

## Chapter 8: Conclusion

*Well done, good and faithful servant! You have been faithful with a few things; I will put you in charge of many things. Come and share your master's happiness! (Mt 25:23)*

### How are we to remember Kearney?

The Scripture quotation above was cited by Cardinal Napier, Archbishop of Durban, after Kearney's death; it was used at his funeral on 1 December 2018; and it is inscribed on the plaque that commemorates Kearney at the Denis Hurley Centre.

It is an apt quotation since it references a number of things: the completion of a life of hard work – almost 60 years in active ministry; the promise of a future reward that Kearney neither enjoyed nor sought in his lifetime; his faithfulness – to the cause of justice, to the institutions with which he worked, to the Church itself, to +Hurley and above all to Christ. Most of all it calls Kearney 'servant', a title that would have sat very comfortably with him. In Chapter 2, I talked about the way in which the ordained role of 'Deacon' had inappropriately been justified by Acts 6: 1-7; whereas in fact that Scripture references *diakonia* and the most suitable English personal noun for someone who exercises *diakonia* is 'servant'. Of course, Diakonia is also the name of the organisation that Kearney led for 28 years.

I have throughout this dissertation explored different aspects of Kearney's identity: as a Marist, as a teacher, as an activist, as a lay man, as a Catholic, as an ecumenist, as a person of faith. In addition, in Appendix A, I look in more detail at his racial identity and in Appendix F his living out of the threefold office – the *Tria Munera* – of priest, prophet and leader. There are many different lenses through which one can look at Kearney's life. In conclusion I want to try and draw these threads together.

The interviews conducted with people who knew him – 70 people who cover between them almost six decades – showed the richness and the diversity of his life. But there was one thing on which they were all agreed. Without exception (though of course they were a selected group) all the people interviewed felt that remembering Kearney was a worthwhile thing to do: for the Church and for South African society. That in itself is significant. Despite the academic resources of the country, the number and range of biographies or memoirs of South Africans is still quite few. For those involved in politics, it tends to be the 'big men' who get written about: the ones who dominate a room and have grand prestigious titles – not the quiet people behind the scenes. For those involved in religion, it also tends to be the 'big men' who get written about: the ones who dominate a church and have grand prestigious titles – not the lay people behind the scenes. Kearney did not dominate rooms and his professional titles were very ordinary.

So how are we to remember Kearney? Fatima Meer, Muslim anti-Apartheid activist, offers a reflection about +Hurley on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee in 1997 which is quoted by Kearney but could easily be a description also of himself:

Born in South Africa, rooted in an Irish Catholic tradition, a continuous presence in our midst, guiding us through all our travels, standing with us in our afflictions and pointing the way to better things to come as they have today ... ministering to all South Africans and particularly to those who have been overlooked by society ... realising a universalism, an

activism that embraces all humanity and all life and removes all barriers between the temporal and spiritual, the Catholic and non-Catholic, the Christian and non-Christian.<sup>1427</sup>

All of that is true of Kearney; there is, moreover, an additional aspect of universalism that he embodies, which is critical given the clerical Church that he belonged to: his ability to remove (or at least challenge) the barriers between clerical and lay, between religious and secular.

As was explored in Chapter 2, one of the most striking early decisions of Kearney was both to join and then leave the Marist Brothers. His departure in the late 1960s could be lumped in with the many priests and religious sisters and brothers who 'left the Church' after Vatican II in what has been termed an 'exodus'. But Rademacher explores the word 'exodus' not as a failure but rather as a way of understanding the various transitions that people go through as they develop, and also that the Church must go through as it develops.<sup>1428</sup>

As the ministers' faith goes through various phases and styles, their ministry will be affected as it interacts with the process of this faith relationship.<sup>1429</sup>

Developing his ministry – not for his own benefit but for the benefit of others – is a recurrent theme of Kearney's life. When a young Marist, in an institution which did not encourage personal questioning, Kearney shocked Peter Taylor, a fellow scholastic, by asking the question 'what do you want to do with your life?' Taylor's reflections on Kearney more than half a century later are enlightening:

How can we remember Paddy? As a follower of Jesus; a committed Christian. No one chooses the family they are born into but Paddy, as he developed as a Christian, was growing into one family, the human race. He was helped in this by his natural talent to mix with people of all ranks and races. If you compare the Marist and the post-Marist Paddy, you see how he discovers that there is no need to insist on conformity: that that is not the definition of obedience to God's will.

He did learn something from the [Marist] brothers: the fundamental spiritual virtue of humility, simplicity and modesty. To quote John the Baptist speaking of Jesus: 'He must increase and I must decrease'. But when we were there, the brothers never mentioned this as having anything to do with God. Vatican II called Religious Orders to go back to their origins and original spirit. For the Marists that includes 'have a special predilection for the poor'. Marcellin Champagnat started the brothers because of the shock he received when a poor teenager was on his death-bed and did not know God or about salvation.

It seems that Paddy [long after he left the Marists] was going more monastic in his personal living (the kind of flat, etc) in his later years. And he was always at the service of others, asking them: 'what can I do for you?'<sup>1430</sup>

---

<sup>1427</sup> Kearney, Paddy. "Courageous and Consistent Witness". *Denis Hurley – a portrait by friends*. Anthony Gamley ed. (Pietermaritzburg: Cluster, 2001) 17

<sup>1428</sup> Rademacher, William. *Lay Ministry – a theological, spiritual and pastoral handbook* (New York: Crossroad, 1991) 134

<sup>1429</sup> Rademacher, *Lay Ministry*, 87

<sup>1430</sup> Taylor, Peter. Personal interview by author, 1 February 2021 via Zoom (fellow Marist novice/ brother with Kearney)

## Kearney's relationship with +Hurley

One major question to answer in relation to remembering Kearney is his relationship with Archbishop Hurley. As was detailed in Chapter 7, +Hurley's presence dominated Kearney's life: not only was he Kearney's bishop from the age of 4 until the age of 51, but for the 28 years that Kearney was at Diakonia, +Hurley was effectively his employer. Moreover, the influence did not end there since, in the 12 years between stepping down as Archbishop and his death, +Hurley continued to work closely with Kearney (not least on preparing his memoirs); then after +Hurley's death, Kearney spent the last 14 years of his own life writing about, talking about and commemorating +Hurley.

So it is tempting to see Kearney as a disciple of +Hurley and even to reduce Kearney to nothing more than a mirror of +Hurