethical thought, not least to become aware of the constraints on religion set by ethical concerns. There is a good case for providing students for the ministry with a basic philosophy course on the
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nature of knowledge and related concepts such as truth, belief, doubt, probability, and certainty.\textsuperscript{145}

In the opinions of students the outcomes of philosophical studies at Banyo barely approximated to these criteria of Crittenden. In the monastic spirit of Banyo’s ‘total institution’ they did their best to study Philosophy because the Church demanded them to do so and the rector saw to it that they did. It was a means to an end and a test of their obedience.

Among other things, Father Frank McKinley taught English Literature, supposed to be a serious study of major pieces of literature but studies comprised reading the text and providing a superficial commentary. Alan Sheldrick thought that Charlie, as students called him, just did not want to be at Banyo and he hated it.\textsuperscript{146} Alan also recalled the following:

His classes lacked life; he never corrected any examination he set. The proof of this was that students often found uncorrected English exam papers in the waste disposal of the seminary building. If questioned about an exam he would make a remark that he was still looking at the papers. To test out whether Charlie even looked at our exams at all, Frank Derriman, a classmate, wrote his response to the examination questions in
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Italian while I wrote a three page essay as a self apologia. We never heard any more of it.\textsuperscript{147}

Students regarded Charlie as a poor teacher, not interested in seminary teaching. Terry Hickling contrasted the love his teacher at Nudgee gave him for English Literature with Father McKinley, “whose classes in English Literature seemed a chore for him.”\textsuperscript{148} Bill O’Shea believed that a good course in English Literature could have been related to life in society which would have been an advantage in the isolation of Banyo, but the poor quality of the course made it a wasted opportunity.\textsuperscript{149}

The field of Scripture Studies at Banyo belonged to Dr Alexis (Lex) Carroll. As a seminary professor of Sacred Scripture before the Second Vatican Council and before the Bible was accorded increased status and prominence in the Catholic Church, Lex held an unenviable position. When Martin Luther had advocated the private interpretation of Scripture, the Church claimed sole authority for interpreting the bible and jealously guarded it. During the nineteenth century, Protestant scholars, free to study the Scriptures in the light of the findings of archaeological, cultural, and other forms of research, derived conclusions vastly different from those held by the Catholic Church. Some Catholic scholars who attempted to reconcile their findings with Catholic teaching came to grief early in the twentieth century when Pius X condemned their efforts as Modernism.\textsuperscript{150} Later, Pius XII gave limited freedom to
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Catholic scholars to follow the paths of the Protestants, but instituted the Papal Biblical Commission in Rome to monitor and, if needs be, check their findings. They had to proceed with caution.

Dr Carroll did proceed, but his students were always conscious that he was doing so with the utmost caution. Barney Wilson described him as a conservative who wanted to put the picture of modern biblical developments before his students. Brian Bird gave an example of this in the way Carroll taught the substantial Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible) until the new theory of sources arising from oral traditions was included in the Jerusalem Bible. Eddie Colwell believed Dr Carroll had to work overtime in this rapidly changing area. In doing so he made students aware of the changes taking place, interpreted controversial text but in ways that could be reconciled with the decrees of the Biblical Commission.

During the philosophy years students studied the characteristics of the Bible and its individual books in Biblical Introduction. Jim Hynes remembered Dr Carroll putting a sparkle into his classes by referring to Judith as ‘Miss Israel 600 BC’ and suggesting Ezechiel went into exile in his chariot with the number plate ‘EZI 593.’

During Theology, Carroll directed studies in the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis, the four Gospels, and the Pauline Epistles to the Romans, Galatians and
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others. Students were sometimes disappointed that he did not cover a wider range of the Scriptures, but attention was directed to these parts of the Bible because they were closely related to the Theology of Original Sin, the Incarnation and the Redemption studied in Dogmatic Theology.

In his classes, Dr Carroll dictated notes for students to write down.\textsuperscript{156} This was a chore that students did not enjoy. However, because of the quality of the information and the obvious dedication and amount of work he had put into his preparation they were prepared to accept this approach. Jim Hynes said: “I appreciated the work that Lex put into his classes. I also believe that his passion for the Scriptures lifted us.”\textsuperscript{157}

Two of his students, Bill O’Shea and Alan Sheldrick, went to Rome after ordination for postgraduate studies in Scripture. Each of them believed that they were further advanced in their knowledge of what was happening in Scripture Studies than most of their fellow students from around the world. This they attributed to the hard work of Dr Alexis Carroll.\textsuperscript{158} Alan also remembered how Carroll went through the Psalms, the central feature of the Divine Office recited daily by priests, and made three pertinent points about each psalm.\textsuperscript{159} Barney Wilson was often complimented by Army chaplain colleagues from other Australian seminaries on his knowledge of the Scriptures, which he attributed to Dr Carroll.\textsuperscript{160}
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For the purposes of preaching and giving religious instruction, priests were expected to be familiar with the teachings of the Church. The study of these was covered in Dogmatic Theology. Mgr Roberts continued to teach Dogma throughout the years he was in charge of the seminary. As a teacher he was ‘a man of the manual,’ closely following the prescribed text of Herve’s *Dogmatic Theology*. Students recall that he kept very much to the structure of the textbook as it established proofs of each thesis from the Teachings of the Church, Scripture, the Fathers of the Church (Patrology), and from reason (Philosophy). The course he covered began with the creation and fall of man, and included the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption and Death and Beyond at the close of earthly life. This was in accordance with the Scholastic Theology of the time.

Con was acclaimed as a good teacher “with the rare gift of getting the message across without confusing you with asides and trivialities” for the explanations he offered for complex theological concepts, but his classes were always serious, unimaginative, and unexciting. He expected students to memorize the information in text books for regurgitation in exams. While Con did not have the volatility of Dave Hawe, he was skilful at generating tension by his long silences and glares when students stumbled in answering his questions. He had special areas to which he gave great attention such as the apparent paradox of divine foreknowledge and human free will. This involved the issue of predestination, a topic frightening for some students.
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During his years at Manly where he taught this course and wrote articles for publication in the *Australasian Catholic Record*, Con made his reputation as a dogmatic theologian. His great failure as a theologian was his neglect to discuss theological issues fermenting in Europe between World War II and the Second Vatican Council. Theologians such as Karl Rahner, Yves Conger, Hans Kung, and even the present Pope, Benedict XVI, as Joseph Ratzinger, all of whom contributed to the direction and the outcomes of Vatican II, remained unmentioned and unknown. His substantial treatment of Dogmatic Theology was incomplete.

Students spent the first year in Theology laying the basis for future Dogmatic Theology studies in Fundamental Dogmatic Theology where topics involved the presence of God in the Created World, in Divine Revelation, in the Divinity of Christ and in the Church Christ established. The vice-rector, Dr William (Bill) Smith, taught this course. To establish arguments for the divinity of Christ, Bill Smith relied heavily on the historical reliability of the four gospels, a topic then being critically scrutinized by biblical scholars. He stressed the juridical nature of the Church and emphasized its teaching and governing roles but rarely referred to the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, thus leaving his students unprepared for the Second Vatican Council’s definition of the Church as the People of God. Bill was able to grasp things quickly but he showed no interest in theological developments. His neglect of the developments taking place restricted his approach to another course he taught, the place of the sacraments in the Church. These courses were concerned about rules and
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regulations and hardly about the community and individual ritual expressions of the human relationship with the divine as the Second Vatican Council was about to proclaim. The isolation of the seminary from the rest of the Church was reflected in the manner in which both Mgr Roberts and Dr Smith presented their subjects.

Dr Cecil Ballard took responsibility for Moral Theology, another major area of study, and also for Canon Law. After he had recovered from the condition referred to as ‘a stroke’ following the ‘Purge,’ Ballard came to the seminary by taxi each day from Northgate where he lived with his mother. He used the prescribed manual for Moral Theology of Noldin – Schmidt, a legalistically structured dry text. Dr Ballard had a wide range of interests and was always concerned about the practical elements of his course. Despite his physical difficulties, he kept in touch with many areas of interest in the Brisbane church and brought these into his classes for discussion. He could be entertaining even if at times such entertainment came about by a spoonerism, a faux pas or a lapsus linguae. Dr Ballard taught Canon Law in much the same way and made his students aware of the many intricacies and applications of ecclesiastical law. In his own characteristic way Ballard endeavoured to overcome some of the seminary isolation by relating the subjects he taught to his own pastoral experience.

Dr John Clarke, who had taught earlier in the minor seminary, replaced Dr Ballard in 1960, when he returned to the Rockhampton Diocese. Students regarded John Clarke as a rigorist and did not warm to him. According to Kieran Dalton, “John Clarke
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threatened and intimidated students into accepting Church moral teaching set down in
the Moral Theology textbook. He disliked accepting questions in class and gave the
impression that we were not to think but to accept the store of knowledge given
through that seminary style education.”¹⁷⁰ Brian Bird recalled Clarke became acting
dean of discipline during 1963, the year of the rector’s sabbatical leave. According to
Brian, “The title of dean seemed to go to his head … The way he went about his task
soon made him disliked by students who refused to cooperate with him in whatever
way they could.”¹⁷¹ John Clarke never seemed to fit in at Banyo and the next year he
left the seminary to take up a parish appointment.

Bernard Wallace, later Bishop of Rockhampton, taught the Principles of Moral
Theology courses to students in their first Theology year and on the morality of
sexual behaviour to the ordination class. Everyone regarded Wallace as one of the
better seminary teachers and admired him for his self developed pedagogical skills.
He always prepared well, knew his subject thoroughly, and presented in a way that
captured the interest of students. He was almost a utility member of the staff. He
could take over when another professor was unavailable. He also taught Modern
History to first year students, where he delivered detailed and most engaging lectures
on the Renaissance and the Reformation.

In the early years of the Roberts regime, Dr Lex Carroll taught a three year course of
Church History, a rather ‘cut and dry’ course delivered through dictated notes to
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cover the events, the people and the issues of these events. Kevin Ryan saw Carroll as presenting information to students which indicated that “significant people in the Church did exist, that places were real, and that events involving these people had actually taken place.”\(^{172}\) There was little effort made to probe the historical issues of the Church. In 1961, Dr Tom Boland, a Roman graduate with a doctorate in Church History, took over this course. Barney Wilson thought that Boland’s lectures were always interesting, although he followed a fairly direct line of events in the history of the Church.\(^{173}\) Although Dr Boland set books for study, “there was no seminar style of teaching and no real support for student learning.”\(^{174}\) While students criticized most courses as outdated and difficult to relate to the future life in a parish, criticism was more severe on the lecturers for their lack of professional teaching skills and their inability to engage students in the topics of study in interesting ways. Tom Boland, along with Bernard Wallace and Alexis Carroll, escaped this criticism.

Library research work and other reading which added scope and depth to studies was not required. Kevin Ryan recalled: “What library there was consisted of a room full of books that arrived at the seminary as depository of the books of deceased priests’ personal libraries … When extensions were added to the seminary in the late fifties a suitable space for a library was designated within the buildings constructed.”\(^{175}\) It was only later that tutorial groups and assignment work were introduced and students were required to do independent research.\(^{176}\)
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The preparation of students for liturgical ministry as a leader of public worship was limited to the preparation and delivery of practice sermons, familiarity in the use of rubrics for the celebration of Mass and the use of the correct matter and form in the administration of the sacraments. Actual sermons training occurred in the last two years when each student had to prepare and deliver a sermon of extended length on a theological subject in the presence of his classmates. This was supervised by the rector, the vice rector or another professor designated by the rector. When the sermon was delivered the supervising priest indicated what he considered to be helpful points for improvement. Bill O’Shea regarded this approach as “quite deficient” for “such sermons were rather academic and theoretical and hardly related to people’s lives.”

He thought that many newly-ordained priests continued in this mode for some time after they were appointed to parishes. Terry Keliher, along with other former students, suggested that the training in public speaking through the Literary and Debating Society where each student was expected to give at least two speeches a year was a far more valuable experience for preaching and teaching.

Dr Bill Smith had the responsibility of preparing students for their ritual roles. In the months before ordination he familiarized them with the rubrics for celebrating Mass according to the Roman rite through instruction, demonstration, and guided practice. He was a thorough Master of Ceremonies and in the matter of ceremonies and rituals he prepared students very well. However, these were the years after the publication of Pius XII’s two major encyclicals on the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ and the Liturgy as community worship, both directing laity involvement in the Liturgy.
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Dr Smith’s instructions finished with the priest’s celebration of Mass. He never considered how a priest could promote a more active participation of the laity in the Mass. As regards the administration of the Sacraments, his Sacramental Theology classes focused on the things used, the words said and the actions done as a ritual. Suggestions of how to build into that ritual ways to express the presence and action of Christ in meeting the person receiving each sacrament and the gathered community were not forthcoming. In the isolation of the seminary at that important time before the Council students were left in ignorance of coming changes that liturgists and theologians overseas were advocating.

In preparation for pastoral life, during the year of their ordination students attended a weekly Pastoral Theology class conducted by Father Cyril Shand, a Brisbane pastor. John Quinlan’s remarks sum up the reaction of students to these classes:

He spoke to us mainly about the parish registers and forms we would have to fill out in conjunction with the administration of Baptism and Matrimony and for funerals. There was nothing practical in this for the first time I saw a corpse was when I did my first anointing at the Toowoomba hospital when I was helping out at the Cathedral.179

According to Eddie Colwell, “Pastoral practices were developed mainly through on the job experiences. How well a young priest learnt these depended on the ability of his parish priest to be a good teacher of pastoral practices.” 180
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To provide training for taking religion classes in schools, the rector directed each student in the ordination class to explain a question and answer in the catechism to the rest of the class group.\footnote{Ibid.} For young men about to enter the parish life, where a considerable amount of their week days would be spent conducting religious education lessons in Catholic and State Schools, this was insufficient. They needed to develop the basic teaching skills of preparing and delivering a lesson as well as involving the children in their classes. There was no preparation for such tasks as instructing converts, preparing couples for marriage, chaplaincy for lay apostolate groups, home visitation, and hospital visitation. Young priests just went out and did these things the best they could.

To promote students’ human development, Con ran the seminary like a “Gentlemen’s Finishing School.” He frequently reminded students, individually and as a group, that they must “wear the soutane with due decorum.”\footnote{Rules of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, No. 54.} He reminded students of the required length of a soutane, that it must be worn with all buttons done up and that the collar and its attached clerical vest must never to be removed in public. When students went as a body from the seminary to the ordinations at St Stephen’s Cathedral and the Corpus Christi procession they wore soutanes which marked their separation from the community.

Table etiquette, including how to use cutlery, was one of Mgr Roberts’s obsessions. He even chided one student for failing to use his fork at table in the way he had been
directed.\textsuperscript{183} He demonstrated and insisted that students peel and eat their fruit, including oranges, using a knife and fork.\textsuperscript{184} Martin comments, “New students were highly amused by the latter, but it had to be discreet as levity had no place in Con’s make up.”\textsuperscript{185} He also directed students to continue the practice of listening for mispronunciations when students read in the refectory during meals. Roberts irked students by insisting on one pronunciation of words like ‘aspirant,’ when two or more were acceptable. It was as if those who used the pronunciation prescribed by Roberts thereby expressed superiority in their use of language.

A contribution Con made to the development of students’ appreciation of church life was the number and quality of people he invited to address students. These included Douglas Hyde, a former Communist who had converted to Catholicism, Mgr Joseph Cardijn, the founder of the Jocist Movement, (known as the Young Christian Workers in Australia), and Father Bernard Leeming, a leading English Jesuit theologian. Father Leo Hayes, a Toowoomba Parish Priest known for his great collection of books and other publications also came. He had connections with Historical, Geographical and Geological Societies and was involved in many of their field activities. His lectures were always interesting and entertaining.

Another visiting lecturer, Father Ernst Worms, a Pallottine missionary priest and anthropologist, had worked with Aborigines in North Western Australia.\textsuperscript{186} He gave
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a series of informative lectures on Aboriginal culture and customs. While students
appreciated and enjoyed his lectures, they considered he was talking about an
interesting aspect of Australian life with which they never expected to have any real
contact. In the light of the developments of relations with indigenous people, much
could have been gained by encouraging students to investigate indigenous life and
seek social contact with indigenous Australians.

The works of Australian portrait painters and landscape artists was Mgr Roberts’s
passion. To pass on his appreciation of art to students he acquired many painting of
merit which he hung around the seminary walls.187 One acquisition was the “Ecce
Homo,” a large painting by Eric Smith of the mocked Christ that had been entered in
the competition for the Blake Prize in Religious Art.188 He invited artists to come to
the seminary to give lectures about their works and to donate a painting to the
seminary. All artists invited to the seminary were males. James Wineke, the curator
of the Queensland Art Gallery, delivered a memorable series of lectures to the
students on the History of Art.189 Roberts also commissioned the distinguished
portrait painter, William Dargie, to paint for the seminary a life size portrait of
Archbishop James Duhig dressed in his Episcopal robes and his regalia as Doctor of
Laws. He also commissioned Graeme Inson to paint a bust portrait of the former
rector, Mgr Cleary. Cleary then commissioned this artist to paint a similar portrait of
Roberts.190 The two portraits were hung in the assembly hall to begin what was

187 Ryan, , op. cit.
189 Ryan, op. cit.
190 Martin, op.cit., p. 98
expected to become a ‘wall of fame.’ Through this exposure to art works an appreciation of art and artists developed in many students.

There were other ventures into the world of art. From Dublin he obtained stained glass windows of St Peter and St Paul to complete the set in the seminary chapel. He commissioned sculptured statues of Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Christ the Priest for the seminary grounds. This love of things beautiful was expressed in his hope of turning the seminary grounds into parkland. This involved making lawns and planting trees. Students supplied the labour force. It was not quite a pressgang but it was close to being one. Kevin Ryan said, “Students did the work for Con but for most of them this was done grudgingly.”

To the relief of those not keen on sport, under Con sport was no longer compulsory, although partaking in recreation was. As well as the opportunity to become involved in the rector’s landscaping project, the seminary farm-garden, poultry run, the hobby shop, picnic days, and occasional walks outside the seminary grounds were alternatives. Students enjoyed these activities. Walks and picnic days afforded brief opportunities to ‘escape’ the seminary.

At the same time, he did not neglect the needs of those who liked their sport. With the assistance of one of Brisbane’s race clubs he was able to lay a concrete basketball court.

---
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court and make extensive improvements to one of the ovals. Con worked hard to have a swimming pool built for students, a project completed after his time. Among the student body were a number of fit and skilled sportsmen who enjoyed their cricket, basketball, rugby league, and tennis. Eddie Colwell spoke for many in saying, “The recreation time at the end of each day provided a good balance to the time we spent at lectures and in study. … I enjoyed the outdoor interaction of the cricket, basketball, and tennis matches we played during recreation.”

Roberts could also claim the title of ‘builder.’ Towards the end of the 1950s, increasing enrolments made extensions to the seminary imperative. During Roberts’s eleven year term of office, 199 new students began their studies for the priesthood. The largest group was the 1963 intake with 31 new students, following the opening of the Second Vatican Council. In each of the consecutive years – 1956, 1957, and 1958 - there were over 20 new enrolments.

At the beginning of 1958 there were sufficient student rooms to accommodate each theology student in his own room. By the beginning of 1959, more than half of the first Theology class was squeezed into two small, temporary dormitories in St Aloysius’s House. Because of the high number of enrolments, the dormitories used by the students of philosophy were also full. More accommodation was needed.

---

194 Eddie Colwell, Interview, 23 February 2009.
In a letter of 17 May, 1957, Bishop Andrew Tynan of Rockhampton, Secretary of the Committee of Trustees for the seminary, wrote to Archbishop O’Donnell informing him of a letter received from Archbishop Duhig, “urging the need for the provision of more accommodation at the seminary.” When provisional plans were drawn up by the architect to set the project in motion, a contract to erect a wing corresponding with the original wing on the other side of the seminary and a block of student rooms was awarded to Messrs Hutchinson & Sons. When the contractors went into liquidation, work continued through a day labour scheme. The job was finished in the middle of 1959 and students in two small dormitories moved to rooms in the new wing which also included an assembly hall, a library, a recreation area and garages for the professorial staff.

Later that year, the new buildings were blessed and opened by Cardinal Agagianian, the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith (Propaganda), then visiting Australia as Papal Legate and taking part in the celebration of the centenary of the establishment of the Diocese of Brisbane. In addressing the gathering on this occasion the Cardinal said, “This completed seminary, of which you may be justly proud, is now well equipped for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the students with a view to their future efficiency as priests.” Even at that time so close to the commencement of Vatican II, while the seminary buildings were noted as completed, no questions were being raised about the suitability and adequacy of the seminary system of training.

---
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In his own strange way, Mgr Roberts did much to advance the human development and the welfare of students. Students, in their own way too, organized activities for their own development. As well as the public speaking experiences through the Literary and Debating Society meetings where students enjoyed the lightness of the atmosphere, there were the Dramatic and the Music Societies. Students enjoyed the productions of several Gilbert and Sullivan operettas and plays like *Arsenic and Old Lace*. These productions gave students confidence to perform in front of audiences and other presentation skills. These student activities were remembered for their entertainment, the distraction from normal seminary routine, and the bonds that were forged through their shared activities.

While Roberts made many worthwhile contributions to the seminary and student life, the general opinion of him was that he never managed to get along with his staff, was not liked by students, and most of all, he was a stern and inflexible person. Whether intentionally or unintentionally in preparing young men for the priesthood, Mgr Roberts did run Banyo like a ‘total institution’. This he did through a traditionally established and accepted system governed by rules which he rigorously imposed. The impact these made were not softened by his contributions to the development of the facilities of the seminary. In 1963, Mgr Roberts took the year off from seminary duties as a sabbatical year. When he returned in 1964 with the imminence of radical changes coming into the Church and into seminaries, the Queensland Bishops realized that Roberts with his determined, inflexible, and rigorous personality was not the rector to take the seminary into the post Vatican II era. He was a harsh man
over-attached to a system that was at long last being officially questioned. That year he refused to support the ordination of one deacon to the priesthood. He also directed at least three students not to return to the seminary the following year, a directive that was overruled by their bishops.\textsuperscript{200} Whatever the explanation, the fact was that Mgr Robert’s term as rector was terminated at the end of 1964 when Archbishop O’Donnell appointed him as Parish Priest of Hendra, thus bringing to an end his eleven years as rector and over twenty years as a seminary professor at Banyo.

\textsuperscript{200} O’Brien op. cit.
Chapter V  Tumult of Changes

In the wake of the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965),¹ Monsignor John Torpie’s appointment as rector of Banyo (1965 – 1967) ushered in a period of change and reform at Banyo. Before a consideration of those changes and the challenges and difficulties they brought, the impact of Vatican II on the Church generally is discussed as the context within which these reforms were inaugurated. Both a challenge and a difficulty at Banyo was the changing characteristics of the student body as the baby boomer generation moved into the seminary. These changes which reduced the seminary’s separation from mainstream society and weakened its detached characteristics as a ‘total institution’ commenced with a relaxation of the strict rules of the Banyo Tridentine tradition. By removing many barriers between the seminary and the community, students gained closer contact with people and, through the Church, became more involved with them and the wider world. The process became painful when disagreements arose over the extent to which rules needed to be relaxed for the seminary to become integrated with the Church and the civic community. Through it, Banyo became more open and less rigid but its obsession with changing rules led it to neglecting other areas needing modifications. It also found the monastic model as a ‘total institution’ difficult to leave behind.

Behind the changes at Banyo from 1965 to 2000 was the transformative impact of the Second Vatican Council throughout the Roman Catholic Church. Vatican II aimed to

change the Church so that it might exercise a beneficial influence on the world of which it was part and from which it had become separated since the time of the Protestant Reformation (1517 – 1660). Thus what happened at Banyo in the years following the Council has to be seen from the perspective of the Church endeavouring to become once again involved in the world. While basically seminaries changed because the world had changed, they did so because of the influence of Vatican II. In response to changes in the secular world the Council changed the Church. Through Vatican II seminaries were consequently brought out of isolation and changed in response to the demand for adaptation.

The 16 years (1965 – 1980) were a time of complex and conflating changes throughout the Catholic Church that impacted on the seminary, itself in a state of flux. Changes were initiated when Pope John XXIII succeeded Pope Pius XII in 1958. Prior to John XXIII, the Church tended to see itself existing in an inhospitable world from which it had distanced itself. Since the Protestant Reformation and the subsequent wars of religion, then the Enlightenment and rationalism, the French Revolution, Liberalism and Marxism that followed in Europe, the Roman Catholic Church had cut itself off from a world it saw as hostile. In the centuries after the Reformation to the time of Pius XII (1939 -1958), the Church, because of its disconnection from the world, had gained what the German theologian, Peter Fransen, labelled a “ghetto image.”

---

The high mark of this hostility was reached during the papacy of Pope Pius IX. From when he lost control of the Papal States in 1848 to the government of a newly unified Italy until the end of his papacy thirty years later, “he aligned himself totally with reaction in Church and State and set his face against liberalism in any form,” declaring himself “a prisoner of the Vatican.” This status was accepted by popes up to 1931 when Pius XI entered into a concordat with Mussolini which established the Vatican City as an Independent State. Even then the rift between the Church and the world remained. John wanted to heal that rift by bringing the Church into closer contact with the modern world. The Church had practically ignored its break with the world except when confronted by the world. Those interventions were usually to condemn. Pope John wanted the Church to become a partner in dialogue with the world, to offer inspiration and service to that world becoming increasingly secular.

In the hope of this, Pope John XXIII called Vatican II to modernize the Church in a way that it became relevant in the modern world.

In the first three months of his papacy in 1958, Pope John XXIII metaphorically “flung open the windows of the Vatican,” saying he wanted the Church to openly acquaint itself with the modern world so that it could align itself with its changes. In alluding to this, Bishop Geoffrey Robinson wrote: “He (Pope John XXIII) spoke of opening windows, bringing the church up to date and of seeing much that was good

---
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in the world around him. In this Council the Church finally did take an open look at the world and culture in which it lived and sought to engage with it.”  

Very soon after his election he called the Second Vatican Council to prepare the Church, its bishops, priests, religious and laity for this challenge.

Scientific, technological, cultural, social, and economic changes meant the Church existing in an industrial and urban world different from the rural agricultural world of the past. Through these changes the Church had lost contact with ordinary people. At the intellectual level, from a philosophical and scientific perspective, the way men interpreted the world had changed. Archaeological, cultural, historical, and literature research had influenced biblical and theological studies in a manner that implied that the Church urgently needed to reconsider how it interpreted its teachings. These changes, each at its own level, were complex and that complexity was increased by their conflation with each other. John set the Church the challenge to recognize, accept, and work with these changes.

The historian E. E. Y. Hales recorded the proclamation of the mission Pope John announced for the Council on its opening day. Hales wrote how the Pope told all, that day in St Peter’s, what their task was. Pope John XXIII told them that it was not so much, as in past centuries, to concern themselves with “such and such a point of doctrine, or of discipline, which it was necessary to bring back to the pure sources of revelation and tradition,” but “to show in its true light and restore to its real value the

---

quality of human and Christian life, of which the Church is the custodian and mistress throughout the centuries.”

Pope John hoped that the Church would present itself to the world as the light of individuals and the light of the social order, sentiments echoed by *Lumen Gentium* (Light of the Nations), the first two words of Vatican II’s Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, used as an image of the Church in the world. In the document *Spes et Gaudium* (Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World), the Council stated that “it wishes to set down how it understands the presence and function of the church in the world of today,” by offering a worthwhile contribution to the life and cultures of humanity. To do this the Church had to be modernised, for which the Council recommended widespread changes.

The dynamics of change generated by the Council had immediate effects in the Catholic Church. A former priest, Alex Nelson, attempting to explain the impact of the Council on the life of the Church and its members, cited the observations of Naomi Turner:

Turner (1992) … noted that, to a culture which expected to exercise control and to require obedience, the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965) had announced an aggiornamento. This appraisal of the values and

---

meanings of the church’s theology and life, in the light of the condition of
the twentieth century world, had plunged the whole culture of
Catholicism into a time of review and renewal of this practice. Initially,
the impetus for the reappraisal came from the directives of the church’s
hierarchy. However, very soon there was an enthusiastic and energetic
movement, particularly within religious communities of women, to
engage in revisioning their personal and communal vocation.¹⁶

This enthusiastic movement spread rapidly to all sections of the Church: the bishops,
the parish clergy, male and female religious orders, and to the laity. Not all changes
were universally accepted nor did they all bring about the beneficial results expected.
In all sections of the Church, the introduction of changes brought ‘mixed blessings.’¹⁷

Categorising proposed changes, establishing their meanings and implications,
understanding how they related to the old situation, and attempting, in limited time
and under pressure, to develop a confident ‘road map forward’ became an enormous
problem for the whole Church. Chris McGillion indicated some of the complexities
of the problem:

The Council defined the Church as the ‘whole people of God’,
acknowledged that Catholics didn’t have all the answers to the problems
of the day, and called for renewal of Church structures and ritual, in line

¹⁷ Paul Collins, *Mixed Blessings: John Paul II and the Church of the Eighties*, Ringwood, Vic:
with the ‘signs of the times’. This was a radical challenge to the old hierarchic-dogmatic model of Church.

A death notice had also been served on an expression of Catholicism that was centred on the priest, grounded in moral absolutes, and adorned with saints and sins and rosaries. The Second Vatican Council contributed to the Catholic community’s disintegration by exposing its past to critical re-evaluation and raising fundamental questions about the direction of life.18

Making these changes was fraught with difficulties in the way adaptations were to be made for a Church that had used a traditionally centralized decision making process.

Most barriers shutting out the world were removed but positions for new boundaries were unclear. Differences arose over what was to be changed and the extent and direction of those changes. This was complicated by the manner of making changes, whether at a gradual evolutionary pace or a rapid revolutionary pace. Conservatives wanted little or no change and any changes adopted to be slowly implemented. Progressives wanted many changes to be implemented as quickly as possible. Positions were taken at all points in between. As the drama of change unfolded in every diocese, parish, religious order and lay group throughout the Church, tensions developed among the interacting individuals and parties. This same drama was played out in seminaries, including Banyo, with an unexpected level of tension.

---

Since their establishment after the Council of Trent, all seminaries had followed practically an identical lifestyle, curriculum, and program of formation. *Optatam Totius* (Decree on the Training of Priests) signalled the need for seminary renewal and emphasized a renewal according to the needs of each country:

Given the great diversity of peoples and countries only laws of a general nature can be laid down. In each country and rite, therefore, a specific “Program for priestly formation” shall be established by the episcopal conference, to be reviewed at suitable intervals and approved by the holy See, so that the general rules may be adapted to the special circumstances of time and place, and the formation of priests will always be in keeping with the pastoral needs of the areas in which they minister.\(^\text{19}\)

This Vatican II document directed that the training for priests continue in seminaries but offered little detailed direction for changes in a traditionally embedded system. Its main principle and consequent directives were stated in *Optatam Totius*: “Major seminaries are needed for priestly formation. Their entire formation program should aim at enabling students to be formed as true pastors of souls, following the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, teacher, priest and shepherd.”\(^\text{20}\)

Seminaries remained ‘forming houses of change’ but that formation process moved from focusing on the priest as ‘another Christ’ to that of pastors according to the example of Christ as ‘teacher, priest and shepherd.’ In this, the Council used its

---

\(^{19}\) *Optatam Totius* (Decree on the Training of Priests), 1965, No 1, in Flannery, *op. cit.*
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understanding of Christ’s mission as applied to a priest as having the roles of attracting people to the Christian life by relevant and engaging Scripture based preaching and pastorally caring for them in addition to gathering them for worship in the Mass or the Eucharist.

For centuries, Catholics had regarded their priests as cultic persons who offered the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist. This stood in contrast with seeing priests as following the example of Jesus Christ as teacher, priest and shepherd. Seeing the priest in this renewed way was a return to the manner in which priests were seen in the earliest years of Christianity. The Second Vatican Council broadened the understanding of the priesthood leaving behind the narrow view of the past.\(^{21}\)

In the early Church those who later became known as priests were recognized as elders or presbyters who carried out the leadership functions of proclaiming the gospel (teacher), serving the people committed to their care, (shepherd), and presiding at the Eucharistic gathering (priest). It was this understanding of ministry in the early Church that the Council restored. From this perspective, the Council directed the local episcopal conferences and the rector and staff of each seminary to develop programs for the spiritual training, theological studies, and the pastoral formation for the priestly training of seminary students. The development of each seminarian as a human being, as someone in contact with and able to relate to the modern world and its people, was implied in those programs.

The aim of Banyo remained the priestly formation of its students but the image of the priest to be formed changed. Banyo was challenged to adapt its program to enable students to be ‘formed as true pastors like the Lord Jesus Christ, as teacher, priest and shepherd,’ who could connect with the modern world of their environment and act effectively there in that role. That was the task for the Queensland Bishops and the seminary staff to put in place.

In a Church accustomed to being directed by Rome local churches were not ready for so much local autonomy suddenly thrust on them. World-wide representatives of bishops sought guidance in 1967 when they met in Rome for the newly-established Synod of Bishops.\textsuperscript{22} In response, the Congregation for Catholic Education with the bishops published \textit{Ratio Fundamentalis} (A Basic Plan for Priestly Training). The Australian bishops used this for \textit{Preparation for Priesthood}, to guide seminaries.\textsuperscript{23} The Second Vatican Council, the Synod of Bishops, and the Australian Episcopal Conference provided the blueprint for change. Banyo now had the task of implementing that blueprint.

At Banyo the student body at whom this new plan was directed was changing in size and in their characteristics. At first numbers increased but suddenly declined after a few years and kept declining until the cessation of the seminary in 2000. There were 31 new enrolments in 1963, 18 in 1964, 32 in 1965, 39 in 1966, and in 1967, 34 new


\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid.}
students entered the seminary bringing seminary enrolment to 140. Additional buildings were provided to accommodate the growing numbers. The increase was attributed to the enthusiasm aroused in young people by the Second Vatican Council and the energetic work of diocesan vocations directors. By the beginning of 1974 that enrolment had decreased, almost by a half, to around 70. Fewer sought enrolment and students were leaving the seminary in higher numbers before ordination.

The characteristics of students had changed from those of previous years. Many new students, born around 1946, representing the first of the baby boomers generation, arrived at Banyo after completing secondary schooling. They were idealistic young men with a strong Catholic family upbringing reinforced by schools and parishes but they were not the compliant students of earlier years. Their main formative influences are described by the authors of *Winds of Change*, a report on the state of denominational religion in post-World War II Australia:

In sharp contrast to the two world wars and depression experienced by their parents, the baby boomers experienced their formative years during the longest continuous economic boom Australia has ever known. Caught up in the rising consumerism of the post-war era, they wanted for nothing. They were part of a generation that saw the emerging global youth culture epitomised by Coca Cola and jeans, with a new music that expressed the struggles, the hurts, the hopes of a new generation.

---
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The baby boomers had high expectations back in the late 1960s and ’70s. They believed that they had all the answers and were high on idealism. They were brought together and united by concerns about the future of the world and their own hides, particularly in relation to the Vietnam War. They had a strong belief in their power to change things: that the world of the future would be significantly different to the one they inherited. Keynotes of the age were optimism and idealism. This came out in music, in attitudes to security and hard work, in the election of governments.29

Through the educational practices of the fifties and sixties they had learnt to articulate their ideas and argue for their acceptance. Not ready to accept anything just on the word of authority but determined to argue their case,30 they arrived at Banyo as the restrictive rules of the past were being relaxed allowing them to become more and more vocal. Bill O’Shea, a staff member from 1967 and rector during the years 1974 to 1977, expressed the view that students of his time were “excellent young men” who “took themselves very seriously.” He also adds that they developed “some kind of a naive idealism.”31

The changed characteristics of Banyo’s students contributed to the tension that developed as steps were taken to alter seminary life. Difficulties emerged when, in an effort to reduce the separation of the seminary from the world, the priority area for change adopted at Banyo, attempts were made to change a seminary lifestyle from a

30 O’Shea (Rector), op.cit.
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monastic to a college arrangement. Establishing what those arrangements were to be, the pace for making changes and what were their limits became sources of conflict between the rector and his staff on the one hand and the students on the other. The decrees of the Second Vatican Council meant that changes to the Church in its Liturgy, its priesthood, and its seminaries had to be implemented at Banyo. In the introduction of change the seminary rector became the anchor person central to the interaction between seminary staff and students. The changes introduced by Mgr John Torpie and his successors, Dr Bill Smith (1968 – 1973), Fr Bill O’Shea (1974 - 1977), Dr Tom Boland (1978), and Fr Alan Sheldrick (1979 - 1980) were welcomed especially when they began under John Torpie. However, an underlying rationale for changes was far from complete such that the changes to be made, their extent and direction were not always clear. At the time the need to be in touch with the modern world was to the forefront. The Council’s enriched model of a priest’s role took some time to emerge and become clarified.

The rectors proceeded with changes according to their perspectives of the situation they faced. Between seminary authorities and students these did not always coincide. The rectors and staff opted to take an evolutionary approach and proceed slowly with caution, while students wanted to take a revolutionary approach and proceed as quickly as possible. Vocal students challenged the approach of the rectors and staff.

---

which led to mishaps and instability. This was compounded by the instability of the Banyo staff, in contrast with the relative permanence of earlier staff at Banyo.

No changes had been made in 1965 when Mgr Torpie became rector but their urgency was obvious. With the experience of Vatican II, the bishops, by 1964, knew this and that someone other than Mgr Roberts was needed for this undertaking. Of those days, Tom Boland wrote:

The heady atmosphere in the Church was not shared in the seminary. The rigours of the Roberts regime affected the morale of both staff and students. The unchecked authoritarianism wore down the enthusiasm of some lecturers and eroded the idealism of many students. The exciting years of the Second Vatican Council scarcely disturbed the artificial calm of the cloister. There was little official communication of the surging vitality of the Roman debates; and there was no leadership given to the students in the understanding of the ecclesiastical revolution that was occurring. Yet it was impossible to keep news out, and the unfortunate result was that the almost miraculous aggiornamento of the Holy Spirit was seen as an underground resistance movement by the brighter students. Combined with the dissatisfaction and the inappropriate system of control, it was leading to an explosion.

According to Boland, Fr Bernie Wallace, a Banyo staff member on sabbatical leave in Rome in 1964, alerted the Queensland Bishops attending Vatican II to this

33 O’Shea (Rector), op. cit.
situation. When they returned they moved Roberts to Hendra parish and installed a new rector.\(^{35}\)

Among the clergy appointments appearing in the *Catholic Leader* early in 1965 was a simple announcement that Monsignor J.A. Torpie, Administrator of St Stephen’s Cathedral, was replacing Mgr C Roberts as rector of Banyo seminary as Mgr Roberts had retired.\(^{36}\) Continuing and beginning students arrived at Banyo following the summer vacation in February 1965 to meet their new rector, John Ahern Torpie, the son of Thomas Torpie and Bridget Ahern. He had been ordained a priest in 1934 following which he served as an assistant priest in the parishes of Gatton and Ipswich before joining, first, the 7\(^{th}\) Infantry Brigade as a chaplain, then the 5\(^{th}\) Australian Division during World War II. John Torpie saw service at Milne Bay in New Guinea. After the war he was parish priest of Ekibin, then Holland Park, before becoming the Administrator of St Stephen’s Cathedral in 1956.\(^{37}\)

As a military chaplain at Milne Bay, John Torpie had witnessed battle scenes of Australian soldiers with the Japanese and it is plausible that these experiences, very different from those of his predecessor who had spent all his years as a priest in seminaries, led him to see some matters, regarded by Mgr Roberts as highly important, as having low priority on his scale of values. Like Roberts, his approach was authoritarian, but where Roberts was rigid and unforgiving Torpie was flexible


and ready to pardon. At this crucial stage John Torpie was seen as the right person in the right place to bring flexibility into a highly-authoritarian seminary regime.

John Torpie brought to the seminary his deep commitment to pastoral ministry, a reputation that increased during his three short years at Banyo.\(^{38}\) He was a respected and well liked person who succeeded in reducing the constant air of tension in the seminary.\(^{39}\) In stark contrast to the man he succeeded, John Torpie, through the personal interest and pastoral care he demonstrated, made an immediate favourable impression on students. He even invited students to join him and his staff to review the way that rules were applied at Banyo.\(^{40}\) According to Michael Peters, he set out to develop a pastoral relationship with each student and adopted a more relaxed attitude towards the rules.\(^{41}\) Peter Madden referred to the new rector as “a good natured person, if a little on the conservative side.”\(^{42}\) Peter continued:

He was very supportive of the students and open to their suggestions. He supported many of the suggestions made and helped students to implement their ideas. One of his innovations was the students’ representative council, made up of two students from each class. My classmate, Mick Peters, and I were the first representatives for our class group. The meetings this group had with the rector and staff facilitated communication among staff, students and the rector. Indications of a generational gap between the rector and students were visible, but this
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was to be expected. At the same time we never felt curtailed by him in what we wanted to do.\textsuperscript{43}

Torpie had fostered accepting relationships with students and through these relationships introduced changes to the rules that were welcomed by students.

After a settling in period, he abolished rules that had continually bugged students such as no access to newspapers and the radio and sending and receiving personal mail opened. He also eased the restrictions confining students to the seminary precincts. Students were given the opportunity to have Wednesday afternoons free to leave the confines of the seminary.\textsuperscript{44} Catholic, ecumenical, cultural, and sporting groups were invited to the seminary to participate in student activities. Soon afterwards he announced that students would go home for their two week mid-winter holidays instead of remaining in the seminary.\textsuperscript{45}

At Banyo, the Second Vatican Council perspective that the Church become more open to the modern world became the dominating orientation of change. Seminaries had been closed to the world beyond their fences, something that had to change. Peter Madden related how John Torpie opened up the seminary by inviting religious and lay people there for discussions;\textsuperscript{46} church youth groups and football teams to visit the seminary for sporting matches; students from the Anglican College at Milton for discussions; and the Catholic Dramatic Society, the Villanova Players, to rehearse

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}
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their latest production with an audience. Through these groups the seminary began reaching out to the local Church and the wider world. Under the pastoral care of John Torpie, Banyo became a warm, friendly and accepting place where students were respected and given a role in the process of change then underway.

The manner in which he conducted the funeral at Banyo for a Franciscan Missionary of Mary member of the Banyo community, Sister Gundeberta, gave testimony of the pastoral qualities of this man. Sister Gundeberta had spent 57 years in religion, 35 caring for lepers and the poor in China and 13 in the obscurity of Banyo. In an account of this funeral, Sister Marie de St Crescent wrote: “At the gospel Mgr. Torpie spoke praising the great but humble missionary. ... In fact we did not feel it was a funeral, but a triumph. She was so fond of beautiful music and hymns, she must have been thrilled.”

Jeff Scully thought Torpie was an affable person but was not a ‘hail fellow, well met.’ He relaxed rules but he remained firm in his insistence on the observation of rules still in force. He disciplined students in an adult manner rather than scold them as naughty little boys. However, subsequent rectors found that the tensions that developed with changes made the seminary a less the harmonious place. John Torpie possibly erred not in his creation of a student representative council, but in creating
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48 Sr Marie de St Crescent, Letter to My dear Mother and dear Sisters, Banyo, 31 July 1967, FFMA.
49 Scully, op. cit.
50 Peter Grice, Interview, 6 March 2009.
such a large group of 14 students (two representatives for each year) when students were becoming less compliant and more vocal.

After three years, John Torpie was appointed Bishop of Cairns. In the short time his efforts were effective but limited. Pat Cassidy, a student of several years prior to Torpie’s arrival, believed he set out to develop a more relevant seminary, but was cut short by his episcopal appointment in developing his vision.\textsuperscript{51} As rector he was restricted to introducing the first changes in the Liturgy. Except for the relaxation of rules, the program of Banyo remained basically the same,\textsuperscript{52} run on boarding school lines.\textsuperscript{53} Mick Peters thought that by continuing to be structured that way it did not stimulate the development of maturity.\textsuperscript{54} It failed to shake off the image of Goffman’s ‘total institution.’ Mgr Torpie removed many barriers between the seminary and its world and gave the seminary a more relaxed atmosphere where those coming to Banyo as students or visitors felt welcome.

Fr Bill O’Shea described Mgr Torpie as neither an academic nor a theologian and as someone who, at times, was out of his depth.\textsuperscript{55} Given Torpie’s pastoral rather than academic and theological background, he was unfamiliar with seminary administration and had limitations in directing changes. Although the seminary was moving from a monastic to a college structure, the underlying structure of a total institution remained in its prescribed programmed day. Attempting to change a
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system embedded for almost 30 years in a building designed for a monastic style of life became an almost impossible task. Meanwhile, the Council’s revised image of the priesthood was still emerging, being clarified and still to be used as a guiding principle of change at Banyo.

When Bishop Torpie’s appointment to Cairns was announced, no one, except the Queensland Bishops, seriously considered Dr Bill Smith as his replacement. Priests who as students had known him never envisaged him in that role. 56 As vice rector from 1954 Mgr Roberts gave him limited responsibilities and, unlike Mgr Roberts, he never looked for trouble and tended turn a blind eye if he stumbled on it. Unless confronted with a serious problem he let students and situations look after themselves. In his dealings with students he was affable and fair with a tendency towards leniency. 57 He also enjoyed telling stories. Thus it was a surprise when the Queensland Bishops announced that he would be the rector from the commencement of 1968.

Being the kind of person he was, he continued the innovations at Banyo begun by John Torpie. Under Bill Smith what had to happen did happen, but not much more. He continued to relax seminary rules and made Banyo a more open place where students were given more responsibility for the personal organization of their lives. He encouraged older students to gain pastoral and catechetical experience, However, in the emerging situation he neglected to establish new boundaries for students’

56 Jim Hynes, Interview, 17 March 2009.  
57 Cooney, op.cit.
activities and put them in place. Students knew they could push him for the widest interpretation of their proposals, did so, and succeeded. He was not the person to radically overhaul the system when overhauling was needed. Tinkering around the edges but essentially keeping the system going was more his approach. He did introduce a staff mentoring system of students and the use of psychological profiling, the first welcomed by students and the second welcomed by staff. When Smith left Banyo its ‘total institution’ character with its daily monastic style structure remained but with students tending to be less docile in accepting and following the basic rules still in force.\textsuperscript{58}

Intellectually, Bill Smith could quickly grasp an argument and sum up a situation at a superficial level and was blessed with a good memory. In his teaching he was satisfied to pass on the text book treatment of the topic. He never seemed motivated to delve deeper into what underlay the content of what he taught. Rather, he relied heavily basic understanding and memory. He gave the impression that he saw no need to get to the heart of any matter once he gained an initial grasp of what it was about. In the situation of multiple, constant, and complex changes that had to be dealt with at Banyo, Bill Smith gave the impression that he had no inclination of an inner drive to sort out the intricacies of what was happening.\textsuperscript{59} Given this disposition and his approach to matters, a clear focus of forming students in the image of Christ priest, prophet, and shepherd was never obvious.

\textsuperscript{59} Cassidy, \textit{op. cit.}
Students in the past had found it difficult to take the subject he taught seriously.\textsuperscript{60} Not much progress was ever made in any of them as he was easily distracted,\textsuperscript{61} especially by questions about Rome and his years as a student for the priesthood in the Eternal City.\textsuperscript{62} This laid-back approach to his teaching work overflowed into his role as the administrator of the seminary.

Bill Smith’s tendency to be content with only a superficial consideration of situations was observed in the way he managed the seminary. As Michael Cooney pointed out:

Unluckily Bill had no aptitude to evaluate and prioritise individual changes. During Bill’s time, Banyo was moving from a monastic style model it had operated under since its establishment to something more like a college model. Unfortunately the changes that were introduced were made in piecemeal fashion. Bill was not the person to draw up a blueprint for a seminary and proceed to introduce it, taking into consideration the kind of society students would go into as priests, the kind of priests needed for that society, and what the seminary should be doing to form priests to fit the model for the future.\textsuperscript{63}

Smith seemed unable to deal with that wider spectrum of a changed priesthood in a changing Church when wider perspectives were required as a guide into the future for
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the seminary. Peter Madden summarised William Smith’s term as rector in the following way:

He was more of an administrator who kept the system going rather than a change agent with leadership qualities. He tended to keep the place going as he had inherited it. At times he gave the impression that he had not sought the position of rector but had it thrust upon him. He came across as a person who thought more highly of himself than did the others with whom he worked.64

In key positions on his staff were two intelligent and strong characters, the vice rector, Father Bernard Wallace, and the dean of discipline, Father Bill O’Shea. They cooperated closely and, at times, frustratingly with the rector to contain students’ proposals. This led to students’ disregard of the limitations placed on them and helped to intensify the tensions that emerged between students and staff.

When Bernard Wallace, a long serving professor, was appointed Bishop of Rockhampton in 1973, his years on the Banyo staff came to an end.65 During his long years at Banyo since 1942, with only one short break in the early 50s, he had taught in a wide range of courses. Wallace had inherited the teaching of Dogmatic Theology when Mgr Roberts retired from the seminary.66

---
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While most Banyo students had a high regard for Father Wallace as a teacher and vice rector, not everyone related positively to him. On occasions he could be distant with students.67 As Brian Noonan put it, “Bernie was a perfectionist who did not suffer fools gladly.”68 He could be harsh with students if he thought they were superficial or mistaken in what they had to say.69 Roger Schreck thought that he was generally pleasant enough, but at times could be very cutting in his remarks.70 Because of this some students kept their distance from him.71

Most supported the view of Ray Crowley that Wallace was an excellent lecturer.72 For his research and up to date familiarity with Vatican II documents and his clear, interesting and attractive presentation style he was regarded as being the outstanding lecturer at Banyo. He directed his students to consult further sources for deepening their knowledge of the topics he taught.73 While Ray Crowley felt that he exuded warmth for the creative aspects of theology, he thought that sometimes he discounted situations and was more concerned about the defence of a teaching rather than responding to the pain and suffering of victims brought on by such a teaching.74 Wallace’s ability to explore and gain familiarity was counterbalanced by his tendency to be defensive of current positions and proceeding cautiously with change. This appeared in the part he took in directing changes at Banyo.
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But Bernie’s influence went beyond the academic aspects of the Theology he taught by extending its application to the life of a priest. As Jim Cronin asserted, “The Theology I learnt from Bernard Wallace ... had a persuasive influence on the development of my spirituality.” This ability to relate the study of Theology to the spirituality of a priest was a quality that many students often found wanting in other parts of the Banyo program. Being familiar with the teachings of Vatican II, including the Council’s understanding of the priesthood, he was able to apply them to the seminary and endeavoured to influence Dr Smith to adopt them with his assessed implications. In this he was supported by Father O’Shea and at times was successful in doing so.

Following the retirement of Brisbane Archbishop, Patrick O’Donnell, Francis Rush was transferred to Brisbane as its Archbishop. Bernard Wallace took his place in Rockhampton. Tom Boland reflected on his appointment:

In the seventies it seemed time for Bernie to go. He had spent nearly thirty years in the seminary. He had been shuffled from subject to subject as lecturer. In a number of regimes he had been the constant carer. He was tired, and it showed ... He needed something to stir again his spiritual and theological energy. It came from an unexpected source.  

Wallace was often critical of bishops and thus it was a surprise to many when he was appointed to the Diocese of Rockhampton.  

---
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personal shortcomings, Bernard Wallace had made significant contributions to the quality and standard of the academic program at Banyo seminary.

Dr Bill Smith held the position of rector until the end of 1973 when he returned to the Diocese of Rockhampton at the same time as his former vice-rector, Bishop Wallace. His successor, Father Bill O’Shea, who worked closely with him said he felt that in the years at Banyo under Torpie there was a lot of ferment going on below the surface in the Church. “The big changes started to come after Bill Smith became rector in 1968.” O’Shea has provided an evaluation of how, as rector, Dr Smith managed this challenge:

He did not handle it too badly, he survived and he was well liked by the students when he left the seminary. Bill could frustrate the staff by his indecisiveness or his failure to implement decisions made at staff meetings. Sometimes, when he did try to implement those decisions, he did so in ways contrary to the wishes of staff. In spite of this no one really disliked him. He never held a grudge. On a day following a disagreement with him when hurtful remarks were made, there was never any resentment. Perhaps the fairest comment that can be made is that for that period he was not a bad type of person for the position of rector. Banyo at that time was not a good place to be on staff, let alone rector. It is questionable if anyone could have done the job better. Bill was not the

---
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ideal person for rector but one wonders who could have been the ideal person for that time.\textsuperscript{79}

For those years Dr William Smith was not the strong leader that was needed. Someone was needed who could display leadership over a range of areas and who could integrate these areas in their application to the seminary. Further skills were needed for implementing changes at Banyo in a way that through the management of conflict and negotiation those changes would be accepted. William Smith was not that ‘ideal person for that time.’

In 1974, the Queensland Bishops selected Father William James O’Shea as the next rector of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, the first former student appointed to this position. He commenced studies for the priesthood at the beginning of 1954 after completing the Senior Matriculation Examination as a student of Nudgee College when he won an open Scholarship to the University of Queensland.\textsuperscript{80} At the seminary his brilliance shone through and at the same time he was a person with ‘the common touch.’ Bill, as he was called, was ordained to the priesthood for the Archdiocese of Brisbane in 1960. It came as no surprise when, in 1963, he was sent to Rome for studies in Theology and Sacred Scripture.

When he returned to Australia in 1967 with Licentiates in Theology and Sacred Scripture he was appointed to teach Sacred Scripture at the seminary.\textsuperscript{81} John Torpie
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was appointed Bishop of Cairns shortly after. From 1968 to 1973, while Bill Smith was rector, O’Shea served as dean of discipline.\textsuperscript{82} Bill O’Shea remained the seminary’s rector until the end of 1977.\textsuperscript{83}

Enrolments had decreased when Bill Smith retired as rector in 1973. After the enrolment surge smaller classes entered the seminary and students in growing numbers left the seminary before ordination.\textsuperscript{84} Changes at the time tended to be held responsible for the situation that developed. Bill O’Shea, with Banyo in mind, saw seminaries trying to cope with the changes:

This system left great problems to work out when seminaries began to change following Vatican II when I was on the seminary staff as dean of discipline. It was almost impossible to suddenly scrap the old system and replace it with another. A gradual loosening of the discipline practices and allowing students more individual freedom seemed preferable. The main difficulty came in trying to make the changes through meetings of representatives of students and staff. This was happening during a period when the time of compliance had passed. Young people had been urged on by the activities of European and American youth and the example of youth protesters against the Vietnam War here in Australia to be critical of and question all decisions of traditional authorities. This happened at
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Banyo where students scrutinised every proposal, making a peaceful transition most difficult.\textsuperscript{85}

Bill O’Shea became rector at a critical time when students were rejecting seminary authority in favour of what they considered they should be doing.

The Queensland Bishops, his priest friends, his seminary colleagues, and students he taught had the highest regard for Bill’s ability as a scholar with an aptitude for imparting knowledge. One student, Jim Cronin, said, “He was a great Scripture teacher who had the facility of simplifying complex matters. He was able to break things down and draw a line of simplicity through the most complex task.”\textsuperscript{86} Peter Mulder believed that “Bill was at the forefront of the field of Scripture studies.”\textsuperscript{87} Dudley McMahon considered he had “a great breadth of knowledge and showed interest in his students by his readiness to spend time on matters they raised” but “by spending so much time on smaller matters there was not enough time to cover everything.”\textsuperscript{88} Dudley McMahon suggested that this could be self-defeating at times.

As the rector, he was prepared to initiate and implement change and had set out to make the seminary into a place where students were free to take responsibility for their own decisions and actions.\textsuperscript{89} However, he maintained some basic rules in place which he expected students to observe, such as attendance at Morning Prayer of the
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Church, meditation and Mass each day,\textsuperscript{90} being quite stern with those who failed to do so. Greg Stenzel believed that Bill was “open and frank with students,”\textsuperscript{91} and in running the seminary “he had his finger on the pulse more than anyone before.”\textsuperscript{92} O’Shea and his staff met regularly with the student representative group to discuss and make decisions on changes in the seminary. This decision-making mechanism ran into difficulties when students exerted pressure to take the rector and staff beyond their proposed limits, such as on the matter of students’ cars.\textsuperscript{93} For Bill O’Shea this became “the painful experience of horse trading between the staff and students in matters relating to seminary discipline.”\textsuperscript{94} About the situation that had developed, he elaborated:

The catch cry of students was that they wanted a principle of self-discipline to be approved for the seminary. They claimed that they could only become responsible people if they were allowed to use their own initiative to behave responsibly. We as a staff wondered whether we could trust the students to behave in this way. In fact the students did betray our trust. They kept pressure on us by pushing out the boundaries of discipline further and further in the name of greater freedom. We knew that students were doing many things that were not allowed and I suspect that there were many things we did not know about as it was impossible to police the students the whole day, every day.\textsuperscript{95}
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As well as the daily spiritual exercises each morning followed by breakfast, seminarians were still required to wear soutanes and to spend each night in the seminary, unless other permission had been obtained. They were also required to be present for classes and for lunch. For the rest of the day they were free to organise their own activities. Students objected to the lack of choice in the observation of these basic rules. They saw in this the continuation of the monastic model and the ‘total institution’ characteristics of a strict daily routine and partial enclosure in the seminary. The continued student perception of the monastic model in the seminary could not be dealt with effectively and put aside. This impeded attempts to develop the understanding of the priest as teacher and shepherd as a servant leader with a preference for the poor, an understanding of the priesthood becoming more important for priestly ministry.

Evidence gathered from students’ interviews suggests student life at the seminary seriously disintegrated, although for some conscientious students the aberrations occurring were hardly noticed. In the students’ quest for fewer rules and greater freedom an “us and them” situation developed through which they badgered for changes and permissions. If the rector and staff did not agree to what they wanted they went ahead with what they had demanded. This tended to wear down the rector and staff, making the task of managing the seminary even more difficult.

In the seminary, as in the rest of the Australian Church following Vatican II, with many matters under review, former laws, rules, and directives had been abrogated
without the establishment of new ones. In this situation individuals ignored established laws and followed their own judgments. With the uncertainty in this time of transition, a ‘softly, softly,’ approach to managing suspected irregularities developed in the Church. For some this developed into a new freedom to take on practices not approved by the Church. This attitude found its way into Banyo.\footnote{Pat Lavercomb, Interview, 13 January 2010.}

Students’ access to their own cars was one such issue.

To make access to transport to venues for pastoral activities available, senior students were given approval to have their own cars,\footnote{Alan Sheldrick, (Rector). Interview, 13 March 2009.} an approval that was not at first extended to junior classes. Students ignored this directive and used their own cars, garaged at houses of Catholics near the seminary,\footnote{Ibid.} for travel to social activities like Saturday Church Rugby League matches and the barbecues and parties that followed. An excessive consumption of alcohol by a number of students became a problem. Alan Sheldrick expressed his concern, especially when some students were becoming problem drinkers or were breathalysed by police and found to be over the limit.\footnote{Ibid.}

Through these social occasions students met and established friendships with young women, a situation that for both students and young women was beneficial in learning to relate to one another at a companionable level. In some cases such friendships, facilitated by the access to personal transport, extended to more frequent contacts and serious involvements. These situations forced some students to
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reconsider their calling to a celibate life and leave the seminary. For others, a seminary student, having a female friend for sharing companionship, conversation and affections, was considered as being normal. Students were getting in touch with life beyond the seminary but hardly projecting an approved seminary image.

Another situation among a small group of students was the emergence of relationships with homosexual overtones. Of the students interviewed, most had not been aware of such relationships, but there was a sufficient number who spoke of this to confirm their existence. This phenomenon in seminaries was not confined to Banyo. The presence of gays in seminaries, at least in the English speaking world, has become more prominent in recent times and has had significant consequences, as Garry Wills has pointed out in relation to seminaries in the United States:

The high salience of gays in seminaries has led some homophobic men to avoid entering the seminaries or to withdraw from them. In fact, the admission of married men and women to the priesthood - which is bound to come anyway – may well come for the wrong reason, not because women and the community deserve this, but because of panic at the perception that the priesthood is becoming predominantly gay.

\[100\] Ample evidence of this was made in a number of the interviews conducted but the sources of such evidence have requested not to be named.

[101] Again, because of the sensitive nature of this allegation, sources of this have asked not to be identified.


Wills has also indicated how such a situation developed from a confused understanding of the implications of celibacy and an ignorance of Catholic moral teaching on homosexuality:

Some think the command to abstain from sex is absurd, a formality. Others think it means an inner dedication to the gospel. A significant number ... think that celibacy means not being married to a woman – a definition that would make all single gay men, even the most promiscuous, celibate. On the more basic issue of the morality of homosexuality itself, gays would seem to have some theological problems. After all, scripture has nothing to say about abortion or contraception or a married priesthood. But there are several clear condemnations of at least some kind of homosexuality in both the Jewish Bible and the New Testament.\textsuperscript{104}

While not a widespread problem at Banyo, the homosexuality that emerged was significant. It indicated the lack of effective spiritual formation and counselling needed to confront the issues of a celibate life within the seminary that applied to all aspects of sexuality. What celibacy as the complete abstinence from sexual activity, entailed for heterosexuals, homosexuals, and pedophiles from psychological and sociological perspectives, as well as the theological aspects, was not made clear to students for the priesthood. Observed situations were usually attended to in a manner described as ‘quietly and prudently’ whatever that meant. The necessity of understanding sexuality from the point of view of orientations and intensity in social situations and not just at the individual level had not arrived at Banyo.

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid. p. 129.
O’Shea later regretted that he “possibly made a mistake by not commencing with an attempt to develop a new seminary constitution in the form of a big picture and then complete the details as we went.”\(^{105}\) During 1977 he designed that plan, namely, to create an environment that fosters the development of maturity and spiritual growth in students in which they are prepared for their future ministry through a rich but manageable academic education and sound pastoral formation.\(^{106}\) By then, his time for implementing that plan at Banyo had passed. At the end of 1977, Bill asked to be relieved of his position as rector.

Father Bill O’Shea was a person who could display leadership over a range of areas and had the ability to integrate these areas in their application to the seminary. His difficulty lay in being able to relate effectively with the less compliant and more assertive students in a period of instability both within the Church and within the wider society. Further skills were needed for implementing changes at Banyo in a way that, through the management of conflict and negotiation, issues were diffused and changes accepted.

When Father Bill O’Shea joined the seminary staff in 1967 he had been ordained eight years, four of which had been spent in overseas studies. He had been an assistant priest in the parishes of Banyo and Coolangatta before going to Rome.

When appointed rector at the beginning of 1974, he was young and had had limited pastoral experience. He was literally thrust into a top management job where human

\(^{105}\) O’Shea, \textit{op. cit.}
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management skills were needed. The attitude of students generated a level of stress O’Shea found difficult to cope with.  

At the beginning of 1978, Doctor Tom Boland followed Father O’Shea as rector at Banyo. He had been a student and then a lecturer at Banyo. “Tom had been teaching in the seminary for several years and had distinguished himself in the way he taught Church History”. Dudley McMahon’s testimony is typical of the high regard in which students held him:

Tom Boland taught Australian and American History with emphasis on the role of the Catholic Church in each country. He taught Church History to students during their Theology years. He had something interesting to say in every class. He was one of the most interesting and engaging lecturers in the seminary. The thorough way he considered the period of the Reformation demonstrated this.

He showed his versatility in teaching Australian and American History to first year students when he teamed up with Therese D’Arcy, a speech pathologist, employed to assist students with voice production. Each year they produced a presentation of readings by students for a seminary audience. Students read from documents relating to events and issues they had studied in Australian or American history.

---
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Dr Boland also taught English Literature. His main efforts were directed at getting students to read widely and enjoy what they read. Ray Crowley believed that Tom “gave students a hunger for good literature and further reading. He helped students develop skills for choosing diverse, challenging, and thought provoking books.”¹¹² Michael Cooney believed that Tom succeeded in encouraging him to read serious novels.¹¹³ Joe Duffy recalled Tom Boland as moving “me from being disconnected from the English Literature tradition to becoming familiar with English authors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”¹¹⁴ These positive comments were in sharp contrast to remarks about other English Literature lecturers at Banyo.

From the time of his return to Australia after studying in Rome, Tom made contact with both Catholic and non-Catholic groups. In January 1963, he spoke to the Anglican clergy about the Second Vatican Council and in March the same year he addressed the people of Warwick at their St Patrick’s Day Dinner on the topic of “Irish Immigration to Southern Queensland,” focusing on the Irish settlement of the Darling Downs.¹¹⁵

Prior to being appointed rector, apart from being a mentor for a group of students,¹¹⁶ Tom Boland was not involved directly in the seminary in any administrative capacity. Thus, in considering Boland’s appointment, and indeed any Church appointment, John Allen’s reflection on Vatican appointments is worth noting:

¹¹² Crowley, op. cit.
¹¹³ Cooney, op.cit.
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In the Aristotelian-Thomistic framework of the Catholic Church, there is an instinctive distrust of claims to specialized expertise from people who don’t share the moral and metaphysical worldview of Catholicism. They may indeed know how to build a better mousetrap, but in the process they could be asphyxiating the soul. For this reason, the Church has preferred to put people in leadership roles who may or may not have a technical command of the issues involved, but who can be relied upon to grasp the larger theological and spiritual aims the work is intended to serve.117

Having someone “who can be relied upon to grasp the larger theological and spiritual aims the work is intended to serve” was, no doubt, foremost in the minds of the Queensland Bishops when they selected Boland to succeed O’Shea. He was the sole surviving member of the pre-Vatican II seminary staff and by this time had become its senior member. In the circumstances that had developed it was necessary to appoint someone who could relate effectively with students. Tom Boland had amply demonstrated that he was such a person.

Gerry Hefferan, the head representative of students, had met frequently with Dr Boland. Hefferan had also known him when he came to his parish on Sundays to help out with Masses during his secondary school years. He praised Boland for his ability to resolve issues through discussion.118 Earlier in his seminary career, Boland had been “in a serious car accident that had taken its toll on him psychologically as well

118 Gerry Hefferan, op.cit.
The stress of the tasks as rector brought on an illness that forced him to give up his appointment after only a year. According to John Mahoney, “Through poor health he was unable to become engaged with students. Because of the defects of the system, the bizarre situation that had developed swung further out of control.” Given Tom Boland’s state of health and the bizarre situation that had developed in the seminary, his influence on the seminary and the direction it was taking was minimal.

In 1979, Father Alan Sheldrick was the third Banyo graduate to become its rector. Alan, who had demonstrated high levels of intellectual and personal abilities at the seminary, was ordained in 1963. He worked in Townsville parishes before going to Rome for postgraduate studies in Theology and Scripture. Sheldrick joined the seminary staff in 1974.

He was regarded by students as a competent Scripture scholar and teacher who worked hard in the preparation of his classes. He assisted students to appreciate and apply a pastoral understanding of the Scriptures. In this way he applied the Old Testament Scriptures to preaching and teaching in parishes. Alan had strong social justice leanings and for various movements of the Church working in social justice.

---
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Through this interest he became involved in a project at Cribb Island’s Jackson Estate, a poor area near the seminary in the 1970s.\footnote{124 Grealy, \textit{op.cit.} and John Mahoney, \textit{op.cit.}}

When Fr Sheldrick joined the Banyo staff Fr Bill O’Shea was rector. Many staff had been students when Mgr Roberts was rector. As staff members they avoided being like Roberts in their seminary roles. In comparison with his own student days Alan Sheldrick thought that students were much more assertive and students and staff mixed together more frequently. This was very different from Alan’s experience as a student when members of the staff were remote and having access to them was restricted. However, Alan found that even in that closer association between staff and students an atmosphere of “us and them” prevailed. Attempts were made to break it down but without complete success. He thought that for all his efforts, the students did not develop a greater trust in him.\footnote{125 Sheldrick, (Rector), \textit{op. cit.}}

Students saw Father Sheldrick as being aloof and strict. He was seen only when things were going wrong and gave the impression that he had been reluctant to take on the role of rector, a role he did not find easy.\footnote{126 Ibid.} Alan reacted strongly against the anti-intellectualism of students: “The seminary had to be regarded as a place of learning. However, it became apparent that students were failing to get their work
done on time.”¹²⁷ Students were not living up to their obligations to study; nor were they accepting the opportunities available to them.

Alan Sheldrick found the excesses in students’ behaviour unacceptable and was determined to take the necessary measures to eradicate those them. His comments on this were:

It was generally accepted that for an organisation like a seminary to function some rules were necessary, although this was a time when the importance of rules in the seminary was declining and we were working towards a greater relaxation of rules in an orderly way. A students’ representative council was put in place for students to be involved. Students met regularly and forwarded their suggestions to staff. Student representatives were also welcome at staff meetings where issues were raised and discussed. Our hope was that if the students had taken part in making the decisions they would own those decisions. Unfortunately this did not always happen.¹²⁸

He believed that as students had to manage their own lives as priests they should be given the opportunity to manage their own lives as much as possible. He wanted to give students as much freedom as possible, but within set limits of what could and could not be done – limits far less restrictive than in his student days. Some students did not always respect and make good use of the freedom they were given. They did

¹²⁷ Ibid.
¹²⁸ Ibid.
not accept that they had been given freedom to accept responsibility for their own
development and to realise there were limits to that freedom.

Another problem Alan Sheldrick had to deal with was the excessive alcohol
consumption by students and its consequences. A student who asked to remain
anonymous has outlined how Sheldrick tried to deal with this and other problems:

To counteract situations he found in the seminary he decided to interview
offending students individually and ask them to leave the seminary. I
found this method appalling but as regards to everyone he identified as a
person who should leave the seminary he was correct.\footnote{Report of Student’s Interview, 2009.}

He was also concerned about the lack of maturity of students entering Banyo: “We
felt that the seminary was not the place for young men to grow up. Rather we
expected them to be grown up before they arrived.”\footnote{Sheldrick, (Rector), \textit{op.cit.}} He and the spiritual director,
Pat Rasmussen, suggested to the Queensland Bishops conditions of entry to the
seminary for prospective students. These conditions were that the candidate seeking
entry should have left school and have achieved some qualification in life; those at
university should complete their degrees before coming to the seminary; they should
be living independently of home; and have become involved in some kind of church
ministry. The person should be well known to his parish priest or a priest in a similar

\begin{footnotes}
\item[129] Report of Student’s Interview, 2009.
\item[130] Sheldrick, (Rector), \textit{op.cit.}
\end{footnotes}
position and not just the diocesan director of vocations. The bishops reluctantly approved these but were not always consistent in the way they applied them.

Faced with the problems of lack of maturity in students, their failure to obey rules, and also their serious disregard for behaviour expectations outside the seminary Alan Sheldrick exercised strong leadership. He attempted to raise the level of student maturity in the seminary. His efforts to establish maturity level indicators for those seeking seminary entrance is an example of this. Sheldrick had a difficult task for which his strong leadership was required, but that in itself was not sufficient at that time.

In the immediate aftermath of Vatican II, an effort to bring the seminary into contact with the modern world dominated Banyo. For this students were given greater freedom and the seminary became a more open place. What took time to emerge while this happened was a clear realization that students needed to be prepared as priests, teachers, and shepherds for their future parish communities. The development of programs for this purpose was the next step. By 1980 Banyo, through its spirituality, theological education, liturgical preparation, and pastoral care formation programs, supported by a human development program, was trying to achieve this goal, but progress to this point had been slow and difficult. Gradually, spiritual formation took on a new direction, efforts were made to offer more relevant

\[131\] Ibid.

\[132\] Ibid.
theological courses, pastoral experience and catechetical training were introduced, and liturgical changes were adopted.

Between 1965 and 1980, spiritual direction leading to spiritual growth became more personal, but not fully oriented to the life of a priest in a metropolitan, regional or country parish. This change did not happen immediately. Dr Timothy Sullivan, the spiritual director when John Torpie arrived as Banyo’s rector, seemed well qualified for this role. He held a doctorate from Belgium’s Louvain University, had the reputation of a scholar and had served as chaplain with the British Army in France. But by the time he came to Banyo he was fixed in his ways. Unlike enthusiasts about the progress of Vatican II, Tim was seriously disturbed. He followed Fr McGoldrick’s approach to the spiritual formation program as set down in Tanquerey’s work on the spiritual life but in a more rigid manner.

Before every seminary holiday he never forgot to remind students there was ‘no vacation from vocation’ and urged students ‘not to turn the pages for Maggie McGinty while she played the piano.’ He advised students as men embracing a celibate life to be circumspect in their relationship with women. According to Joe Duffy, Sullivan echoed the Mgr Robert’s dictum: ‘Keep the rules and the rules will keep you,’ in spite of obvious examples of students for whom this was not working in

133 Mulkerin, *op. cit.*
135 Brian Connolly, Interview, 14 April, 2008.
137 Bernard Wilson, Interview, 28 May 2009.
a seminary that was locked up and strict. According to John Maher, he was forever warning them to beware of the dangers of the world. The influences of Vatican II on Banyo students became too much for Sullivan. In 1968 he left Banyo for the chaplaincy at the Mater Hospital in South Brisbane. With the departure of Dr Sullivan, Adolf Tanquerey’s book on spirituality “considered as dry as dust and long past its use by date,” disappeared.

Father John Bathersby, a priest of the Toowoomba Diocese, was appointed to succeed him with the understanding he would take up his duties after completing a preparation course in Rome. To act temporarily as spiritual director, John White of Rockhampton was appointed. On his return from Rome, John Bathersby worked as Banyo’s spiritual director until returning to Rome to study for his Doctorate in Theology. Then, another Rockhampton priest, Pat Rasmussen, took his place.

The spiritual directors of the seventies took a more personal approach to supporting students with their spiritual development. Through discussions they helped them to identify their personal values and used psychological profiling of personality traits to help them discover their strengths and weaknesses. They were also easily accessible and readily available for personal consultation. In addition, they

---

138 Joe Duffy, Interview, 14 October, 2009.
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introduced students to different approaches to spirituality and methods of prayer.\textsuperscript{144} They were friendly men appreciated by students, but students indicated that their approach to spirituality did not sufficiently establish the fundamentals of spirituality on which they could develop a personal spirituality specifically directed to their life roles as priests.\textsuperscript{145}

Bill O’Shea noted the immaturity of students in the efforts made to direct spiritual development. In speaking at a conference for seminary educators in 1977, Fr O’Shea outlined some difficulties he found at Banyo. He believed that an important factor in the process of spiritual development was counselling at the level of personal development each student had reached. However, students were in the process of discovering their own identity in an all-male, peer-level environment where seminary structures had a tendency to inhibit the growth to adult maturity. These factors militated against the effectiveness of spiritual counselling. Fr O’Shea was also conscious of the demands of the academic and pastoral programs made in competing with students’ prayer life and spirituality.\textsuperscript{146} As well he suggested that individual students selecting personal spiritual directors from a list of approved priests could be beneficial for students especially when it was practically impossible to have the one spiritual director who could relate effectively with every student in the seminary.\textsuperscript{147} O’Shea’s remarks suggest that, given the maturity level of most students and the conditions of seminary life, the development of an appropriate and effective spirituality program was still far from complete.

\textsuperscript{144} Frank Fillipetto, Interview, 5 August 2009.  
\textsuperscript{145} Clare, \textit{op. cit.}  
\textsuperscript{146} O’Shea, \textit{Catholic Leader, op.cit.}  
\textsuperscript{147} Hefferan, \textit{op. cit.}
The issue of celibacy for the priesthood continued to fester. During a Council debate leading to *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests) in 1965, Pope Paul VI excluded any discussion of priestly celibacy and indicated that he intended no revision of the requirement as then current.  

This was reaffirmed in Paul’s encyclical, *Sacerdotalis Caelibatus* (Priestly Celibacy, 1967). But the change of granting dispensations from the obligation of celibacy to men already ordained on condition that they no longer exercised their official priestly offices had already been made. This made it possible for priests to resign from ministry, a radical departure from the practice of never granting dispensations from this obligation. In the past men who left the priesthood were never dispensed from the obligation of celibacy so that they could validly marry. Those, then entering the priesthood, knew that they could be dispensed from the celibacy obligation, but no serious advancement was made in seminary practice on the understanding of that obligation and how to deal with problems in living up to its ideals when difficulty arose.

The academic program, still by no means professionally ideal, considerably improved, but Theology did not become the integrating energiser for which it had the potential. Students studied the documents of Vatican II and were introduced to the works of a range of contemporary, prominent theologians. Dr Peter McEniery and Fr Bill O’Shea, two outstanding former Banyo students who had gained postgraduate qualifications, joined the staff in the late 60s to join Father Bernard Wallace in fostering an enriched approach to Theology. Peter Mulder regarded McEniery as

---

being “at the forefront in his field of study,” namely Fundamental Dogmatic Theology where the study of the Church in the light of Vatican II was placed. This course dealt with the Church as the ‘People of God,’ and the role of a priest following the example of Jesus Christ as ‘priest, teacher, and servant.’ Peter worked tirelessly in following the Council to prepare and deliver the developing Theology.

Some students held him in high regard. “He was brilliant and displayed this as a voracious and forensic reader. Nothing went by without being noticed. Literally he could put his finger on anything.” His lectures challenged Roger Schreck to think about the Second Vatican Council proposals and about the authority style exercised in the Church for centuries. Peter distributed a lot of notes. To these Justin Clare echoed the reaction of many of his fellow students: “For students in their early twenties just beginning their theological education, such readings were difficult and often meaningless. Peter ... was an indefatigable worker. Unfortunately, he expected everyone to work as hard as he did.” Peter was a brilliant student, keen to share the fruits of his labour with his students but was hindered without the skills of a trained teacher. The same criticism applied to most of the lecturing staff at Banyo. Most students appreciated the friendliness of their lecturers and the efforts they put into their teaching their subjects, but were frustrated by their lack of teaching skills.

151 Peter Mulder, Interview, 30 July, 2009.
152 Ibid.
153 Roger Schreck, Interview, 18 August 2009.
154 Justin Clare, Interview, 14 September, 2009.
Under the new rectors Father Dave Hawe continued to teach Philosophy and
remained the same crusty old self to external appearances, continued to give boring
lectures, and be sarcastic with students.\textsuperscript{155} But even with Dave there were changes.
He translated his teaching notes from the original Latin into well written English
which he duplicated for students. He also introduced assignment work into his
assessment.\textsuperscript{156} His mentoring duties brought him into closer contact with individual
students and small groups. There he was a friendly and helpful person.\textsuperscript{157} He suffered
a heart attack and died soon after in 1976. The tragedy of Dave Hawe was that for so
long he kept these personal qualities suppressed. In this way he deprived students of
his personal warmth that had the capacity to make his classes more pleasant. Such a
classroom atmosphere could have facilitated achievement in learning. After his death
the importance of Philosophy at Banyo tended to fade.\textsuperscript{158}

In the light of thinking about the Church as the ‘People of God’ after Vatican II, the
demand for changes in the liturgy of the Mass, the organisation of dioceses and
parishes, and the involvement of lay people in the life and work of the Church
increased at an accelerating pace. An important change with implications for the
training of priests as ‘teacher, priest, and shepherd’ was that many ministries or
functions exclusively carried out in the past by priests were to be shared with lay
people. This demand for change and the pace at which it was demanded brought on
many difficulties to its implementation.

\textsuperscript{155} Sheehan, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{156} Mulkerin, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{157} Stenzel, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{158} Wrex Woolnough, Interview, 8 March 2010.
In the seminary the Liturgy received much more attention than previously. The new rite of the Mass and the use of English in the Liturgy were introduced. Alterations were made to the main altar in the chapel so that Mass could be celebrated with the celebrant and the congregation facing each other and to facilitate concelebrating Mass expressing the unity of the priesthood in Christ, an important change in a seminary.  

Priests versed in the Liturgy such as Father Barry Copley led students into using the much more flexible new rite in ways that engaged the congregation more and had more meaning as a community celebration than the ritualistic performance of the Latin Tridentine Mass. This was directed at assisting them to be facilitators of congregations in their parish Eucharist as the Mass tended to be then called.

Following the Council more attention was devoted in the seminary to the practicalities of parish and pastoral life. Father Kevin Caldwell, a priest trained in social work, introduced seminarians to aspects of social work applicable to pastoral ministry and organized placements to witness pastoral counselling in action.  

There is anecdotal evidence that some priests objecting to this type of work called into question the place of a priest exercising expertise in this field, referring to them as ‘social worker priests.’ This criticism did not curtail this approach to pastoral ministry which was seen as carrying out the role of the priest as a servant leader in the community. They saw this approach as enriching their own ministry and were keen to become familiar with the insights it provided for the development of their own pastoral practices.

160 Schreck, op.cit.
161 Maher, op.cit.
Peter Gagen, a Christian Brother recognized for his work in Catechetics, provided a much needed course in this previously neglected area. Its necessity came from the fact that young priests in parishes were allocated the task of taking weekly Religious Instruction classes in State Schools and assisting in the parish school’s sacramental preparation programs. To be effective in teaching religion, some teacher training was needed. Peter had the ability to pass on this kind of knowledge and skills.162 Peter and his successor, Sister Agnes Ryan of the Missionary Sisters of Service, gave lectures and organised visits to schools for seminarians to practise what they had learnt.163

Several efforts were made to advance the human development of seminarians on their way to the priesthood. When Dr Smith was rector, what students called the ‘Guru’ system was introduced. Each staff member took responsibility for mentoring a group of students. Beginning students all had the same mentor, but there was more flexibility in allocating students to mentoring priests in the other years. A ‘Guru’ was someone a student could talk to and be listened to,164 through the development of a helping relationship.165 This system was embraced with enthusiasm by some students while others accorded it only moderate success. The system lacked clarity and some mentors were uncertain of what they were trying to achieve. In principle the system had possibilities, but for its successful implementation, preparation and training of staff were needed. They lacked awareness of the need to introduce changes such as these with orientation sessions for students and professional development workshops for staff.

162 Peters op.cit.
163 McMahon, op. cit.
164 Ibid.
165 Cooney, op.cit.
In his interview Bill O’Shea recalled that with the assistance of Father Des O’Donnell, a priest of the order of the Oblate of Mary Immaculate, and Brother Ron Perry of the Marist Brothers, psychological and vocational testing was introduced to the seminary during this time. According to Bill O’Shea, “While these were not screening tests for seminary entrance they proved helpful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each student and provided guidelines for staff members working with those students.”

In 1975, while Father O’Shea was rector, the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary closed their Banyo convent as the time had come for the Sisters to follow the directives of the General Chapter Orientations of 1972 “to give priority to a milieu where Christ is least revealed.” For 35 years the Sisters gave their life to providing for the students and staff at Banyo. Until their last years the sisters were not allowed to speak to the students unless in exceptional circumstances. They worked apart, they prayed apart, and, even at times like Easter when they came to the seminary chapel for the liturgies of the Passion, Death and Resurrection of Christ, they entered and left the chapel by a separate door and sat apart from the rest of the congregation. They were almost totally isolated at Banyo and unlike teaching and nursing nuns, they had no outreach to children and their parents or to patients and their relations. Shortly before leaving Banyo, Dr Smith wrote to the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary: “May I repeat once more how grateful we are for the work the sisters have done and are doing here. It is a great burden off our shoulders to know that our domestic arrangements are handled

---

166 O’Shea, (Rector), *op.cit.*
167 ‘Closed Houses,’ notes supplied by Sister Madonna Purcell, Archivist, Franciscan Missionaries of Mary.
so competently and so unobtrusively.” In this way a modest tribute and expression of gratitude was paid to the sisters for the constant work they performed at Banyo in silence and solitude.

During these sixteen years changes, following Vatican II, brought seminarians into closer contact with the Church and society, thereby reducing its isolation from life outside the seminary and weakening its detached characteristics as a ‘total institution’. By removing many barriers, students became more involved with people and their activities. The relaxation of seminary rules was needed for this to happen. Students participated in this process which became painful when disagreements arose over which rules needed to remain in force or to be relaxed for the seminary to become integrated with the Church and the civic community.

In a seminary with more liberal rules students often failed to develop mature responsibility and seek self improvement through the new opportunities introduced. The changes could hardly be said to have worked. Rectors could not get away from a focus on rules and an obsession with students keeping the rules. The reduction of the number of rules with the accompanying directive that those remaining rules had to be obeyed just made the students want to ignore them the more. The ‘total institution’ character of the monastic style of the seminary, although considerably modified, remained firmly in place.

---

168 Notes supplied by Sister Madonna Purcell, Archivist, Franciscan Missionaries of Mary.
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Chapter VI  More for Less

From 1981 to 2000, attention was given to stabilizing the seminary. Beginning around 1980, in the early years of the papacy of Pope John Paul II, more orderly changes with intended positive outcomes were introduced to the chaotic conditions of Banyo. New rectors, not attached to the seminary staff, were appointed in the hope of returning stability to the seminary. Innovative programs developed in the late 70s were implemented and offered to a clientele broader than Banyo’s seminarians. Through considerations of gender, ecumenism, and multiculturalism, Banyo was drawn further into a broadening social context. In spite of all that was happening, enrolments further declined and fewer students reached ordination. ‘More’ was being done for the ‘less’ at Banyo which continued to supply priests for Queensland, but in very much depleted numbers. To make a fresh start in 2000, the Queensland Bishops decided to establish a new seminary, thus bringing about the cessation of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary, Banyo. In these last 20 years, the ‘total institution’ character of the seminary weakened further, but did not altogether disappear.

After Vatican II, Pope Paul VI tended to restrain the pace of change in the Church and his successor, Pope John Paul II, fostered the restraint more emphatically.

Among other things, he set definite directions for seminary formation. ¹ After Paul VI died in August 1978 his successor, John Paul I, a double name taken to pay

tribute to the reforming popes John XXIII and Paul VI, began his papacy on a high
note, but it ended abruptly with his death only a month after his election. His Polish
successor, Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, Archbishop of Krakow, was the first non-Italian
Pope since 1523. He took the name Pope John Paul II, a choice of names promising
hope of continuing reform in the Church, but his conservative style and decisions
disappointed many. Paul Grealy, a Banyo student in the early years of the new pope,
gave this impression of John Paul II:

Pope John Paul II was young, strong and forceful. He ... was able to
impose his conservative views on the universal Church. John Paul dashed
the hopes of many who were hoping for a more dynamic Church as the
messages of the Second Vatican Council unfolded. Many of the
impending changes he slowed down and gradually eliminated some of
them.4

Paul further observed:

The influence of John Paul’s conservatism was felt in the seminary where
a tension had developed in some students brought about by the monastic
environment of Banyo pushing them in a specific direction of formation
and the alternative of exploring directions of seeking a greater fullness of
life and not seeing yourself condemned for taking that option.5

---

In many places people at all levels in the Church reacted against the Pope’s conservatism and did not happily accept the restrictions he imposed. Banyo seminary was no exception.

These were the last years of the episcopate of the Archbishop of Brisbane, Francis Rush, previously a strong prelate firstly in Rockhampton and then in Brisbane. He was then becoming an aging prelate presiding over an archdiocese in distress, which was seen by a vocal minority as the disrupting legacy of the Second Vatican Council. The other Queensland dioceses had likewise struggled with the changes. Patrick O’Farrell portrayed this general state of affairs in the Catholic Church throughout Australia:

Its [The Second Vatican Council’s] Australian legacy was being revealed as not merely the challenges, discomforts and disruptions of creative change, but the dubious quality of the new religious habitation. ... It appears (sic) as jerry built, tawdry, insubstantial, cluttered with the shoddy, silly and second-rate, not attractive accommodation.

Archbishop Rush and the other Queensland Bishops were trying to keep the Church in their dioceses together. In the seminary tensions emerged between students wanting no changes who saw John Paul II as their champion, and those who opposed the direction the new pope was taking and wanting to continue the reforms of Vatican II.

---

6 Ibid.
Students coming to Banyo in the eighties were fewer in number but continued to belong to strong Catholic families who were close to their parish priests and involved in the activities of their parishes. Depending on their parents and their pastors they were inclined to be conservative or progressive in their attitudes towards a changing Church. As well they belonged to a new generation, “a generation between the Baby Boomers and their children (ridiculously dubbed Generation X as though they might be too mysterious to be understood).” Peter Kaldor and his co-writers have called them the “Baby Buster” generation, identifying the mass media as an important factor that influenced their life and development:

Of critical importance in contemporary value and culture formation is the media. If previous generations have been defined by life experiences such as wars or depressions, current generations are strongly shaped by media and global communications. The values and images portrayed on the television can become the basis of accepted values and shared experiences for each generation.

Through lifelong exposure to the media, particularly television, the minds of Generation X Banyo students were shaped by its powerful influence. The way they saw things and the values they formed through the variety of what they experienced through the media were different. Discussions, especially of social issues and similar matters, during their schooling had trained them to be articulate and assertive, ready to voice their perceptions of Church issues and seminary life.

---

At the end of 1980, Alan Sheldrick relinquished the position of rector and moved out of the seminary. By then he had spent seven years on the seminary staff, a little longer than most at that time had been prepared to give. His own words indicated he did not enjoy his time on Banyo’s staff, especially not as its rector.\textsuperscript{11} Earlier in 1980 the Queensland Bishops’ appointed a Victorian priest, Father Maurice Duffy, as rector of the seminary from the beginning of 1981, suggesting Father Sheldrick had accepted the position as rector for a limited period only.

Given the conditions then current at Banyo, it was important to choose someone who was acceptable and effective as the seminary rector. Academic qualifications and being pastorally minded had been the ‘unstated’ selection criteria for this role. Of the seven previous rectors, six were academics with higher degrees in church related studies and the five rectors in the 1965 – 1980 years were pastorally minded men. Another factor was the rector’s attitude to the seminary rules. All seven seem to have been guided by an assumption that students needed to show they could live a disciplined lifestyle built around a daily routine of spiritual exercises inculcated through obedience to seminary rules.

Up to a point compliance with the rules, as Cleary and Roberts, each in his own way, demanded, had worked. The widespread recognition of the dedicated commitment of Banyo priests to their parish responsibilities and priestly duties bore this out.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Alan Sheldrick, Interview, 7 March 2009.
before the Council the necessity and implication of some rules had been questioned, from 1965 onwards, both staff and students openly regarded many rules as unnecessary or too strict and needing change, but disagreed over the extent and the timing of those changes. The process of changing seminary rules, as already discussed, made the 1970s as years of tension and disorder. So the commitment of a new rector to the seminary rules and his style of commitment became a further consideration.

The complete outsider, Father Maurice Duffy of the Victorian Diocese of Sandhurst, took an entirely different approach to student management and training, when, as rector of Banyo in 1981, he took charge of “between 30 and 40 students.” Duffy operated through the relationships he established with students individually and as a group. Through those relationships he attempted to inspire them to develop their talents in ways that could be used to serve the Church and its people. With this approach he was hailed as “a breath of fresh air to Banyo.” Duffy believed in the intrinsic goodness of each person before God and of the personal ability of each one to contribute to the opening up of the world to God. This was in sharp contradiction to past regimes where students were regarded as prone to doing what was not approved, had to be closely supervised, and had to be corrected or dismissed when discovered to be involved in unapproved behaviour. He was not an academic nor was he a stickler for the rules. His view of obedience was placed in the response of an individual, in the light of his personal talents, to the call of God in his life situations.
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in the Church. Obedience took the form of answering the call to service in the community of the Church rather than the display of an ability to keep rules.

Maurice Duffy was not completely new to Banyo. He had previously established a reputation when, on two occasions, he had directed retreats for students. According to Tim Noonan:

He strongly advocated discovering and developing our personal gifts so to put to the service of others. He also suggested we should affirm people by recognizing their gifts and encourage them also to use those gifts in the service of others. This ... indicated there were other ways of leading a spiritual life than strict adherence to a set of rules.\(^{18}\)

Eddie Loh who also made a retreat under his direction said: “As a person he was charismatic, inspiring, and most impressive. He was certainly able to relate easily with students.”\(^ {19}\) In preparing for Banyo during 1980, before taking up his seminary appointment, Duffy toured each of the five Queensland dioceses to familiarise himself with church life in this state.\(^ {20}\)

As rector, formation activities dominated his contact with students, especially with those beginning at the seminary. Maurice Duffy (1981 – 1986) used a straightforward method of formation with students. He tried to build up students’ confidence by setting them achievable tasks and then regularly recognizing and affirming their achievements and the abilities that contributed to the achievements. John Mahoney

\(^{18}\) Brian Noonan, Interview, 14 August, 2009.

\(^{19}\) Eddie Loh, Interview, 26 January, 2010.

\(^{20}\) Grealy, op. cit.
believed that Duffy “searched for spiritual and pastoral opportunities in which students could take part that would positively contribute to their spiritual and personal growth and development.”21 It was not what he taught but the confidence he inspired in students.22 Paul Grealy reflected:

Maurice was a strong advocate of students spending as much time as possible in pastoral placements. He indicated that the time students spent in the seminary was time taken away from being with people. He had a vision of students living in parishes and coming to the seminary for their academic studies. He wanted to link students with the life of the Church in Queensland and inspire them to keep true to the ideal of faithfulness.23

Maurice Duffy helped students to form a sense of self, a sense of who they were in relation to God and in relation to the people they would serve as priests. He focused on their personal gifts, developing those talents and using them with confidence to serve others in exercising their priesthood as servants of their people.

In the way he dealt with students Maurice Duffy was non-directive. John Pyke vividly remembered his style:

When asked to do so, Maurice would not give specific instructions. He would say, ‘I did not make you, you do!’ Older students were used to being told what they should do and where they should be. Traditionally everyone had his or her own place in the Church and that person did not

21 Mahoney, *op.cit.*
23 Grealy, *op.cit.*
step outside that place. If he or she did then the “offending” person had to be given direction and guidance. This was not the case with Maurice. He told us to “be priests” for which we had to discern our own priesthood. In coming to Banyo I had apprehensions about the seminary structure being hierarchical and bureaucratic ... The seminary under Maurice Duffy was not like that.²⁴

In this way Maurice encouraged the development in students of a sense of self reliance and personal responsibility as well as a sense of self. In responding to situations they addressed he urged them to take initiatives and accept responsibility for their decisions and actions.

Sister Elaine Wainwright, a Sister of Mercy and a recognised Scripture scholar who lectured at Banyo when Maurice Duffy was rector, observed:

The new rector brought a strong sense of the need to develop a spirituality for the priesthood and this he tried to do with his students. He lived his own spirituality and believed that it was important that people understood where they are coming from and the perspective they bring with them.²⁵

He was thus teaching his students by his example to use their gifts in service for those with whom they were responsible and dedicate that service in prayer to God.

²⁴ Pyke, op.cit.
²⁵ Wainwright, op.cit.
Gerald O’Connell saw this also: “According to Maurice each one of us should live his own life. This meant discovering who and what you were and your aspirations. Living your life meant in turn realising your aspirations by using your personal gifts.”

This practical and pastoral approach to spirituality was one of Maurice Duffy’s positive contributions to Banyo. He believed in the uniqueness of each person in his spirituality and ministry as a priest. Each priest had a unique service for the people committed to his care which he only could give. Mark Dorge’s appreciation reflected the response of the student body to their rector: “He was a charismatic, enthusiastic, positive, and well spoken person who generated much enthusiasm within the seminary. Maurice made us new arrivals feel very welcome.”

Students recalled him as “an effective communicator and a powerful preacher.”

Gary Logan remembered him as “a genuine visionary and a larger than life story teller who used vivid word pictures in the metaphors in telling wonderful stories to illustrate his points.” In this way he was able to motivate and excite students. Bill Reuter said:

He immersed himself in humanity and encouraged us to become likewise immersed. In his characteristic style he would metaphorically refer to his little brothers and sisters as gifts from heaven about whom we should be concerned and ready to do anything that could help them.
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The rector was totally concerned about human beings, their welfare, spiritual and material, and ensuring anything that could be done to contribute to their welfare was done. He tried to pass on this approach to the priesthood to his students. In style rather than by technique he demonstrated how to proclaim the Good News.

Father Duffy told his students that they should never be afraid to dream. Each student had to have his own dream of being a priest and then live that dream. He used his “ability to recognize the potential and possibilities in people and to spare no effort in getting together resources to allow each student to explore that potential.” Many caught the dream. Duffy had the ability to sustain students and keep them going, although his approach to his work was rather unorthodox. Peter Meneely’s memory of him was:

He was a fatherly type. He was able to identify the gifts of person in an individual and encourage that person to develop those gifts for their greater exercise in the priesthood. This development did not proceed in a systematic manner but was expedited by the occasions Maurice capitalised on as they sprang up.

Bill Reuter believed Maurice Duffy became a real shepherd for him and a person he felt connected to: “With him you could be free to express yourself, knowing that you would be listened to and that he would take notice of what you said.”

[33] Ibid.
[34] Peter Meneely, Interview, 9 March 2010.
Duffy was a realist in the way he dealt with students. Bill Reuter and John Mahoney appreciated the way he did not make presumptions about them on the basis of their presence at Banyo but made it perfectly clear that just by being at Banyo, they were not necessarily in the right place nor ‘destined by God,’ as it were, to become priests of their dioceses. According to Bill Reuter, “Maurice even encouraged some students to leave the seminary because it was not the right place for them.” Maurice Duffy even enabled some students like John Mahoney to explore the foreign missions to assist them to make up their minds whether they wanted to remain at Banyo and be ordained for their own dioceses or to seek the challenges of the missions abroad.

Keeping rules was not an explicit priority for the new rector, but he expected students to observe them. If and when there were infringements, he expressed his disappointment with the students concerned and after an agonizing examination of what had happened took what action he thought necessary. Often this was to make those students aware of how they had let themselves down. In a small number of cases he had to go further than this. In the way he dealt with students he could not be accused of giving the impression that the measure of a person’s worth as a future priest depended on his history of keeping seminary rules.

Seminarians responded positively to Maurice Duffy. He recognized and encouraged the autonomy of each student. According to Gerard O’Connell: “Students read his message as being, ‘I shall bring you to me and raise you up. I shall respect you for
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what you are and empower you to do something worthwhile.’ ... He did all he could for each student.” Peter Meneely believed, “He had the ability to encourage you to believe in yourself and to live beyond mediocrity. He had an impact on the students of his time and that impact still continues to this day.” Paul Grealy appreciated Duffy’s approach: “Maurice Duffy set out to capture the idealism and the passion of youth that he witnessed in students during their pastoral work placements. He visited and stayed overnight in parishes where students had placements.” Maurice Duffy inspired and encouraged his students.

Two staff members commented on Duffy’s style. Wrex Woolnough declared: “He was a creative story teller and remarkable communicator who motivated and excited students. He took his students on an emotive journey rather than on an intellectual one.” However:

In some ways Maurice could be described as a loner who made things happen ... In my opinion he was a leader who led from the front. I would say he was not a collaborative leader and a team man. Nevertheless he was a gifted person who captured the imagination of the Banyo students and inspired them in their journey towards the priesthood.

Elaine Wainwright spoke positively about him without hiding some of his blemishes:
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Maurice ... had vision, imagination and a creative flare but was not always on top of the task of looking after the detail of day by day matters. This tended to frustrate some of the staff. He did not go down well with those who wanted more clarity and detail, those wanting to know exactly where they were at and exactly where they were going. Some staff members considered his vision as not being concrete enough for them.\textsuperscript{44}

Just as Duffy was somewhat lax in attending to daily matters of organization, he was furthermore lax in caring for his health. He was obviously sick during 1985 but that did not deter him from working with all the energy that was required. In 1986 his health further deteriorated causing him to return to Victoria. He died in the Mercy Hospital, East Melbourne on 31 July, 1987, just two months after his fifty-second birthday.\textsuperscript{45} Wrex Woolnough believed that he left an indelible mark on Banyo.\textsuperscript{46} Gerald O’Connell said, “It took a Maurice Duffy to change the mould of “the rector” at Banyo.”\textsuperscript{47} By the example of his life and work he showed the life of a priest as that of priest, teacher, and servant for those for whom he was responsible. Maurice Duffy demonstrated that there were ways of running a seminary other than insisting on conformity to a set of rules. While interviewees such as Paul Grealy did make references to the monastic style of Banyo, in the likeness of a ‘total institution,’ his years as rector were a period when such references to the seminary’s ‘monastic’ way of life were least made.
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At the beginning of 1987, Father Frank Lourigan, a priest of the Archdiocese of Brisbane, succeeded Maurice Duffy. He studied for the priesthood at Banyo, but had not been connected with it since then. In the twenty years after his ordination in 1968 before he came to Banyo, he had gained wide pastoral experience as a priest. As well as working in several Archdiocesan city and country parishes, he had been a member of the Senate of Priests, and held other positions including that of Director of the Pontifical Mission Aid Society and Catholic Immigration and Chairperson of the Archdiocesan Liturgical Commission. Basically he was a ‘pastoral person.’

When Lourigan became rector in 1987 he “had big shoes to fill.” Peter Oram said, “The ghost of Maurice Duffy continued to hang around Banyo. The strong presence of this well liked charismatic figure continued to pervade Banyo. For some students, Frank could never take his place.” But through hard work and persistent effort he gained the confidence of students. Because “he had a sincere and keen interest in each student ... he won them over.” Wrex Woolnough admired him because: “He worked like a beaver and would always see things through.” Jamie Collins remembered him as “a helpful and supportive person who identified with students by joining them in sport. He was a great supporter of the Broncos Rugby League team and sometimes went to their Brisbane matches, taking students with him.”
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Meneely said, “He was much more ordered than Maurice in the way he did things and in what he said he was straight down the middle of the road.”\textsuperscript{54}

Frank Lourigan, like Maurice Duffy, did not take classes in the academic program.\textsuperscript{55} That was left to the able lecturers: Elaine Wainwright, Wrex Woolnough, James Foley, Michael Putney, Greg Moses and others, each of whom gained the admiration of their students for their familiarity with their subject areas and their competence to present topics effectively and interestingly in their lectures. Frank was readily available to students and used student assemblies for much of his group contact with seminarians. Through discussions he fostered an attitude to “the way students behaved on the basis of freedom within the limits of the base line.”\textsuperscript{56} He stressed teamwork as being a necessity in the priesthood and for the formation of students within the seminary community. According to Paul Kelly, “Team work came through the development of ordinary human relationships with one another.”\textsuperscript{57} This was explained by ‘base lines’: “A Rugby League match demonstrated that players on the field were free to do what they liked as long as it fell within the boundaries of the game’s rules. The seminary was the same. We were free to adopt any behaviour as long as that behaviour was within the seminary base lines.”\textsuperscript{58} This suggested that, in his management of the seminary, traditional monastic rules were part of his mindset.
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Frank Lourigan, as a former Banyo student, was again expressing the traditional Banyo assumption that a young man to become a priest must first demonstrate that he had ability to live a life governed by stipulated rules. Dan Toombs stated, “The base lines had overtones of an expectation that these norms of behaviour were required and demanded ... Those who tried to buck the rules came off second best.”⁵⁹ According to Jamie Collins, “Most of the rules consisted of expectations of how we were to live, work and carry out other duties, like attending Mass each day, observing meal times and other significant house events.”⁶⁰ Whatever else about them they were reminiscent of the monastic way and the ‘total institution’ where everyone did everything together and rules had to be kept.

Lourigan described himself as a process person,⁶¹ or as the person in charge of processes. He defined processes as what was happening and why it was happening.⁶² It seemed that he saw himself as the manager of all seminary activities. Students having any problems with seminary life could turn to him as someone who had a process for resolving it.⁶³

During regular house assemblies Lourigan was open to the discussion of seminary issues. Prolonged dialogue took place between rector and students at these meetings⁶⁴ However, while he frequently insisted on the necessity of conforming to the “base
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lines,” he was very tolerant of the latitude students used in observing them; for some students, he was far too lax in applying what he said.65

Father Lourigan positively influenced students and the seminary. Dan Toombs found him to have “the ability to communicate with people at all levels. He was straight to the point and you always knew where you stood with him. He was a reasonable person in the way he dealt with students.”66 Adrian Sharp believed that Frank established a good tone within the seminary.

He was a pastoral man rather than an academic although he valued academic pursuits. He encouraged us to develop our individual and community prayer life and he was keen for us to become involved in sport. I always felt quite comfortable with him.67

Lourigan’s contribution to the seminary lay in the pastoral support he gave students and his contribution to their formation as future priests. In this he continued what Maurice Duffy had started. In his own quiet but determined way he made his mark during his years as seminary rector.

In 1995 John Chalmers became rector of Banyo, a position he held until the cessation of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary at the end of 2000 when it was reorganized as the Holy Spirit Seminary and St Paul’s Theological College. It was John who took charge of the preparations for this change. The story of his path to the rector’s
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position through his student years, as a priest in parishes, a postgraduate student and
a staff member at Banyo appeared in the Catholic Leader in 2000.68

Brisbane’s Auxiliary Bishop, James Cuskelly, invited him to study at the Jesuits’
Lyola University in Chicago as preparation for replacing Dan Grundy as director of
pastoral formation. There he gained a Doctorate in Ministry and Masters degrees in
Theology and Organisational Development. After his return to Australia, Bishop
Cuskelly invited him to become rector at Banyo.69

The low number of students at Banyo forced the Queensland Bishops to consider the
future of the seminary, its buildings, and facilities on its Banyo site. Consequently,
they directed John Chalmers to explore possibilities for the most fruitful use for its
large buildings. In the light of Pope John Paul II’s encyclical on priestly formation in
the contemporary world, Pastores Dabo Vobis (I Will Give You Pastors),70 they also
asked him to review the seminary formation according to the four areas identified by
the Pope: human, spiritual, intellectual and pastoral formation.71
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The Queensland Bishops had deemed that a more suitable place was needed for the
small number of students at the seminary.\textsuperscript{72} Elaine Wainwright, from her experience of teaching at Banyo, echoed the observations of many others:

During the 1965 – 1980 years, the emphasis at Banyo was to make it unlike the Banyo of earlier days. There was an effort to make it a more relaxed place by reducing the requirement to live each day according to a routine of rules. By 1980, the semblance of the old monastic order still pervaded the place. Students all lived under the same roof, had meals together, attended classes together according to a timetable and were required to seek a number of permissions from seminary authorities before undertaking specific activities.\textsuperscript{73}

The Queensland Bishops set up a Future Seminary Taskforce chaired by Justice Tony Fitzgerald in whose deliberations John Chalmers participated. On the basis of the Taskforce’s findings the bishops in 1997 decided:

- The formation program for candidates for the priesthood would be reshaped into four phases, prior to entry, academic phase, internship phase and apprenticeship phase.

\textsuperscript{73} Wainwright, \textit{op. cit.}
A house of formation would be established at Wavell Heights, called ‘Lanigan House,’ after Michael Lanigan, Banyo’s first head student in 1941, with students travelling to the seminary campus for academic courses.74

John Chalmers reorganized the formation program and this transition to ‘Lanigan House’ in the years 1997 to 2000.

The structure of the course was considerably modified. After a preparation in their home diocese new students entered the house of formation where the focus of the first year was on spiritual formation and prayer. In their second, third and fourth years they moved on to a program which combined spiritual formation with the study of academic subjects taken for the degree of Bachelor of Theology. For the last three years before ordination students undertook ministry work in parishes of their home dioceses, the first year in the form of an internship and the other two as an apprenticeship.75 This structure of preparation for the priesthood was designed to offer a more practical and relevant approach to the years of priestly preparation.

According to John Chalmers, this formation “emphasised that the priest should understand his own human personality in such a way that he is able to assist others in building a bridge – rather than being an obstacle to knowing Jesus Christ.”76 He added that a more intentional formation process was envisaged with emphasis on
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individual formation and self formation. The location of students during their time of formation had also to be considered in response to the questions: “What sort of seminary, for what priests, for what sort of Church, for what sort of world?” Information of the responses to those questions and how those responses were formulated was not found.

As rector, John Chalmers also directed the pastoral formation program. Students saw his style as rector and director of pastoral formation as being in contrast with that of Maurice Duffy and Frank Lourigan. In group discussions related to reflections on pastoral experience, John took a non-directive approach, leaving students to their own devices. Some students found this disconcerting. The reaction of Jamie Collins to these sessions was that “with John as rector it seemed at times as if anything goes. Personally, I felt the place was running amok and needed to be straightened out but nothing was really resolved.”

By way of contrast, Tony Girvan reacted positively to John Chalmers:

The rector, Father Chalmers, was someone I had total respect for. ... He did not get closely involved with the students but kept his distance from us. While he made the major administrative decisions for the seminary, he did not get involved with the problems arising from our living together. He was well versed in the area of group dynamics and left us to
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ourselves and the group dynamics we experienced to work out for ourselves the issues that arose. He indicated that as priests we had to grow as people and promote the growth of others. ... John Chalmers was a smart person who taught me the best lessons I ever learnt.  

Whatever may have been the case of the lack of personal warmth in John Chalmers, he demonstrated that he had the task orientation and the organizational skills to undertake this assignment and successfully see it through. His style was in contrast with that of his two predecessors. While he and Maurice Duffy were non-directive in their approach, Chalmers lacked Duffy’s charismatic inspiration for motivating students. Frank Lourigan was different again. He relied on an appreciation of teamwork and an acceptance of the rules of the game by team members.

By 1981 the development of academic and pastoral formation programs were well advanced and there was movement towards a spirituality program that students could more effectively relate to from the perspectives of the life they lived. A formal spirituality program of this nature emerged towards the end of this period. What had been an informal and incidental human development program became more formally established and implemented in the formation programs for students at ‘Lanigan House.’ To the extent they were involved, Maurice Duffy and Frank Lourigan facilitated rather than supervised the implementation of these programs, while John Chalmers supervised, according to the directives of John Paul II, the development and implantation of the formation program at ‘Lanigan House.’
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The term ‘formation’ had always been part of the Banyo vocabulary and was usually associated with the spiritual growth of students. In the years before Vatican II it was understood as the process of becoming another Christ overseen by the rector who supervised the practice of humble obedience of the seminary rules ‘modelled on Christ and the spiritual director who fostered a spirit of prayer, asceticism and charity towards others as expected of a priest. While spirituality was seen in the context of obedience, prayer and asceticism or self denial, its connection with good works done in charity for others was never very clear. Charity was practised indirectly by contributing donations to assist the disadvantaged, but charity as personal service to others only became explicit at Vatican II. By 1980 the narrow perception of spirituality at Banyo had been considerably expanded.

From a military style of unquestioning obedience to religious superiors it moved to centre on living in a spirit of charity and justice to honour God by using the God-given gifts of person to serve one’s neighbours. It took the form of a response to God’s call to service as a way of following Christ who came not to be served but to serve and to give his life for the ransom of many.81 Thus the priest had to work “as ‘a man for others’ standing at the side of Jesus in the service of the neighbour.”82 He was the microscopic expression of the ‘Servant Church,’83 the Mystical Body of Christ. As a servant-leader the priest obeyed the direction of being ‘a man for others’ by leading the Eucharist with his assembled people, by preaching the gospel to them and by exercising pastoral care for others, particularly the disadvantaged. The
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practices of personal and community prayer and asceticism tended to be based on the understanding of Christian service from which it took its meaning.

The spiritual directors, Father Pat Rasmussen and Father John Bathersby, helped students identify their personal strengths for use in the service of others. John Bathersby suggested that as servant leaders and future priests, students should view their abilities in an Australian context where they would use them as Australians working with fellow Australians.84 Maurice Duffy took them further.85 He gave them opportunities to use those gifts and to reflect on them afterwards to see what they were able to do. He then acknowledged what they had accomplished, affirmed their efforts and celebrated their achievements.

In a reflection and prayer context, with the guidance of their spiritual director, students considered their abilities, their activities and their successes and failures as an offering to God, as a thanksgiving for his blessings and a petition for assistance in their endeavours. Together the formation team helped students develop a spirituality that was closely related to life, integrating all the facets of their life as students. It was one that could be readily translated into their lives as future priests. As rector, Frank Lourigan continued this approach but added a strong emphasis on the need to exercise personal gifts through team work by complementing one another in the exercise of talents in imitation of Christ as servant and servant leader. This was another perspective that lent itself to liturgical expression.
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During Banyo’s last decade a comprehensive package on spirituality was brought together through the development of academic programs in spirituality.\(^{86}\) A historically and sociologically based course, ‘Introduction to Spirituality,’ ranged over aspects of spirituality literature with attention directed to spirituality genre.\(^{87}\) This expanded into spirituality courses as units to be taken towards theology degrees at graduate and postgraduate levels. They provided a basis for a spiritual director to assist students in his care with a spiritual formation that corresponded to the dispositions and aspirations of each. This in turn gave meaning and direction to the spirituality practices of prayer, the Eucharist and the Sacraments and the works of ministerial service. After long years of a vague and otherworldly spirituality program at Banyo, a comprehensive, concrete and practical approach grounded in the life experiences and religious practices of priests emerged.

Asceticism in the form of celibacy was another aspect of the spirituality of a diocesan priest expected to live a celibate life as a requisite for ordination and consequent ministry. A more concerted effort was made at Banyo to address the need to prepare students adequately for accepting this obligation, but students still felt those efforts were insufficient. According to Tony Girvan, “at the end of each semester workshops were held around the topic of celibacy and other sexual issues.”\(^{88}\) Even with these, students remarked on their lack of satisfaction as it appeared as presumed that students knew and understood what the obligation of celibacy entailed. The topics on the obligation of celibacy and living a celibate life were not adequately
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addressed. Anthony Shields recalled: “There was not a great deal of discussion about celibacy. As a young man with sexual urges celibacy did not make a lot of sense to me. Celibacy was there and a student was just expected to accept it.” What appeared to be missing in the preparation for celibacy was recognition of the presence, strength and orientation of sexual desire, what can be the short and long term consequences of frustrating this need and how to manage the sexual urge successfully when a person voluntarily foregoes sexual activity in a celibate life.

Some students struggled with the notion of the celibate life and agonised over the decision on whether to leave the seminary. One such student was John Pyke.

If the Catholic Church allowed married priests, I felt that all would be fine. Unfortunately in the exclusive notion of the priesthood adopted by the Church a priest was excluded from marriage and family life, something I believed I needed. It seemed to me that as a married priest with a family I would be nourished by that experience in my priesthood. I had witnessed the success of a family working man in the role of an Orthodox priest and a Protestant minister. I could not see why it would or could not work for the Catholic Church. Even Anglican priests who converted to Catholicism could retain their marriage as well as their priesthood. For someone like myself that path was blocked.

Students like John Pyke left the seminary excluding themselves from a sacramental ministry but followed a pastoral ministry through a career in human services.
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The perceived priorities of the Church can be seen in John Pyke’s reflection on priestly celibacy. The Church prefers celibate priests living what approximates to the life of a hermit than married priests sharing the family and community life of his parishioners. The Church is ‘in the world but not of the world.’ As the representative of the Church, the priest, through a celibate life, reflects this image. Church authorities of the Latin Rite continue to refuse to recognize that there are benefits to be gained by having a married clergy who as faithful priests and faithful family men can bring both worlds together.

While students agonized over celibacy, priests and religious brothers were being arrested and sent to prison for the sexual abuse of children. An attempt was made to address the problem for seminarians as future priests through a series of workshops on clergy abuse. Tony Girvan spoke of them as being conducted at a fairly practical level and focused on how to avoid situations where sexual abuse can occur and how to avoid the possibility of being falsely accused of sexual abuse. What was classified as abuse and non-abuse and the difference between open and private space were clarified. The need for having boundaries for one’s behaviour and not to stray outside those boundaries was emphasised.\footnote{Girvan, op. cit.} Being a seminarian during a period of the exposure of widespread clerical abuse of children was difficult.
Tony related that he often had to fend off jokes about clergy abuse and had personally experienced his credibility as a priest undermined by what was happening. He added:

I have been surprised by the extent of clergy abuse ... I am also surprised by the length of time it has taken for church leaders to recognize and accept what has happened ... Bishops seemed to be more concerned with taking measures to avoid scandal than attending to the pastoral needs of these situations as they arise ... At least I feel that the Australian Bishops have become proactive in dealing with cases that emerge by developing protocols for dealing with them. At least, priests publicly accused of abuse are now taken out of parishes rather than being transferred from one to another.93

Dan Toombs was a seminarian who struggled with the clergy pedophile crisis:

The early 1990s ... was a time when several Catholic priests and religious brothers, along with clergy from other denominations, were facing charges of sexually abusing children. I soon found myself struggling with the relevance of the priesthood at that time. I saw myself as a future priest as a struggling salesman trying his hardest to sell a product that had become out of date and was no longer an attractive buy for prospective customers. When asked by people what I was doing, I told them I was studying for the priesthood. In the light of the clergy misconduct cases that became so public I felt that I was
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under suspicion, regarded with disdain and regarded as someone whose
credibility was in question.\footnote{Toombs, op. cit.}

Towards the end of the twentieth century a definite response to celibacy and other
sexual matters had been made at Banyo seminary but there was still a long way to go.
In this crisis the Church gave the impression it was under threat and was prepared to
respond to priest sexual abuse cases only to the extent it was compelled to do so by
civil law.

During these years, advancements in the theological education of students were made
and implemented. The inspiration for this was ecumenical with its source being the
ministry training institutions of the Anglican and Uniting Churches. In a partnership
with the Banyo seminary they combined to design a degree program in Theology that
was sufficiently flexible to meet the training needs of the three churches. The
initiative for this was taken when a number of Protestant denominations, who relied
on the University of Queensland for degrees in Divinity for their students, felt that
this university was no longer able to offer this degree.

In 1978, a meeting of a consortium of the Australian and New Zealand Association
of Theologians (ANZAT) at the University of Queensland including Father Wrex
Woolnough of Banyo discussed the possibility of combining ministry studies for
students of the member churches. This proposal received considerable attention and
strong support, especially from the Uniting Church. In view of new trends in the Department of Studies in Religion at the University of Queensland they were concerned about the future of its Divinity degree on which the Anglican and Uniting Churches had relied. There were also several reasons for having Banyo students undertake a degree course in Theology.

Studies and application to studies were always stressed as important elements of seminary training but students did not always respond at the level expected. Even though the Latin barrier with theological text books no longer remained after Vatican II, many students were not attracted to the academic aspect of the seminary, voicing their objection that they came to be trained as pastors and not as academics. After ordination, most priests left the seminary pleased that study was behind them. Very few young priests were keen to continue to study. John Tracy Ellis commented on a similar situation in the United States:

A further factor that helps to explain the low state of the intellectual life among the priests of the United States is that in too many cases the natural tendency to intellectual laziness and sloth was not combated in the seminary by the professors’ insistence on extensive and deep collateral reading, on the writing research papers, and by active encouragement to students to use their critical faculties and to give rein to
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their intellectual curiosity. In other words, there has been no such serious approach to the learning process.\textsuperscript{98}

Ellis further clarified this remark in a manner more applicable to priests in parishes:

It is not the purpose or function of a seminary to turn out productive scholars. But it is hardly asking too much to expect that priests, whose ministry automatically thrusts them into a position of leadership, should have a lively interest in intellectual and cultural affairs, lively enough at least to prompt them to assemble a good library and ... use it.\textsuperscript{99}

Steps were taken in the late 60s to help priests become knowledgeable in ecclesiastical studies and other areas.\textsuperscript{100} Improvement in the quality of the courses appeared at Banyo when Dr Peter McEniery, Father Bill O’Shea, and other keen lecturers joined the teaching staff of which Father Bernie Wallace and Dr Tom Boland were members. Some students responded confidently to the opportunity but others were not enthused, something they later regretted. Michael Peters lamented: “My biggest regret in regards to Peter and Bill is that I only wish that I could have been as intent on what they were teaching as I am now.”\textsuperscript{101} Some students found that the new freedom they enjoyed and the expanded interests in pastoral and social activities were a distraction from their studies. A later student, Peter Meneely, provided the following typical reflection of students to their seminary studies:

In retrospect I wish that at the age of 22 I had formulated the in-depth questions to ask in Theology and Ecclesiology that I later found myself
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asking. I wish I had approached the studies with much more zeal than I did. In some ways I felt that I did not learn a great deal from them but on further consideration I took more from them than I thought.\(^{102}\)

For those with the ability and motivation to pursue studies at a higher level, opportunities were made around 1970 for a small group of more academically inclined seminary students to study units leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Religious Studies at the University of Queensland. There were limits to the number of students who could manage this path as Fr Bill O’Shea noted: “In Banyo Seminary few students find they can afford the time to do part time university studies because of the demands made on them by the pastoral program and a heavy academic program within the seminary itself.”\(^{103}\) He also hinted at a need to reform Banyo’s academic program to which “many new disciplines have been included in the curriculum in recent years ... whereas very little has been discarded.”\(^{104}\) The establishment of the Brisbane College of Theology (BCT) made it possible to reorganize Banyo’s curriculum and offer students a degree program.

Initially six denominations, Anglican, Baptist, Catholic, Churches of Christ, Continuing Presbyterian, and Uniting Church, were involved in planning a degree course for the proposed college. Their aim was to design units in Scripture, History, Systematic Theology and Pastoral Practice broad enough for each student to choose a pattern of units acceptable to his or her denomination. Six denominations began
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working together, but disagreements among the representatives of the different denominations on what contents to include caused a division in the group.\textsuperscript{105} The units some of the churches wanted to develop were in conflict with the doctrines of other participating churches.

Without a resolution of this conflict, the Anglican, Catholic and Uniting Churches decided to continue together. Wrex Woolnough worked with Jim Warner of the Anglican Church and Hans Spykeeboer of the Uniting Church to develop the submission for the Board of Advanced Education that was eventually accepted. The establishment of the Brisbane College of Theology (BCT) involving St Francis’s Seminary, Milton, Trinity College, Auchenflower, and Banyo Seminary soon followed.\textsuperscript{106} Students began enrolling at the BCT in 1983. Lecturers with acceptable higher degrees were required for the Brisbane College of Theology and a number of nuns who held the necessary qualifications were appointed to BCT.

The exercise of designing a submission to the Board of Advanced Education to accredit the degree provided a professional development activity for those involved. To gain accreditation, those working on the courses had to be familiar with a curriculum development format with attention given to aims and objectives, preparation, planning, learning experiences, and assessment in a much more structured way than previously.\textsuperscript{107} This had the potential to make those who lectured
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in the degree program more familiar with what went into the task of teaching. Sister Elaine Wainwright, a recipient of a Doctorate of Philosophy and other degrees for her work on St Matthew’s Gospel, taught units in Sacred Scripture for the degree course. She was highly regarded for her thoroughness and effective teaching practices by both staff and students. Through her presence on the Banyo staff she contributed to the professional development of priests-lecturers who did not have formal teacher training.

Once a week, on a rotational basis, Auchenflower, Banyo, and Milton campuses hosted a Liturgy for their own denomination in which students from all three campuses participated. On these occasions at Banyo, Maurice Duffy always celebrated the ecumenical nature of BCT, acting as ‘mine host’ for a luncheon for visitors. On the anniversary of Hans Spykeeboer’s ordination as a minister of the Uniting Church, the luncheon was held in his honour when a stole embroidered with the Uniting Church symbols was presented to him. This presentation indicated the type and the quality of the ecumenical gestures being exchanged.

That the Catholic seminary of Queensland could cooperate with the Anglican and Uniting Churches in the Brisbane College of Theology was a major milestone in the progress of ecumenism in these churches. Students had to travel to the campus where the lecturer for the unit being studied was located. Banyo students attended lectures
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with the students for the ministry of those two churches. As well a number of lay people from the three churches had enrolled to do the degree and attended lectures.

Non-Catholic academics, Hans Spykeeboer and Ray Barraclough, along with Elaine Wainwright, looked after most of the Scripture studies. Catholic priests provided most of the Theology lectures: Wrex Woolnough, Systematic Theology; Michael Putney, Sacramental Theology; and Michael McClure, Moral Theology. Jim Cronin, another Catholic priest, lectured in Liturgy. James Foley looked after the philosophical units. BCT was proving to be an effective means for promoting the theological education of ministry students, for admitting lay people to study Theology, and for advancing the ecumenical relations among those students of the participating denominations of the College.

Elaine Wainwright noted the stimulus given by the Brisbane College of Theology to ecumenical cooperation and the efforts made in ecumenical academic pursuits:

With the advent of the Brisbane College of Theology in 1984, scripture subjects have been taught ecumenically by faculty members from the three colleges. Seminarians, therefore, join with other students from each of these member colleges. This reflects the arena of biblical scholarship generally, where, at the close of the century, Catholic and Protestant scholars work collaboratively in academic associations, as faculty.

---
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members, in research projects, in fact one could say in all areas of the scholarly endeavours.\footnote{112}

The Brisbane College of Theology provided richer and wider opportunities for theological studies to students. The rector of Banyo now shared his authority over studies with others belonging to all three campuses of the Brisbane College of Theology. The sharing of this authority was a major influence in promoting the advancement of theological studies at the Banyo seminary.

During the early days of BCT a number of teething problems arose. One of these was the problem of having students arrive at Banyo who did not have the necessary Tertiary Entrance Score (TE Score – now an OP or Overall Position Score) required for enrolment in the degree program of accredited tertiary educational institutions in Queensland. The academic dean found a way to overcome this problem. After the Uniting Church requested provisional matriculation for its students on the grounds of what they had been able to achieve in other areas was approved, Fr Lourigan asked for and received a similar approval. Students given provisional matriculation had it confirmed after the successful completion of their first year. This boosted their confidence as they no longer felt that they were second class students. Some went on later to do Masters degrees in Theology and Ministry.\footnote{113} Students also received assistance, if needed, to help them to master the technical language of the Philosophy, Theology and Scripture units.


\footnote{113} Name withheld by request, \textit{op. cit.}
The BCT courses were made available to lay people of the participating churches. Through the extension of the seminary’s study programs to Catholic lay students, in addition to seminarians, there were “another 106 students [who] use the theological education resources of Banyo through the Brisbane College of Theology”.114 Because of the ecumenical nature of the degree program and their availability to ministry and lay students of the Anglican, Catholic and Uniting Churches, Banyo had also fostered an ecumenical dimension in the delivery of its programs.115

An undated flyer entitled “Learning Opportunities for Priests” indicated the success of the BCT where it was stated: “More than 200 have obtained an Associate Diploma, Bachelor or Graduate Diploma in Theology through the BCT. Presently nearly 400 students are undertaking undergraduate or postgraduate studies.”116

Most students appreciated the opportunity to do the shared courses through BCT. Paul Kelly remembered feeling a little apprehensive when he realized that he would be studying with Anglican and Uniting Church ministry students and was pleasantly surprised when he found it a worthwhile experience: “It helped in developing friendships and cooperation with ministers of other denominations when we meet them in our parishes.”117 Anthony Shields said, “We experienced different ways of
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learning as lectures were given at three campuses.”\textsuperscript{118} The perspective of Dan Toombs, however, was different:

On the ground level we were meeting students of other denominations. I felt a strong sense of their differences. ‘We are Catholics: they are not.’ We shared each other’s forms of worship on occasions. This gave me the impression that they saw things differently from us and did things differently. After classes taken together there was little by way of ecumenical activity. A lot of ice-breaking that needed to be done never really happened. They seemed odd to me and in their beliefs and forms of worship they were too far either to the right or the left.\textsuperscript{119}

For most the ecumenical nature of the studies was welcomed and regarded as a beneficial way for different religious denominations to pursue the same study programs together.

Sister Malette Black, although not directly involved with BCT, saw the benefits of introducing other adults into the Brisbane College of Theology:

In that situation the attitudes of seminarians were conditioned by the presence of lay people who were struggling with time and financial constraints to do the course, who were passionate about what they were doing and who regarded what they were doing as vitally important. For them it was not just doing the course as a means of getting into a parish.

\textsuperscript{118} Shields, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{119} Toombs, \textit{op. cit.}
The introduction of this new element into the learning situation moderated the manner of the learning process.\textsuperscript{120}

In the college situation Banyo students were able to assess their performance in relation to other ministry students and lay people. It was an opportunity for reality testing where they could see how well they were progressing in their studies in a wider environment and not just the relatively isolated environment of the seminary.

The establishment of the Brisbane College of Theology served in continuing to break down the isolation of Banyo by putting students and staff priests in touch with highly qualified ministers of other churches and religious women who worked in a cooperative situation with them. Seminarians also met their contemporaries studying for ministry in their respective churches, which, in the cases of the Anglican and Uniting Church, included women as well as men. Finally, as well as meeting and studying with Catholic lay people, they met Anglican and Uniting Church lay men and women studying for theological degrees.

The Brisbane College of Theology provided a variety of worthwhile courses delivered, for the most part, by capable lecturers in an ecumenical context. It became a means of involving women in an area of substantial work of the Church. While the number of Catholic lay students was growing, the number of Catholic students for the priesthood was declining. Theology programs as a preparation for priestly ministry had implications and meaning for lay ministries in the Church too. BCT was

\textsuperscript{120} Malette Black, Interview, 18 February, 2010
providing a new human resource for the local church in the form of theologically literate lay people. As such they challenged the Queensland Church to establish where and how they could contribute to church ministry.

The pastoral formation program designed, implemented and supervised by Father Dan Grundy as director of pastoral formation, was another positive development but for too few seminarians, during these last years. When Grundy left Banyo for full time parish duties, Father John Chalmers, Banyo’s last rector, assumed the supervision of the pastoral formation program. Both were assisted by Mrs Patricia Hall, a laywoman, who in collaboration with Dan Grundy and John Chalmers played a significant role in the activities of the program.

During their last semester spent in the seminary after ordination, Banyo students prior to the Second Vatican Council gained no other pastoral experience apart from assisting in parishes on a few Sunday mornings. In response to the directives of the Council document, Optatam Totius, after 1965, pastoral exposure and experience activities began in a piecemeal way at Banyo but they soon took on a definite pattern. By 1977, Father Bill O’Shea could tell his colleagues in other seminaries: “I think I can say that after a few fumbling years we have at Queensland’s Banyo Seminary a pastoral program that is intensive, very well organised and structured, involving students from the third year of their course in a wide variety of pastoral
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experience.”123 From next to nothing a sound beginning of this program in priestly training had been made.

Soon after O’Shea’s address, Archbishop Francis Rush, citing the Vatican Council on the training of priests, announced the introduction of a pastoral year for seminary students in their fourth year. This would be under the supervision of Father Dan Grundy:

Seminarians must learn the art of exercising the apostolate, not only in theory but also in practice. They have to be able to act on their own initiative and in cooperation with others. So they should be introduced into pastoral practice as a part of their course of studies. ... Such programs should be carried out in a methodical way under the direction of men experienced in pastoral work.124

Archbishop Rush outlined a wide range of pastoral work for seminarians then added:

“Banyo Seminary’s director of pastoral formation, Fr D. Grundy, will maintain close contact with both students and priests. This contact will take the form of regular weekly meetings and monthly reviews.”125
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Banyo students participated in a pastoral year for the first time in 1980. After ten years working with the program, in 1990 Dan Grundy and Mrs Patricia Hall, his pastoral program associate, made this report on the pastoral year:

During their pastoral year, students live in a presbytery and engage in parish ministry full-time from mid-January until the first week of December. They are both preparing themselves for this kind of life, and, at the same time, discerning along with the Church whether they are called to it. Hence, for the sake of both preparation and discernment, it is important that they experience during this year the life and ministry of a diocesan priest as fully as possible.  

During their fourth year each student was assigned to a parish where the parish priest mentored the activities of his pastoral placement student. In preparation the student drew up a proposed program for the year which he presented this to his pastor. After it had been discussed, both signed the program document as an Agreement for Learning. Weekly, throughout the year, pastor and student discussed the progress made. The director of pastoral formation made regular parish visits to students and their pastors for further discussion of progress made.

As well students were required to write ‘Verbatims,’ of their experiences which Grundy and Hall described as follows:
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He records the conversation, some of it in summary form, the critical
element of it word-for-word, together with the non-verbal communication
within the event and his own internal reactions to it as it happened. He
writes his own assessment of the event in terms of the other person’s needs, the ministry he offered, and his theological understanding of what
happened. Finally, he clarifies to the best of his ability what are the
questions which the assessed event has raised for him.\textsuperscript{128}

Students’ verbatim became the basis for discussion with a supervising pastor or with
their peers in a ‘Verbatim’ workshop on ministry.\textsuperscript{129} One of the theology lecturers
came into this process to help students formulate theological understandings of their
experiences.\textsuperscript{130} At a meeting with their supervisor and the seminary team in April,
June, and October students presented a statement for formal evaluation. They were
required to “list their strengths, weaknesses and ‘growing edges’, and assess to what
extent they have succeeded in meeting their goals and whether they need to set new
ones.”\textsuperscript{131}

This lengthy, pre-ordination, directed and guided pastoral experience and formation
program was a vast improvement to the ‘learning on the job situations’ and ‘learning
from the mistakes made’ in pastoral situations after ordination. Students gained
experience and were formed through that experience. After their pastoral activities
they received guidance and assistance in reflecting on the meaning of those activities
and the application of what they had learnt. Furthermore through this process they

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., p. 238.
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had the opportunity to discern whether the activities engaged in and the situations
met worked with people and whether they would be happy to pursue permanently
after ordination those kinds of activities and the accompanying life agenda.

The apparent absence of intensive professional development of mentoring pastors for
the program to have maximum effect was noticed. Gerard O’Connell, one of the first
to undertake this year said, “The pastoral year was a welcome change from the
academic routine of the last three years. In many ways the academic program seemed
to have little relationship to what we would be doing as priests.”¹³² He reflected:

Throughout the pastoral year we had group meetings involving students
in parishes, their parish priests, and the director of the pastoral program.
These meetings were meant to share our experiences by means of a
‗verbatim‘ or pastoral report as the basis for discussion and to grow in the
knowledge and appreciation of our work but the link was never clear. All
of us were impressed by the pastoral concern and efforts of our mentor
priests but some of them were coming from different angles, something
that did not make the task easier.¹³³

For some students such as Peter Meneely it confirmed them in their decision to return
to the seminary and continue on to ordination but this was not so in every case:

¹³² O’Connell, op. cit.
¹³³ Ibid.
The year was important to establish whether a student can function as a priest amidst the many parish duties he is obliged to undertake. After being exposed to what the life of a priest in a parish would be like two of my classmates left the seminary. I had difficulty in going back to the seminary the following year as I was keen and ready to take on the work of a priest in a parish. For me the pastoral year was a good experience and a firm confirmation of my aspirations.134

For John Pyke the time became a year of discernment leading to a decision made reluctantly and regretfully not to continue his journey to the priesthood:

Towards the end of my pastoral year I was asked if I would be returning to the seminary. My answer was that at that stage I did not know. I wanted to return but that would mean saying “No!” to the things that are important to me. The year after the pastoral year was oriented towards ordination. I could not honestly go back and say I am willing to go to ordination without marriage and family. That would be living a lie. In saying I want a family, I have to say “No!” to the priesthood – both are of the essence of me. It was ‘so be it’ although this was a painful decision for me.135

John was typical of a number of students torn between the priesthood and married life. They believed they could live a beneficial life as a married priest with a family but, because of the obligation of celibacy, were denied the opportunity of doing so.
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When students returned to Banyo for their fifth year the challenge to complete the degree in Theology was still in front of them. After some years this arrangement was reorganised. Students completed their degrees in three and a half years. In the second semester of their fourth year, in preparation for their pastoral year, they commenced the Graduate Diploma in Ministry. The units aimed at raising awareness of parish life and traditions, the variety of ways people communicate and the organizational dynamics at work in a parish.\textsuperscript{136} This diploma was completed through their parish work and the ‘verbatim’ and other reports written for pastoral workshops and evaluations in their fifth year.

In the final years of Banyo, all in-house studies were completed before the pastoral year. The pastoral year internship was extended to a pastoral apprenticeship for two more years, the first in preparation for the diaconate and the second, in preparation for priestly ordination.\textsuperscript{137} In those two years studies towards the degrees of Master of Theology and Master of Ministry became available for students. During the years of the pastoral preparation program, students experienced parish life in a variety of situations on which they reflected to discover meaning and direction in them for their future as priests in parish life.

The preparation of students as future leaders of worship came under the guidance of staff members, Fathers Barry Copley and Jim Cronin. Most students regarded being involved and active in the liturgical life at Banyo as an important part of their

\textsuperscript{136} Francis Nguyen, Interview, 21 April 2010.
\textsuperscript{137} Queensland’s Provincial Seminary, “Preparing Future Leaders,” Undated.
preparation for becoming priests. In the ritualised form of the Eucharist they celebrated and offered their life work to God, thus integrating liturgical worship with their spiritual life. Peter Meneely in describing the seminary preparation of liturgical leaders was not so sure:

Our course on Liturgy concentrated more on knowledge of the Liturgy than on doing Liturgy. There were rituals we went through but insufficient focus was placed on the methods of engaging people in Liturgy. This was becoming more necessary as the emphasis had moved from the Eucharist as Sacrifice to Eucharist as Gathering and Meal. As part of our preparation we had good models in Archbishop Francis Rush, Maurice Duffy and Wrex Woolnough. This, to some extent, compensated for the lack of opportunity for doing Liturgy. Their example reinforced my understanding and appreciation that Liturgy must be alive.\(^\text{138}\)

Students spoke of their appreciation of the liturgical life of the seminary but were apprehensive of how to transfer what they did there to a parish situation.

The human formation program formally implemented at ‘Lanigan House’ engaged the attention and interest of students such as John Nguyen who reflected:

The humanism phase consisted of workshops, lectures and discussions based on psychological findings that assisted us to grow and develop humanly in and through the communal life situation. It was aimed at getting us to stand on our own two feet in parish life. Liturgy and prayer

\(^{138}\) Meneely, *op.cit.*
were a vital part of the community life and the program. I felt that the communal life was very helpful for me, especially in having to plan rosters and to carry out the rostered duties at the appointed times. I felt that this was a good way of teaching me to plan my life and plan for the life ahead.\textsuperscript{139}

This program had its focus on the limited life opportunities of ‘Lanigan House.’ There were more situations in the life of a priest and a seminarian that involved the effective management of interpersonal relationships. For instance, when students found the pastoral program associate annoyingly assertive and uncomfortably confrontational they reacted negatively to her interventions.\textsuperscript{140} To meet and work cooperatively with different kinds of people meant realizing that each person is different, and in life situations a person has to learn to interact and work with the people in their life world. This is essential learning for human development. However, there was no evidence of any ways of addressing this situation.

The presence of women at Banyo actively engaged in students’ formation activities provided another opportunity for their human development. According to Elaine Wainwright, for a number of years “all staff members were involved in some way with the formation program of students.”\textsuperscript{141} No doubt Sr Elaine, who directed her doctoral studies towards the ‘Feminist Factor in St Matthew’s Gospel,’ took a leading role in the workshop on ‘feminism’ and another on the use of ‘inclusive language.’ Most students felt that they had benefited through their participation in these and

\textsuperscript{139} John Nguyen, Interview, 7 May 2010.
\textsuperscript{140} Students Interviews, 1981 – 2000.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid.
other workshops organised by women on the Banyo staff, but there were a few who thought that what was presented was too forcefully exaggerated.\textsuperscript{142}

Before 1965 women were kept at a distance from students in the seminary. Arrangements for an all male institution had become a long standing tradition in the Catholic Church. Where women were considered necessary for attending to the domestic tasks, they were part of the seminary but were kept in the background. The Franciscan Missionaries of Mary had minimum contact with the seminary community. Apart from these nuns, women for the most part had been kept out altogether. Prior to 1965, each year Banyo held a “Prize Night” to which the fathers of the students were invited, but never the mothers or any other women.\textsuperscript{143} Since young priests would meet and work with women in parishes, in the light of the decrees of Vatican II, seminary authorities began to realize the need to prepare future priests for working in cooperative arrangements with women.

In the wake of Vatican II, the Church became aware that women too were members of the ‘People of God.’ Previously the employment of women in the Church had been generally restricted to roles stereotyped as feminine. They were ‘the handmaids of the Lord.’\textsuperscript{144} Now, women, including women in religious orders, were gaining higher qualifications and, in the new openness after Vatican II, assertively requested access to previously denied church positions. Within the Church, nuns who had become qualified in Scripture, Theology and other Church disciplines sought opportunities to
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use their qualifications. Involving women in seminaries thus became a way of using their talents for a purpose high in priority in the work of the Church.

After 1965 seminary rectors engaged women with something specific to offer seminary students for involvement in seminary life. With the renewed emphasis on the obligation of priests to preach the Word of God effectively, students needed familiarity not only with the contents of theology but also with the means of effective communication. To assist students with voice development and production, a female speech pathologist became a member of the Banyo staff.\textsuperscript{145} Sister Agnes Ryan, a Missionary Sisters of Service, prepared students for catechetical work in schools.\textsuperscript{146} to meet a growing urgency, as every young priest could expect to spend a significant proportion of his week taking religion classes, particularly in government schools. Later, in the 1980s, Sister Mallette Black, a Presentation Sister who had completed a Master of Education in studies in Religious Education and Adult Faith Religious Education, taught courses in these areas to students during their final years.\textsuperscript{147} A further opening for women on the Banyo staff came through the development of the Brisbane College of Theology. A comment on this situation was:

> Having women in teaching positions after 1965 was certainly a breaking down of the old Tridentine tradition of having only priests teaching seminarians throughout their major seminary course. I always felt

\textsuperscript{145} Greg Stenzel, Interview, 28 July 2009.  
\textsuperscript{146} Jim Cronin, Interview, 21 August 2009.  
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genuinely accepted by staff and students at Banyo and had no difficulty in relating to either group or to the seminary community as a whole.\textsuperscript{148}

In recognition of the contribution of one particular sister to the academic program, Jamie Collins declared, “She was always available to help us and bent over backwards to help us in whatever ways she could.”\textsuperscript{149} Not all students agreed completely with this but they indicated that the presence of women so directly involved in their seminary life became a new challenge for them. Dan Toombs believed that having women on the staff at Banyo helped to bring balance into the life of the seminary.\textsuperscript{150} The addition of women to the teaching staff was another important and significant step in the attempts to reduce the isolation of the seminary from one large section of the rest of the world. It also fostered human development.

A multicultural situation developed that also influenced students’ human development. Up to the end of the 1980s the majority of students had Irish forebears. A sprinkling of Italian-Australians and a few Europeans students in the later years were exceptions. During the 1990s a new and important group of students, Vietnamese refugees, including John Hong, Joseph Hien Van Vo, Francis Nguyen and John Nguyen became students at Banyo. Francis Nguyen, like the others, had spent several years in seminaries in South Vietnam. When the Communists gained control in South Vietnam in 1975, seminaries were closed.\textsuperscript{151} John Hong, reared in
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war-torn Vietnam, saw family members driven from their homes and separated forever. He saw relatives die at sea in overcrowded boats and had spent more than three years in detention and refugee camps.\footnote{Lou Robson, “Refugee in the Lord,” \textit{The Sunday Mail}, 8 February 1998.} Joseph Hien Van Vo was ordained a Deacon in Vietnam in 1975 but the new government prevented his ordination to the priesthood. He was imprisoned three times and succeeded in escaping from Vietnam by boat after 17 years.\footnote{Joseph Hien Van Vo, Letter, May 2010.} They escaped by boat from Vietnam and eventually found their way to Australia via detention camps in Thailand, Hong Kong and the Philippines. After years of waiting they arrived in Australia with the strong desire to become priests.

In Australia, they studied TAFE English courses and made contact with Father Pat O’Neill, a Redemptorist priest. They did theology courses in Sydney and Melbourne and eventually were directed to Archbishop Bathersby in Brisbane who accepted them for Banyo Seminary.\footnote{Nguyen, op. cit.} The theological studies they had done were taken into consideration so that they did not have to spend seven years as seminarians.

John Nguyen spoke for his fellow Vietnamese students in his appreciation of Banyo:

> The best thing about the seminary was the opportunity to form friendships there. During my time at the seminary I felt that the processes in operation helped me to identify my strengths and weaknesses in ways which helped me to develop my strengths and manage my weaknesses.
The challenges to grow and develop so that I would be better equipped as a person gave me a sense of confidence. As a Vietnamese person I did feel different but I never felt an outsider.\textsuperscript{155}

Their arrival moderately boosted the numbers at Banyo and slightly increased the number of priests in the Brisbane Archdiocese and its parishes. Their presence at Banyo and ‘Lanigan House’ became an opportunity for members of different ethnic groups to relate to one another. The seminary became a place of opportunities for young men to learn to relate to people of different religious, gender, and ethnic backgrounds. It had the potential to develop greater depth in the seminary human development program.

‘Lanigan House,’ where students moved in 1988, was expected to be homely residence for students where the effects of living in a large and empty place would be avoided. There they were responsible for their own cooking and housekeeping.\textsuperscript{156} On the developments at ‘Lanigan House,’ a member of the formation team, with insight observed:

For the small numbers, ‘Lanigan House’ and the plans for its operation made it a relevant place for students to live and to develop a mature sense of responsibility. They were given responsibility for their living arrangements and getting along with one another. ... At their meetings a feeling emerged that they were trying to organize tasks and routines as a community in which they would do things together. They seemed to be
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failing to realize that as diocesan priests there would not be the opportunities to do things with others but many activities would have to be done independently and alone. They were pushing community but failing to realize the need for independence and that it was a spirit of collegiality rather than community that needed to be developed.\footnote{Name of source withheld by request, Interview, 6 May 2010.}

This small group did not shake off the semblance of a ‘total institution.’ They became their own authority as they tended towards doing things together while they lived under the same roof. To the end, Banyo Seminary did not cast off the characteristics of a ‘total institution.’

By the year 2000, new structures for the preparation of diocesan priests were in place. The Queensland Bishops agreed to hand over the Banyo site to the Australian Catholic University for its Brisbane campus. They told this to the Catholics of Queensland through a joint pastoral letter.\footnote{Queensland Bishops, Pastoral Letter, “The future use of the Pius XII Provincial Seminary site, Banyo, Brisbane, 18 – 19 November 2000.} From 1980 to 2000, the seminary through openness to feminine, ecumenical, and multicultural influences developed wider contact with society. Programs were more closely aligned with church ministry in an ecumenical context and extended to lay people. The continued decline in enrolments and the fall in the number of ordinations, in spite of everything that was being done, constituted the downside for the seminary. However, a determination to confront all challenges prevailed in these conditions of doing ‘more’ for ‘less.’
Chapter VII  Conclusions

Despite encounters with obstacles to development during its 60 years, Banyo Seminary, as an institution, achieved qualified success. In the words of Michael Putney, Banyo achieved its primary goal: “the formation of committed, effective priests for the Church in Queensland,” although the supply of these priests fell dramatically during its second 30 years. During its first three decades serious reasons emerged for dissatisfaction with the seminary’s ‘total institution’ monastic structure as a suitable system of preparation of priests destined to work alone, in pairs, or in a small group among the lay community. When, in response to Vatican II’s directions for changes in seminaries, Banyo staff adopted a trial and error method for steady implementations of changes, students wanted radical changes as quickly as possible. Consequently, a range of problems emerged. As problems were resolved, more relevant spiritual, theological education, and pastoral programs were developed and implemented, although effective preparation for a celibate life remained elusive and a program for human development remained incomplete. Even with constant efforts to change the underlying system the monastic structure of the seminary persisted in a weakened form.

The founders of the Banyo seminary believed the Tridentine system of training would continually prepare suitable priests for Queensland. That it did so is illustrated

---

by the 418 students who were ordained to the priesthood. However, this number needs to be considered in the context of over 800 students who enrolled at Banyo during those 60 years indicating that only about half of the entrants reached ordination. A further qualification to make is that after ordination more than 25 per cent of those ordained resigned from priestly ministry. The first ordinations took place in 1948 and, by 1970, 257 students had been ordained. This was in sharp contrast to the following 30 years when 151 students were ordained with only 29 of those in the last ten years.\(^2\) Church authorities expected an attrition rate at the pre-ordination level but not at the sharply rising level after 1970. While Banyo continued to attract students and prepare them for ordination, given the increase in the proportion of departures after Vatican II, a conclusion reached is that the Tridentine system and its post Vatican II adaptations lacked the capacity to influence students to make the expected, unqualified commitment to the priesthood and the Church. The relevance of the obligation of celibacy was likewise questioned. There was considerable evidence too that the decline in entrants and ordinations was influenced by ecclesiology, socio-economic status, family size, and competing career options in human services, but the investigation of these was beyond the scope of this project.

When Archbishop John Panico and the Queensland Bishops decided in March 1939 to establish a Queensland seminary, because of Church directives, they had no other choice but to accept the rigid organization of a Tridentine seminary.\(^3\) Their task was to provide buildings, facilities and staff for such a seminary, the suitability and

---


\(^3\) *Codex Iuris Canonici* \(^17\) (Code of Canon Law, 1917 ed. – CIC\(^{17}\)) Can.
effectiveness of which was unquestioned as the tried and tested means of preparing young men for the priesthood. Its isolated location with a monastic lifestyle emphasising obedience was accepted as being the ideal seminary training for the diocesan priesthood. But this seminary system had serious flaws. When in the years 1941 – 1965, students joined an isolated seminary community, they voluntarily agreed to suspend their autonomy and to allow their freedom to be restricted. This was done to train them for an eremitical life as a parish priest exemplified by John Marie Vianney and extolled by Lacodaire. This in itself was a deprivation of human dignity. Then, in reality a parish priest could not live as a hermit in a contemporary parish without neglecting his pastoral duties. Furthermore, their isolation seriously delayed the development of skills for relating to people of all ages, races, religions and members of both sexes. Parish priests’ lives as pastors spent among people was incompatible with isolation. The suspension of autonomy and restriction of liberty, as well as being an affront to human dignity, was an inadequate preparation for a role in which responsibilities, heavy as well as light, are placed in the person of the priest.

Seminary life, with its insistence on immediate and unquestioned obedience to a superior, hindered students in developing mature responsibility. Military colleges and police academies were organized on similar lines but the purpose of strict discipline and unquestioned obedience in these was quite different from any pastoral situation. Soldiers and police were trained for intervention in emergency situations where immediate action is necessary. Emergency situations, to limit damage, need competent leaders to take charge and direct operations. There is little parallel between the situation of a priest and that of a soldier or a policeman. Humble
unquestioning obedience to a superior as following the example of Christ is difficult to justify. Each religious superior has an individual perception of a situation for which obedience is demanded and directions can be driven by personal traits leaving them open to question, as happened with the early rectors of Banyo. Besides, obedience lies more in a willing response to the needs of their community which a superior and an inferior need to identify through discussion.

A primary goal of the seminary was to form a student to see himself as an *alter Christus* (another Christ) in the way prescribed by the Church. This is akin to the process at work in a ‘total institution’ which Erving Goffman described as a “forcing house for changing persons.” The underlying assumption of a ‘total institution,’ which Goffman identified, is that a group of like-situated people can have their way of seeing themselves changed by immersing them in specified conditions of life for the group. For the Catholic seminarian, this implied developing the ‘mind of Christ,’ through an isolated environment over a period of time where the stripping of personal identifiers and the experiences of humiliations and mortifications banish the old self. In reality, students responded overtly to the behavioural requirements of the situation without adopting the interior disposition assumed to occur. It furthermore required personnel to facilitate the development of the new self. The personal qualities and styles of Mgr Cleary and Mgr Roberts did not display the ability for doing that.
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5 Ibid., p. 16.
6 Phil. 2:5.
7 Goffman, op. cit., p. 23.
Most students were compliant in accepting the seminary regime. They were prepared to conform externally as a condition of reaching the priesthood, but they never fully internalized seminary demands. Other students were adventurous young men, unready to resist the temptation to break rules and take risks. For these, the seminary as a ‘total institution’ acted as a means of overt behaviour control, but it failed to change their ‘nonconforming self.’

In spite of the faith of authorities in a rigid rule based system of training, it had the potential to hide students with serious problems. Such a student could cover any personal shortcomings by strictly abiding by the rules. Over confidence in the keeping the rules meant depriving students of appropriate interventions to assist them with their personal development and of counselling assistance in discerning their suitability for the priesthood.\(^8\)

Several positive outcomes were indicated in the recollections of those who experienced Banyo’s Tridentine seminary. Former students recalled the enduring quality of relationships they forged despite the rule to avoid particular friendships. They talked about the times they enjoyed, including what they now recognize as immature pranks. This developed into what Goffman described as an ‘under life.’ As such it was not characterised by protest and rebellion. Rather it developed as a survival mechanism for cushioning the harsh effects of the system and the severe manner in which rectors administered it. In a spirit of toleration rather than

---

\(^8\) O’Shea, *op. cit.*
admiration they accepted their rectors as part of the reality of seminary life. Students respected and admired the priests and others who taught them, even if at times they found amusement in their idiosyncrasies and foibles. Up to a point they recognized and appreciated the breadth of educational opportunities they received. Most believed that they learnt more from the example of their spiritual directors than from what they had to say but their spiritual direction had been beneficial. Although Banyo was a positive experience, in many ways students frequently regarded it as a dismal preparation for the priesthood, particularly because of its failure to train them for pastoral life in the parishes of Queensland and to prepare them adequately for the celibate lifestyle they were expected to adopt.

During the years leading up to the Second Vatican Council, enrolments were high and although departures before ordination were also fairly high, particularly in the minor seminary, an acceptable number of ordinations occurred beginning in 1948. Although this thesis did not include an investigation of the range of reasons for this it appears on the surface that students went there highly motivated to accept the restrictions of the system and with a determination to stay until they reached ordination.

For those who for the spiritual and religious purpose of living a life spent in prayer, asceticism, study, and work, voluntarily chose to separate themselves permanently from the mainstream of society, the monastic system has been acceptable. This, however, does make monasticism a suitable system for preparing those, again for
religious and spiritual reasons, who opt for an active religious life among people. For religious formation processes, this structure possibly could be used in other settings. For this to happen effectively, research needs to be done on the goals of such an institution and how the institutional life is related to achieving those goals. The establishment of conducive conditions for attaining those goals such as the degree of isolation, the period of separation from the wider community, and the age levels people can best benefit from extended activities in this kind of structure too needs investigation. Another consideration is the personal qualities of those who direct that system so that it contributes to the development, personal and social, of those participating in its activities rather than hinder or ignore such development.

When so many directives for change emerged from Vatican II, there was an impatience for change in a church inexperienced in dealing with change for almost 400 years. With this impatience, little time was given to considering the significance of each change and the means of implementing them. The ‘People of God,’ as Vatican II described the whole Church, were surprised and pleased with the widespread changes proposed and wanted changes introduced as soon as possible.

The bishops at the Second Vatican Council had challenged the condition of the Church ‘being in the world but not of the world,’ believing the time had come when the Church could no longer work within its self-imposed narrow confines in the
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9 *Lumen Gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution of the Church), No. 9, in Flannery, *op. cit.*
rapidly changing world of its mission.\textsuperscript{10} The Council addressed the topic of seminaries, challenging the assumption that priests could be effectively trained for modern society in an isolated situation apart from society.\textsuperscript{11} In this way, it addressed the contradiction existing in the structure of seminaries. Students, following their ordinations, needed to know what was happening in their parishes, dioceses, localities, and the wider world and how to relate to people in their pastoral and sacramental ministries. The Tridentine seminary had failed to prepare priests in a practical way for becoming pastors. Vatican II stipulated that seminaries had to undertake the role of preparing priests for their ministerial roles among people. This and the other Council directives for seminaries were based on the revived and earlier, rather than a new, interpretation of the priesthood of Christ as priest, teacher, and shepherd. Realizing an appropriate interpretation of what this meant, its application to the seminary, and implementing that application encountered several difficulties.

The professors at Banyo, although aware of this development,\textsuperscript{12} were inhibited by the model of priesthood they had learnt and practised in pre-Vatican II times. This acted as a brake on the development of the model for students in the light of the decrees of Vatican II.\textsuperscript{13} Only in its final years was an attempt made to define the relationships

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Optatam Totius} (On the Training of Priests), No. 21.


\textsuperscript{13} Tom Saide, Interview, 18 October 2009.
\end{flushright}
between the seminarian, the priest and the world in which he would work and what this meant for training for the priesthood.  

Seminary authorities knew they had to move from the old methods of seminaries, but no one was sure of what they should be moving towards. There seemed to be so much to change, but little time to become familiar with the changes before their implementation. In the rush to change, the prior discussion that took place often had little depth. Where and how to train students for the priesthood, what kind of training they should be given and what kind of people should be recruited for training and to provide the training are matters still under discussion.  The rush for change brought confusion, discord and a lack of clear direction in all sections of the Church, including seminaries. Banyo tried to introduce changes before the seminary was sufficiently prepared.

In appointing Mgr Torpie as rector of Banyo the Queensland Bishops recognized the need for changes at Banyo. Two facets of the seminary were obvious in its need of change, namely, its rigid rule based regime and its isolation. In view of this, seminary authorities, according to students of the time, elected to move the seminary from a monastic model of operation to a more college-like approach. In the flurry to adopt changes, the rector and his staff set out on this task without a definite plan of change, using an evolutionary method of a piecemeal, trial and error kind of gradual change. Breaking down the isolation of the seminary by allowing outsiders to

---

come to the seminary for activities was the easier task and proceeded smoothly. Making the seminary a more relaxed place and giving students opportunities to become involved with people outside the seminary required changes to the rules. During Torpie’s three years as rector, generally compliant students of the previous rector’s time, born during World War II, welcomed his changes to rules which were made without serious conflict. Mgr Torpie decision to establish a students’ representative council of two students from each class, a total of 14 students, as a means of their participation in decisions about seminary rules worked well for him.

Torpie’s successor, Dr Smith, was in favour of change, preferred to get along with others, and was not one to evaluate critically the implications of changes. Students realized their rector could be pushed and did so. He approved, without scrutiny, students’ proposals that seemed reasonable. In this way students became aware of the power they could wield. As a group of 14, they could outnumber staff at meetings. Instead of proceeding gradually to a more relaxed seminary, it tended to rush to become a lax seminary. Smith’s decisions over six years as rector often frustrated Fr Wallace as vice rector and Fr O’Shea as dean of discipline. These were years when annual enrolments declined and departures before ordination rose sharply.

The emerging conflict erupted when Fr Bill O’Shea became rector in 1974. At meetings between staff and students the evolutionary gradual approach of staff was forcefully challenged. A student group of 14 idealistic and assertive ‘Baby Boomers’ became a powerful bloc that wanted to move at a revolutionary pace and were
prepared to confront seminary authorities to get their way. In the name of developing maturity and responsibility students demanded the abolition of rules. They were buoyed in their quest by the youth revolution taking place round the world with its resistance to and rejection of constituted authority. High on their list was the removal of all monastic style rules that dictated their daily routine of basic living arrangements, spiritual exercises, and study. Other issues arose but when the students did not get their own way they ignored seminary authority’s directives and did what they wanted, a situation that continued into the periods as rector of O’Shea’s successors, Dr Tom Boland and Fr Alan Sheldrick. Rector and staff had failed to grasp the situation that developed in not sufficiently realizing the changing nature of young people, in being unaware of methods used for organizational change in secular institutions, and in not acquiring skills for managing and resolving conflict.

Through his charismatic and inspirational qualities, rather than being qualified through education and training, the next rector, Fr Maurice Duffy, did defuse the situation. With a personalist and relationships approach, Duffy motivated students to believe in themselves and to take constructive action in the service of others. As well he gave them opportunities to explore options should they think that Banyo and the diocesan priesthood was not what they wanted. The Second Vatican Council declared that lay people as well as priests and members of religious orders were called to holiness. Consequently, students realized that it was not necessary to remain unmarried and childless to lead a Christian life, and that human service careers were available in which a person could live a Christian life of service without the obligation of celibacy and the restrictions of the seminary and the pastoral life of a
priest. Whereas this understanding had emerged in the earlier period, the indications were that Duffy gave it his approval. To some extent this accounted for the continuing fall in enrolments and the rise in the number of departures from the seminary.

The post-Vatican II conditions of Banyo seminary sharply contrasted with the Banyo prior to 1965. Students of this later period entered the seminary after being conditioned by family and social circumstances that were different from those of earlier students. Earlier students entered the seminary with a commitment and a strong determination to become a priest but for later students it became one of a range of options for living a Christian life. Rather than being compliant and accepting the directives of seminary authorities they were confident and assertive in demanding that seminary authorities justify their directives or be ignored. This was happening while seminary authorities were trying to define the structure of the post-Vatican II seminary and their roles within it. This was in contrast to the Tridentine seminary with its rigid structure and legally defined roles for its personnel.

Through most of these 60 years the specific nature of spirituality remained vague and students were unsure of what they were discussing. In the Tridentine seminary spirituality seemed to be equated with a devotional piety that was a continuation of what they had learnt at home, at school, and in their parishes. Within this framework the necessity of obedience in the priesthood was stressed. The day was
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17 Hal Ranger, Interview, 18 November 2008.
ordered with its round of spiritual exercises. Through these, done in a spirit of obedience and humility, it seemed to students they were to become spiritual people. There was no open discussion of cultivating a relationship to God and its implications for a person who was a Christian and a priest. It was as if spirituality was caught by osmosis.\textsuperscript{18}

Adolphe Tanquerey’s textbook on spirituality, used during this period, was written for a situation removed from the complexities and indignities of life in modern, industrial, and commercial circumstances.\textsuperscript{19} It concentrated on spiritual ‘trivia’ rather than on ‘life today’ situations. The book tended to give the impression that grace was something earned, that the more grace you earned the closer you came to God. It suggested that spirituality was about earning grace and the spiritual life amounted to a kind of spiritual bookkeeping. Tanquerey ignored the need to cultivate quality human relationships as an essential factor in the spiritual life of a Christian. Some students found the spirituality developed through gospel discussions in the Young Christian Workers Movement was more practical and helpful. Prior to 1965 Banyo lacked the program, spiritual directors able to connect with individual students, and suitable resources for making its spirituality program relevant and effective.\textsuperscript{20}

The terms “spirituality” and “spiritual formation” had almost alienating connotations, especially for young Australian men. Being spiritual meaning ‘being holy’ had

\textsuperscript{18} Saide, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{19} Adolphe Tanquerey, \textit{The Spiritual Life: A Treatise on Ascetical and Mystical Theology}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Revised ed. Tournai: Declee. 1930.
\textsuperscript{20} O’Shea, \textit{op. cit.}
connotations of being a prude, a prig, or what was called in common parlance, ‘a holy Joe.’ Banyo did not have a practical approach to the Christian life developed through theological knowledge and personal growth to integrate reading and study of the Scriptures and Theology, prayer, liturgy and ministry activities into living a Christian life.

Younger spiritual directors after 1965 introduced students to a range of spiritualities and used psychological exercises to help them identify their strengths and weaknesses. However, apart from the spiritualities introduced, there was little evidence of efforts to help students develop a personal spirituality based on Christian beliefs, particularly the priesthood. This had to wait for the development of academic courses in spirituality in the closing years of the seminary.

A spiritual director was a standard member of the seminary staff, one of whose main duties was being available to all students for regular consultations. This caused difficulties for students ill at ease with the designated spiritual director. During the closing years students were able to choose from a range of spiritual directors with the seminary spiritual director taking a coordinating role for spiritual direction activities. In doing this seminary authorities recognised the individuality of each student and
the need for a person appropriate for each student as a spiritual director in the
delicate task of providing spiritual direction.21

During the 1990s, a spirituality program consisting of an academic study of
spirituality, spiritual formation, spiritual direction and practical spirituality in prayer,
liturgy, and service was developed. Through the constant efforts made for an
adequate and effective spirituality and life program, a comprehensive program was
eventually designed and introduced.

Asceticism in the form of the celibate life was closely associated with the spiritual
life of a diocesan priest. Throughout Banyo’s 60 years the need of this obligation for
diocesan priests was questioned. It was brought more sharply into focus when Pope
Paul VI withdrew any discussion of celibacy from the Council with a strong assertion
that he had no intention of reviewing this law.22 The Pope’s directive was not easily
accepted by priests and seminarians because of a range of anomalies existing in the
law including the admission to holy orders in the Catholic Church of married
Anglican and other Protestant ministers who had converted to Catholicism and been
allowed to remain in a marriage relationship; the recent decision of the Papacy to
grant dispensations from the obligation of celibacy to priests who left ministry and
married despite the long standing statute of never granting such dispensations; and
the growing shortage of clergy. With all these, Catholic priests and people were
perplexed when the Pope would not allow a married priesthood.

21 O’Shea, op. cit.
22 John W. O’Malley, What Happened at Vatican II, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University
Banyo students complained about the lack of adequate preparation they received for a celibate life. The obligation was spelt out, underlined by the absence of sexual activity this implied. From time to time priests on staff gave hints about how to manage this obligation, often denigrating women in doing so. Workshops were held on celibacy during the final years of the Pius XII Seminary, but students who took part in these could not remember any discussion of sexuality and its dynamics as part of the human psyche, how a celibate life could affect a person’s psychological and social development and well being, and what a priest could do to remain celibate and live a balanced human life. Students were clearly made aware of the obligation, but received little worthwhile preparation for living that obligation. A comprehensive and satisfactory program on sexuality in the priesthood was elusive.

With the spate of paedophile incidents involving clergy, priests became frightened even to touch anyone, especially a child, in any circumstances. This situation called for a comprehensive program in the seminary to address sexuality and issues relating to sexuality in the priesthood. In the training of priests where the study of Philosophy was stressed, there was no training in managing emotions and the behaviours that flow from them. Priests are expected to be caring spiritual people who can grow as human beings knowing how to manage their feelings, to behave in appropriate ways, and be helpful to others. Students for the priesthood received little assistance for cultivating those qualities. The seminary never developed an effective program to prepare students for many aspects of the celibate life. As those responsible had a similar experience they had no other precedent as a basis for such a program.

23 Mark Celledoni, Interview, 21 March 2010.
24 Madden, op. cit
The academic courses at Banyo were the means whereby students became familiar with Church teachings so that the knowledge gained provided content they could draw on for teaching and preaching Catholic doctrine and explaining the Church’s position on moral issues. Each week day, from Monday to Saturday, students attended lectures and were expected to spend several hours in study. Their academic advancement depended, among other factors, on the relevance of their text books and other resources of learning, the competence of the lecturers to teach and communicate effectively, and the student’s ability and willingness to use well the learning opportunities available.

During the first 25 years of the seminary, many students found difficulty in coming to terms with much of their studies. Following the Second Vatican Council the obstruction that the use of the Latin language in studies caused was removed. The dry and abstract defensive method of presentation based on the abstract Philosophy and Theology of St Thomas Aquinas according to models used in Roman Universities was changed in favour of the writings of theologians who offered contemporary theological interpretations of people’s relationship to God in the modern world. Competent lecturers on the Banyo staff, many of them young, enthusiastic and up to date, endeavoured to present lectures that were well prepared, organised, engaging and interesting. The changes made were a vast improvement on the old approach, but this did not entirely resolve students’ problems. They still had
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25 Kerry Costigan, Interview, 30 January 2008.
to master the language of Philosophy and Theology and continued to find difficulties with the untrained pedagogical style of lecturers.\textsuperscript{26} 

While most students did not come to the seminary to become academic theologians, some saw the opportunity for this, responded positively, and put their minds to mastering the Theology, Scripture, Philosophy, and History presented to them. Michael Putney, Wrex Woolnough, Greg Moses, James Foley, Jim Cronin, and Terence Collins excelled in their studies, went on to postgraduate studies, gained higher qualifications, and returned to lecture at Banyo. The rest, however, had come to Banyo to be trained as pastoral men. Their outlook was practical and they were not prepared for the amount of academic studies required. They were willing to read the relevant literature in preparation for classes and assignments and to review that literature again following classes, but tended to deflate what they saw as an undue emphasis placed on advancement in studies by the Banyo lecturing staff.

A further problem students experienced was in seeing the relationship between the program of studies and the work of a priest in a parish. The program of studies by not being overtly related to being a priest tended to lack focus. In each topic studied there was no obvious explanation given to students of what they were doing, why they were doing it, and how it fitted into what they could expect to do as priests.\textsuperscript{27} Indicating the relevance of their subjects and their topics was a task lecturers did not do well. Many were young and were appointed to lecture at Banyo after gaining little

\textsuperscript{26} Justin Clare, Interview, 14 September, 2009. 
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
parish and pastoral experience. Nor had students escaped the anti-intellectual character found in the Australian culture. They were basically pragmatic and wanted something they could do, something that would work.\textsuperscript{28}

The establishment of the Brisbane College of Theology with its degree course in Theology was a motivating factor for lecturers to improve their understanding of what was required for effective teaching. In planning the arrangements for the Bachelor of Theology considerations were given to specific courses and course structures, course contact time for students, suitable text books, and assessment proposals so that these could be gathered in a submission for accreditation at degree level. These were tasks the lecturers at Banyo had never had to face before and a reason why they often struggled as teachers. Putting a course in a curriculum structure became a major exercise in professional development for the staff.\textsuperscript{29} The assistance of religious sisters who were trained teachers qualified in Theology and Scripture facilitated the development of courses in this way. Through their engagement with the lecturing staff and their involvement in developing degree level courses they promoted the professional development of teachers in the rest of the Banyo staff.

The introduction of the degree program provided well developed and organized courses and improvements in the pedagogical methods used. Many students expecting to be trained as pastors in parishes complained that their lecturers were still

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{28} Frank Filipetto, Interview, 5 August 2009.
\textsuperscript{29} Grealy, \textit{op. cit.}
\end{flushright}
too theoretical and too academic. They believed there was too much emphasis on high academic performance when high achievers were regarded as doing well in their preparation for the priesthood. After 60 years Banyo was still contending with the problem of having its theological studies program better related to the contingencies of the pastoral life of priests.

The studies at Banyo did improve during its last 35 years making them more appropriate. While the courses of studies were not perfect, Banyo produced its fair share of scholars in the ecclesiastical disciplines of learning. The ecumenical cooperation in the planning and delivery of the degree course promoted relationships with students of the participating denominations that carried over into their future pastoral life.

Prior to the Second Vatican Council, seminary preparation for the pastoral life was most inappropriate. It lacked practical preparation of men meeting people in the pastoral situations of home and hospital visitation, religious instruction in schools, chaplains for parish groups, instructing converts and preparing couples for marriage. They were scarcely prepared for many pastoral activities which brought them into contact with women. There was no real preparation for presbytery life where their appointed pastors varied from being most helpful and friendly to being possessive, suspicious, jealous, antagonistic, and decidedly unhelpful. The few visits to parishes after ordination to help with Masses on Sunday mornings and the series of dry discussions with a Brisbane parish priest about the legalistic side of parish work
provided little help for initiation into parish life. Pastoral training came after ordination and appointment to a parish. Then it was learning on the job, sometimes with little help from the pastor of the parish.

Following Vatican II, at first older students gained practical experience, albeit on a limited basis, in the catechetical work under the guidance of Peter Gagen, Agnes Ryan and others and in the pastoral tasks with Kevin Caldwell. Gradually pastoral work became open to more junior students who were able to get involved in home, hospital and prison visitation, working with St Vincent de Paul and parish youth groups and other pastoral activities. This voluntary and unstructured approach developed into a much more focused course, especially after Dan Grundy became the seminary’s director of pastoral formation. Under Dan Grundy and later John Chalmers pastoral formation through actual experience in parishes became a major feature of training for the priesthood. During their first four years students gained experience in pastoral situations on which they were required to reflect and report. Eventually the last three years were spent in selected parishes with parish priests acting as mentors. During this time they had the support of the director of pastoral formation and the opportunity to broaden their understanding of pastoral work through the Graduate Diploma in Ministry and then the Master of Ministry offered by the Brisbane College of Theology. By the time this came about, compared with former times, only a small number of students benefited from all the work put into the pastoral formation program. The development of this program, so urgently needed, was one of Banyo’s better achievements.
Based on the directives of Pope John Paul II’s encyclical *Pastores Dabo Vobis* (I Will Give You Pastors), human development was formally introduced as a formation program at ‘Lanigan House.’ Throughout its history, activities promoting human development in some form belonged to the Banyo program. Some were initiated and overseen by the rector as appropriate behaviour at meals in the refectory and as conventional ritual protocols for liturgy, while others like sporting activities, the Literary and Debating Society, and the Dramatic Society were managed by the students themselves. In fact the total program at Banyo was supposed to be one of human development within the framework of the Gospels. Aspects of human development were likewise implied in courses and subjects such as spirituality, moral theology and ethics, and pastoral formation. The program at ‘Lanigan House’ appears to have been focused on the development of acceptable standards of interpersonal behaviour.

Human development occurs in the areas of personal, social, intellectual, moral, and spiritual development. The seminary has, as its focus for human development, the human development of the priest who can present Christianity through his ministry to contemporary people in ways that are attractive and relevant. By 2000 the seminary had hardly reached this stage. An improved program is possible based on researched evidence of an ideal contemporary image of a priest in parish ministry and using the seminary’s theological education, spirituality, and pastoral formation programs to promote the personal, social, intellectual, moral, and spiritual development of future priests.
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31 John Nguyen, *op.cit.*
Efforts which were made after 25 years at Banyo to alter the monastic lifestyle of the Tridentine seminary succeeded in reducing its isolation by making it open to a wide range of people and groups. The rules of Banyo were relaxed to give students the freedom to become involved in activities outside the seminary. However, there remained the sense of living in a separated community following the basic rules. Even when they relocated to ‘Lanigan House,’ Wavell Heights, and given a great deal of autonomy they still saw themselves as a community in which they should undertake activities together at the same time. The collegiality in preparation for the diocesan priesthood did not replace the ‘community of the monastery.’ This illustrated how embedded was the Tridentine system of training in the Church.

A microscopic view of a changing and, to some extent, a dysfunctional Church in modern times emerges in the history of Banyo seminary. As well Banyo provides a crucible of what has happened in seminaries formerly based on the Tridentine tradition in the Latin rite of the Catholic Church. The seminary never succeeded in ridding itself of the remnants of its monastic structure as a ‘total institution.’ Nevertheless, in the face of many obstacles, the Pius XII Provincial Seminary never failed completely in its task in supplying priests for Queensland, although that supply was no longer adequate. From the confusion and chaos, enhanced programs in spirituality, theological education, and pastoral formation were produced, although challenges remained for the development of an effective preparation for the celibate lives of priests and a formation program in human development remained incomplete. The Pius XII Provincial Seminary over 60 years made substantial contributions to the dioceses of Queensland and to the lives of its priests.
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I  Oral Interviews with Former Students

Entered Seminary 1941 – 1953 Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Ordained</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckley, John</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Anthony</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13 October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin, Neil</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Martin</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>11 August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernan, Ivan</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3 December 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey, Colin</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane, Bernard</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4 August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsford, Des</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGinley, Pat</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeown, Bill</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>18 August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVeigh, Tom</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 November 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Dwyer, Brian</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>28 February 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O’Dwyer, Pat 1943 19 August 2007  
Pender, Virgil 1944 1951 11 December 2008  
Ranger, Hal 1953 1959 18 November 2008  
Reis, Bernie 1946 3 April 2008  
Ryan, Kevin 1952 1960 21 April 2009  
Valente, Lino 1946 1954 10 April 2008

Entered Seminary 1954 – 1964 Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Ordained</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Brian</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6 May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy, Pat</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>23 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwell, Eddie</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23 February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connolly, Brian</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>14 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costigan, Kerry</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>30 January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton, Kieran</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>27 April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy, Joe</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>14 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice, Peter</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, Paul</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>8 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickling, Terry</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>5 November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hynes, Jim</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>17 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keliher, Terry</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>17 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>Ordained</td>
<td>Date of Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Peter</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>24 April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulkerin, Kerry</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Shea, Bill</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6 February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan, John</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4 August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scully, Jeff</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldrick, Alan</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>13 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Bernard</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>28 May 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Entered Seminary 1965 – 1980 Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Ordained</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare, Justin</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>14 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooney, Michael</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>22 July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin, James</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>21 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley, Ray</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>27 July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipetto, Franco</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson, Barry</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>18 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grealy, Paul</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hefferan, Gerry</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavercombe, Pat</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loh, Eddie</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>26 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Entered</td>
<td>Ordained</td>
<td>Date of Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeaten, Michael</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>27 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, Dudley</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madden, Peter</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maher, John</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>20 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney, John</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>23 December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonan, Brian</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell, Gerard</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>23 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulsen, Alan</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>30 July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, Michael</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12 March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyke, Michael</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuter, Bill</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>18 February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saide, Tom</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Richard</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolnough, Wrex</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>8 March 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entered Seminary 1981 – 2000 Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Ordained</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celedoni, Mark</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
<td>Interview Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Jamie</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorge, Mark</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin, Mark</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>14 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girvan, Anthony</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21 April 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Tim</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4 February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kann, Robert</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan, Gary</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meneely, Peter</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Francis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, John</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oram, Peter</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyke, John</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhead, Daniel</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, Adrian</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields, Anthony</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toombs, Dan</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 November 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II Interviews with Rectors and Staff (Former Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronin, James (Staff)</td>
<td>12 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Shea, Bill (Rector)</td>
<td>2 April 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sheldrick, Alan (Rector) 13 March 2009
Woolnough, Wrex (Staff) 8 March 2010

III Interviews with Religious Sisters

Black, Malette Sr 18 February 2010
Wainwright, Elaine Sr 21 December 2009
Name of Interviewee withheld by request 6 May 2010
Name of Interviewee withheld by request 7 May 2010
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**Thesis**


**Articles**


Glossary of Terms

**Acolyte** is a liturgical minister appointed to assist at the Eucharist and other liturgical celebrations. Before the Second Vatican Council reforms it was one of the four minor orders conferred on seminarians during their progress towards the priesthood. Priests and deacons still receive this ministry during their journey towards ordination. Laymen are also admitted to this ministry on a permanent basis through a rite of institution and blessing.

**Altar** is the focal point within the church building where the Eucharist is offered. It is first of all the sacrificial table where Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross is offered in a sacramental manner. Secondly, it is the table of the Lord around which the faithful gather to receive the food which Christ gives them from heaven.

**Aggiornamento** is an Italian word meaning ‘updating’ or modernizing. The term became popular for describing Pope John XXIII’s program for the renewal and reform of the Church which found its greatest expression in the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965)

**Archbishop** is a bishop who governs a diocese strictly his own, while he presides at the same time over the bishops of a well-defined district composed of simple dioceses which together make up an ecclesiastical province. The subordinate bishops are called the suffragans. The archbishop's own diocese is the archdiocese. The other dioceses of the district form a metropolitan province. The archbishop is also known as the ‘metropolitan.’

**Anthropological, Theological** is the interpretation of the meaning of human existence in the light of Christian revelation and faith. It includes the destiny of mankind and the means of achieving that destiny through the means revealed by God.

**Apostle**: From a Greek word meaning, “one who is sent as a messenger” and refers to a person who is sent as a representative and a messenger on behalf of another. In Christianity, the Apostles were Jesus Christ himself, "the Twelve" members of Jesus' inner circle of disciple and the leaders in the early Church. In the tradition of the Church, an apostle is one who represents Jesus Christ in proclaiming his Gospel. Hence the work of proclaiming the Gospel of Christ is referred to as the “apostolate”

**Asceticism** literally means denying pleasure for the sake of a higher cause. For the Christian it is doing what one does in the name of Christ and in service to his people at the expense of self with all the faith, love and skill that can be mustered. In today’s church doing what one is called to do, doing it well, and doing only that, is the core of asceticism.
Augustinians or the Order of Hermits of Saint Augustine is a religious order of priests and brothers within the Catholic Church. The Order was founded in two successive stages (1244 and 1256) when groups of religious living in Tuscany were united to form the Order under the Rule of Saint Augustine. It quickly spread to many parts of the world. What unites Augustinians is the living of religious life under the Rule of St Augustine with its emphasis on community life, prayer and service motivated by love.

Auxiliary Bishop: Literally, an assistant or a helping bishop. Such bishops are appointed to assist the diocesan bishop in larger dioceses, particularly archdioceses, or when the diocesan bishop is impeded from being able to undertake all his work because of a disability or for some other reason.

Benedictines: A religious order that carry on a monastic tradition that stems from the origins of the Christian monastic movement in the late third century. They regard Saint Benedict as their founder and guide even though he did not establish a Benedictine Order as such. He wrote a Rule for his monastery at Monte Cassino in Italy and he foresaw that it could be used elsewhere. The Rule found its way to monasteries in England, Gaul, and elsewhere. At first it was one of a number of rules accepted by a particular monastery but later, it became the rule of choice for monasteries of Europe from the ninth century onwards.

Bishop: A priest on whom has been conferred the fullness of holy orders through Episcopal ordination. As such bishops are regarded as the successors of the apostles. Most bishops are diocesan bishops where their duties are to teach, to govern and to sanctify the faithful committed to their care. Other priests are ordained as bishops to fulfil special roles. These are given the title of titular bishops with their title as bishop being attached to a diocese of past times which has lapsed.

Christian Brothers, Congregation of: A worldwide religious community within the Catholic Church, founded by Blessed Edmund Ignatius Rice. It is a religious congregation of men who take the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience but are not ordained as priests. They chiefly work for the evangelisation and education of youth, but are involved in many ministries, especially with the poor. At the time of its foundation the British Government’s Penal Laws which discriminated against Catholics and excluded Catholics from education were still in force, and the Hedge school system was still the main source of Catholic education throughout Ireland. They sometimes called the Irish Christian Brothers.

Cleric/Clergy indicates the state to which the student aspiring to the priesthood has been admitted prior to his ordination. Admission to the clerical state is also called incardination and indicated that the person concerned belongs to a particular diocese, religious order, or other official mission of the Church. Those admitted to the clerical state are referred to as clergy. No one can be ordained unless he is first incardinated into a specified mission or diocese of the Church as the Church does not allow for
unattached or vagabond clerics. The clerical state is now conferred when students are ordained to the Diaconate.

**Concordat**: an agreement between the Church and a country or between two countries in regard to some matter concerning the laws of both parties. It has the force of a treaty and is binding on both parties. In the past the Church has entered into concordats with a number of European Countries.

**Conference**: The term used for religious and spiritual lectures delivered by the retreat director during a retreat at Banyo and at other seminaries.

**Coadjutor Bishop/Archbishop**: Coadjutor, from Late Latin coadjutor, from Latin *co- + adjutor* helper, from *adjuvare* to help, is one who works together with another as an assistant; In ecclesiastical terms a coadjutor is a bishop assisting a diocesan bishop and often having the right of succession to the diocese when the incumbent bishop dies or retires.

**Council**: Councils are legally convened assemblies of ecclesiastical dignitaries and theological experts for the purpose of discussing and regulating matters of church doctrine and discipline. The constituent elements of an ecclesiastical council are the following of a legally convened meeting of members of the hierarchy, for the purpose of carrying out their judicial and doctrinal functions, by means of deliberation in common resulting in regulations and decrees invested with the authority of the whole assembly.

**Deaconate** refers to the order of deacon, the first of the holy orders. Deacon holds a clerical office whose role in the Church is generally associated with service of some kind. In the Catholic Church, deacons assist priests in their pastoral and administrative duties. They have a distinctive role in the Liturgy, their main tasks being to proclaim the Gospel, preach, assist in the administration of the Eucharist, perform Baptisms and to serve the poor and outcast. It is generally believed that the office of deacon originated in the selection of seven men, among them Stephen, to assist with the charitable work of the early church.

**Dicasteries** (from Greek: δικαστήριον, judge/juror) are the central offices of the Roman Curia in which the administration of the Roman Catholic Church is entrusted. Examples of dicasteries are the Secretariat of State, Congregations, Tribunals, Councils and Offices, like the Apostolic Camera, the Administration of the Patrimony of the Apostolic See, and the Prefecture for the Economic Affairs of the Holy See. The dicastery is presided over by either a prefect or a president.

**Didache**: Known also as the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, was one of the first documents, other than the books of the New Testament to be written in the first century of the early Church. The contents can be divided into three parts: the first is the "Two Ways", the Way of Life and the Way of Death; the second part is a *rituale*
dealing with baptism, fasting and Holy Communion; the third speaks of the ministry. Doctrinal teaching is presupposed, and none is imparted.

**Diocesan Seminary:** A seminary established in a particular diocese by that diocese for the eduction, formation and training of the priests of that diocese.

**Dominicans:** The Order of Preachers, more commonly known as the Dominican Order or Dominicans, is a Catholic religious order founded by Saint Dominic and approved by Pope Honorius III (1216-27) on 22 December 1216 in France. Membership in the Order includes Friars, congregations of active sisters, and lay persons affiliated with the order (formerly known as tertiaries, now Lay or Secular Dominicans). Founded to preach the Gospel and to combat heresy, the order is famed for its intellectual tradition, having produced many leading theologians and philosophers, the most noted being St Thomas Aquinas.

**Ecumenical Council:** Ecumenical Councils are those to which the bishops, and others entitled to vote, are convoked from the whole world (oikoumene) under the presidency of the pope or his legates, and the decrees of which, having received papal confirmation, bind all Christians. A council, Ecumenical in its convocation, may fail to secure the approbation of the whole Church or of the pope, and thus not rank in authority with Ecumenical councils.

**Ecumenism:** The Catholic Church sees itself as the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic church, founded by Christ himself. Its teachings state the proper Church of Christ is identical with the Catholic Church, thus excluding all other Christian religious groups and churches. Before the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church defined ecumenism as relations with other Christian groups in order to persuade these to return to a unity that they themselves had broken. Pursuit of unity, thus understood, was always a principal aim of the Church. The Roman Catholic Church has, since the Second Vatican Council, reached out to Christian bodies, seeking reconciliation to the greatest degree possible.

**Episcopacy** is a form of church governance which is hierarchical in structure with the chief authority over a local Christian church resting in a bishop. This episcopal structure is found most often in the various churches of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and others of these lineages who employ this form of church governance. It is usually considered that the bishops of an episcopal territory derive their authority from an unbroken, personal Apostolic Succession from the Twelve Apostles of Jesus. Those on whom the episcopacy is conferred are ordained as bishops to the third and highest level of holy orders.

**Exorcist:** In general, an exorcist is anyone who exorcises or professes to exorcise demons cf. Acts 19: 13) and in particular, one ordained by a bishop for this office, the third of the four minor orders of the Church. As times and conditions changed in the Church, the office of exorcist, as an independent office, ceased altogether, and was taken over by priests appointed by their bishops. Since the Second Vatican Council this order is no longer bestowed.
**Franciscans** refer to members of Catholic religious orders, founded by St Francis of Assisi. As well as Roman Catholic there are also small Old Catholic and Anglican Franciscan communities. It is also applied to ideals he inspired in many movements in the modern age.

The most prominent group is the Order of Friars Minor (commonly called simply the "Franciscans"). They seek to follow most directly the manner of life the Saint led. This Order—actually divided among three separate groups—is a mendicant religious order of men tracing their origin Francis of Assisi. The three separate groups, each considered a religious order in its own right, are the Observants, most commonly simply called "Franciscan friars," the Capuchins, and the Conventual Franciscans. They all live according to a body of regulations known as "The Rule of St. Francis".

**Holy See:** A term derived from the enthronement ceremony of the Bishop of Rome, the Pope. The term means in actual sense the seat or the residence of the supreme pastor of the Church, together with the various ecclesiastical authorities who constitute the central administration. It is synonymous with the ‘Apostolic See,’ ‘Roman Church,’ ‘Roman Curia.’

**Jesuits** or the **Society of Jesus** is a religious order founded by Saint Ignatius Loyola. Designated by him "The Company of Jesus" to indicate its true leader and its soldier spirit, the title was Latinized into "Societas Jesu" or the Society of Jesus. The term "Jesuit" (of fifteenth-century origin, meaning one who used too frequently or appropriated the name of Jesus) was first applied to the society in reproach (1544-52), and was never employed by its founder, though members and friends of the society in time accepted the name in its good sense. The Society is a body of priests organized for apostolic work, following a religious rule developed by St Ignatius, a rule often referred to Ignatian spirituality.

**Lector or Reader** is a cleric who had received the second of the four minor orders. The main reason for the establishment of this order in the early Church was to have persons of sufficient education to read the Scriptures in church. The order of reader or lector became a stepping stone to major orders. Following Vatican II, it was retained by the Church and now this office, conferred by the handing of a book, is bestowed on the laity as well as seminarians on the way to the priesthood.

**Liturgy:** Strictly speaking, the official public acts of worship of the Church central to which is the celebration of the Eucharist. In addition to this is the celebration of each of the seven sacraments. The recitation of each of the hours of the Divine Office, known also as the Prayer of the Church, is also part of the official public worship of the Church. Other communal acts of worship, although public, are not official and are therefore not strictly speaking Liturgy. At the most they can be call para-Liturgies.

**Major Orders** are the three ‘Holy Orders’ of deacon, priest, and bishop. Together they constitute the Church’s sacrament of Holy Order. The lowest order is the deaconate, the middle order is the priesthood and the episcopate is the highest holy
order. When men ordained bishops they receive this order of episcopate, often referred to as the ‘fulness of the priesthood. Prior to Vatican II, men on their way to ordination were ordained to the Sub-Diaconate as the first of four major orders. The sub-diaconate was never considered as part of the sacrament of Orders. It was discontinued following Vatican II.

**Major Seminary** is an institution in which young men wanting to become priests receive the appropriate religious formation and education to prepare them for carrying out the duties of the priesthood. Students for the priesthood now spend four years in a seminary and three years in pastoral training in parishes prior to ordination. Previously they spent the whole seven years in seminaries.

**Metropolitan:** The term refers to the bishop of the chief city of an ecclesiastical province. All metropolitan bishops are archbishops but not all archbishops are metropolitan. Metropolitan have supervisory authority over the other bishops in their ecclesiastical province, called suffragan bishops. A metropolitan bishop receives the pallium from the Pope as his insignia which he can wear in his own diocese and in the dioceses of the suffragan bishops of his province.

**Minor Orders** were the orders of porter, reader, exorcist, and acolyte conferred on the lower ranks of the clergy after they had received the tonsure. On each recipient was bestowed the office of carrying out a liturgical function connected with that order. Minor orders were normally conferred by a bishop as steps towards the priesthood. Following the reforms of the Second Vatican Council only the orders of reader and acolyte were retained and ordination to these were extended to members of the laity. Seminarians now are still laymen when they receive these orders.

**Minor Seminary** is an institution which provides a special religious formation within the context of a secondary school education for young men who aspire to the priesthood.

**Monasticism** is literally the act of "dwelling alone." It has come to denote the manner of life of people living in seclusion from the world, under religious vows, and subject to a fixed rule, as monks, friars, nuns or in general as religious. Monasticism in all its varieties is seclusion or withdrawal from the world or society. The object of this is to achieve a life whose ideal is different from and largely at variance with that pursued by the majority of mankind; and the method adopted, no matter what its precise details may be, is always self-denial or organized asceticism.

**Monstrance:** or **Ostensorium,** from ostendere, ‘to show,’ is a sacred vessel designed for the exhibition of some object of piety. Modern usage, so far as the English language is concerned, was limited to vessels intended for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.
**National Seminary:** An interdiocesan seminary established, with the approval of the Apostolic See, to train priests for all the dioceses of a country whose bishops form the national conference of bishops for that country.

**People of God** constitute a pilgrim, liturgical and sinful community. As a pilgrim people the People of God wander in a world that is not lasting. There through Christ they accept God’s revelation which leads them to their destiny of an eternal dwelling place. This People is also a liturgical community, praising God, thanking him, making intercession for themselves and expressing their sorrow for sin as they journey towards the eternal city liturgy. This People is nevertheless a sinful People in need of purification. They cannot participate in the pilgrimage to the holy sanctuary unless we are first prepared and purified.

**Porter:** The first of the four minor orders that were formerly conferred on seminarians on their way to the priesthood. Those who received the order of porter were entrusted with the duties connected with the entrance of a church. Since the Second Vatican Council this order has not been conferred.

**Province (Ecclesiastical)** consists of a group of neighbouring churches of a defined territory whose aims are to promote common pastoral action between the various neighbouring dioceses, such as a provincial seminary, and to foster relations among the diocesan bishops of the region.

**Provincial Seminary** is a seminary established to form, educate and train priests for a group of adjoining dioceses known as an ecclesiastical province.

**Redemptorists** or the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer is a society of missionary priests founded by St. Alphonsus Liguori to labour among the neglected country people in the neighbourhood of Naples. They form a missionary society whose rule is "to strive to imitate the virtues and examples of Jesus Christ, Our Redeemer, consecrating themselves especially to the preaching of the word of God to the poor". Their labours consist mainly of directing parish missions, retreats, and similar exercises. On all their missions they are obliged to preach a sermon on prayer and one on the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

**See:** The word is derived from the Latin *sedes* meaning a chair. It is also used in the sense of ‘residence’ and refers to the diocese a bishop governs. The term was first used to designate the Churches founded by the Apostles, and then applied to the principal Christian Churches.

**Seminary:** Literally, a seedbed or a nursery, from the Latin *seminarium*, from *semen* a seed. It refers to an environment in which something originates and from which it is propagated. It is an institution of secondary or higher education especially an institution for the training of candidates for the priesthood, ministry, or rabbinate. In
the Catholic Church it is the institution where priests are formed, educated and trained.

**Subdeacon:** A cleric who had been ordained to the subdiaconate, the first of the four major orders in the Latin Church. While it was regarded as a major or sacred order it was never part of the sacrament of Holy Orders. The role of the subdeacon was to assist the priest at Mass by reading the lesson or epistle, prepare the bread, wine and sacred vessels for Mass and carry the chalice with wine to the altar. After the reforms of the Second Vatican Council this order was no longer conferred.

**Titular Bishop/Archbishop:** In the Roman Catholic Church, a titular bishop is a bishop who is not in charge of a diocese. These are coadjutor and auxiliary bishops, bishops emeriti, vicars apostolic, nuncios, superiors of departments in the Roman Curia and cardinal bishops of suburban dioceses (since they are not in charge of the suburban dioceses). Most titular bishops hold the title to a titular see. Assigning titular sees serves two purposes. Since part of being a bishop means being the head of a Church, titular sees serve that purpose for bishops without a diocese. At the same time, the office of titular bishop memorializes ancient churches that were suppressed when they fell to non-Christian conquerors.

**Thomism** is the approach to Theology and Philosophy based on the work of the Dominican scholar, St Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas used the framework of the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, for explaining the Christian faith. The tradition of studies originating from Aquinas is also called Scholasticism. Its more recent devotees are referred to as Neo-Scholastics.

**Tonsure:** From the Latin *tondere*, "to shear" was a sacred rite instituted by the Church through which a baptized and confirmed Christian entered the clerical state by the shearing of his hair and the investment with the surplice. The person thus tonsured became a partaker of the common privileges and obligations of the clerical state and is prepared for the reception of orders. Tonsure, as such, was abolished at Vatican II and admission to the clerical state was joined to the ordination to the Deaconate.

**Trent** is the Italian city in which the nineteenth ecumenical council of the church was held between 1545 and 1563. Trent is also used in referring to this council which was the Church’s principal response to the teachings of Martin Luther and others of the Protestant Reformation. It remained highly influential until Pope John XXIII invoked the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965).

**Tridentine** is the adjective derived from the name Trent. The word is used to describe the conservative and legalistic mentality in the Church that emerged from the Council of Trent. It is also used to described the method of seminary training that
developed as a result of the Council of Trent’s decision to establish seminaries for the training of diocesan priests.

**Vatican** or “The Vatican” refers to the Vatican City State which is an independent state situated within the city of Rome and governed by the reigning pope. It is the headquarters of the Roman Catholic Church which includes the Roman Curia as well as the papacy. It takes its name from the Vatican Hill, which was located outside the walls of classical Rome and is regarded as the burial place of St Peter.

**Vicar:** In ecclesiastical terminology in the Roman Catholic Church, a vicar is someone who exercises authority not in his own right but in the place of someone else. In this sense the pope is called the Vicar of Christ.

**Vicar Apostolic:** The Holy See governs missionary regions where the ordinary hierarchy of the Church has not been established, and which consequently fall under the ordinary and immediate jurisdiction of the pope. The pope appoints a delegate who has received episcopal ordination as a Vicar Apostolic. These bishops generally have the same powers of diocesan bishops have in their own dioceses, but as delegated and not the ordinary powers diocesan bishops have for their own dioceses.

**Vicar General** is the title used to designate the priest who takes the place of and represents the bishop of a diocese when the bishop himself is unavailable.

**Vicariate:** A vicariate is an ecclesiastical territory such as a diocese or a parish that is not governed by its rightful ruler or ordinary but is governed by another who represents that person. Such a person is called a vicar meaning someone who takes the place of another

**Ultramontane** is a word derived from two Latin words *ultra* (beyond) and *montes* (the mountains). Literally it means “beyond the mountains” and refers to those French Catholics who looked beyond the Alps to Rome and the reigning pontiff as their source of Catholic doctrine and direction. They were contrasted with the Gallicanism, a word which referred to those French Catholics who saw the Catholic Church in France as centred there and subject to the French monarch.
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Seminary Rectors

Mgr Vincent F Cleary (1941 – 1953)
Mgr Cornelius Roberts (1954 – 1964)
Mgr (later Bishop) John A Torpie (1965 – 1967)
  Dr William Smith (1968 – 1973)
  Dr Thomas P Boland (1988)
  Fr Alan Sheldrick (1979 – 1980)
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Seminary Curriculum

Philosophy Years I – III


Theology Years IV – VII

Year IV  Fundamental Dogmatic Theology (Ecclesiology), Principles of Moral Theology, Scriptural Exegesis, Church History, Canon Law, and Greek.
Year V   Systematic Dogmatic Theology (God – One and Three, God the Creator, Elevation and Fall of Man, Moral Theology, Scriptural Exegesis, Church History, and Canon Law.
Year VI  Systematic Dogmatic Theology, (Incarnation and Redemption), Sacramental Theology (The Sacraments in General), Moral Theology, Scriptural Exegesis, Church History, andCanon Law.
Year VII Systematic Dogmatic Theology (Elevation to Grace, Death Judgment, Hell and Heaven), Sacramental Theology (The Seven Sacraments), Moral Theology, Scriptural Exegesis, Pastoral Theology, Liturgy.
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Queensland Bishops

Archdiocese of Brisbane


Diocese of Cairns

and

Vicars Apostolic of Cooktown

Cooktown

Pro-Vicar Apostolic Adolphus Lecaille (1877)
Pro- Vicar Apostolic Tarquino Tanganelli (1878)
Pro-Vicar Apostolic John Cani (1879 – 1882)
Pro-Vicar Apostolic Paul Fortini (1882 – 1884)
Vicar Apostolic John Hutchinson OSA (1884 – 1897)
Vicar Apostolic James Murray OSA (1898 – 1914)
Vicar Apostolic John Heavey OSA (1914 – 1941)

Cairns

Bishop James Foley (1991 - )
### Diocese of Rockhampton

- Bishop John Cani (1892 – 1898)
- Bishop James Duhig (1905 – 1912)
- Bishop Romauld Hayes (1932 – 1945)
- Bishop Brian Heenan (1990 - )
- Bishop Joseph Higgins (1899 – 1905)
- Bishop Joseph Shiel (1913 – 1931)
- Bishop Andrew Tynan (1946 – 1950)

### Diocese of Toowoomba

- Bishop James Byrne (1929 – 1938)
- Bishop William Brennan (1953 – 1975)
- Bishop William Morris (1992 - )
- Bishop Basil Roper (1938 – 1952)

### Diocese of Townsville

- Bishop Terence Mc Guire (1930 – 1938)
- Bishop Michael Putney
- Bishop Hugh Ryan (1938 – 1967)
- Bishop Raymond Benjamin (1983 – )
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Papal Representatives Australia

History

- 1914: Established as Apostolic Delegation of Australia
- 1921: Renamed as Apostolic Delegation of Australasia
- 1947: Renamed as Apostolic Delegation of Australia, New Zealand and Oceania
- 1968: Renamed as Apostolic Delegation of Australia and Papua New Guinea (branched to create Apostolic Delegation of New Zealand and Pacific Islands)
- 1973: Branched to create Apostolic Delegation of Papua New Guinea and Apostolic Delegation of Pacific Ocean
- 1973: Promoted to the Apostolic Nunciature of Australia

Present Papal Representative:

Archbishop Giuseppe LAZZAROTTO  Apostolic Nuncio of Australia (2007...)

Past Papal Representatives

Apostolic Nuncios:


Apostolic Pro-Nuncios:

Archbishop Franco BRAMBILLA (1986.02.22 – 1998.12.03)
Archbishop Luigi BARBARITO (88) (1978.06.10 – 1986.01.21)
Archbishop Gino PARO (1973.03.05 – 1978)

Apostolic Delegates:

Archbishop Domenico ENRICI (1962 – 1968)
Archbishop Maximilien de FÜRSTENBERG (1959 – 1962)
Archbishop Romolo CARBONI (1953 – 1959)
Archbishop Paolo MARELLA (1948 – 1953)
Archbishop Giovanni PANICO (1935 – 1948)
Archbishop Filippo BERNARDINI (1933 – 1935)
Archbishop Bartolomeo CATTANE0 (1917 – 1933)
Archbishop Bonaventura CERRETTI (1914 – 1917)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pope</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gregory XII</td>
<td>1406-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Martin V</td>
<td>1417-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eugene IV</td>
<td>1431-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nicholas V</td>
<td>1447-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Callistus III</td>
<td>1455-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pius II</td>
<td>1458-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Paul II</td>
<td>1464-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sixtus IV</td>
<td>1471-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Innocent VIII</td>
<td>1484-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Alexander VI</td>
<td>1492-1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pius III</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Julius II</td>
<td>1503-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Leo X</td>
<td>1513-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Adrian VI</td>
<td>1522-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Clement VII</td>
<td>1523-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Paul III</td>
<td>1534-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Julius III</td>
<td>1550-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Marcellus II</td>
<td>1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Paul IV</td>
<td>1555-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Pius IV</td>
<td>1559-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>St. Pius V</td>
<td>1566-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Gregory XIII</td>
<td>1572-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sixtus V</td>
<td>1585-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Urban VII</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Gregory XIV</td>
<td>1590-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Innocent IX</td>
<td>1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Clement VIII</td>
<td>1592-1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Leo XI</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Paul V</td>
<td>1605-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Gregory XV</td>
<td>1621-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Urban VIII</td>
<td>1623-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Innocent X</td>
<td>1644-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Alexander VII</td>
<td>1655-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Clement IX</td>
<td>1667-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Clement X</td>
<td>1670-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Bl. Innocent XI</td>
<td>1676-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Alexander VIII</td>
<td>1689-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Innocent XII</td>
<td>1691-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Clement XI</td>
<td>1700-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Innocent XIII</td>
<td>1721-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Benedict XIII</td>
<td>1724-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Clement XII</td>
<td>1730-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Benedict XIV</td>
<td>1740-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Clement XIII</td>
<td>1758-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Clement XIV</td>
<td>1769-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Pius VI</td>
<td>1775-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Pius VII</td>
<td>1800-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Leo XII</td>
<td>1823-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Pius VIII</td>
<td>1829-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Gregory XVI</td>
<td>1831-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Blessed Pius IX</td>
<td>1846-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Leo XIII</td>
<td>1878-1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>St. Pius X</td>
<td>1903-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Benedict XV</td>
<td>1914-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Pius XI</td>
<td>1922-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Pius XII</td>
<td>1939-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Bl. John XXIII</td>
<td>1958-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Paul VI</td>
<td>1963-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>John Paul I</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>John Paul II</td>
<td>1978-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Benedict XVI</td>
<td>2005—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI
Ecumenical Councils

I. First Council of Nicaea – 325
II. First Council of Constantinople – 381
III. Council of Ephesus – 431
IV. Council of Chalcedon – 451
V. Second Council of Constantinople – 553
VI. Third Council of Constantinople – 680 – 681
VII. Second Council of Nicaea – 787
VIII. Fourth Council of Constantinople – 869
IX. First Lateran Council – 1123
X. Second Lateran Council – 1139
XI. Third Lateran Council – 1179
XII. Fourth Lateran Council – 1215
XIII. First Council of Lyons – 1245
XIV. Second Council of Lyons – 1274
XV. Council of Vienne – 1311 – 1213
XVI. Council of Constance – 1414 – 1418
XVII. Council of Basle/Ferrara, Florence – 1431 – 1439
XVIII. Fifth Lateran Council – 1512 – 1517
XIX. Council of Trent – 1545 – 1563
XX. First Vatican Council – 1869 – 1870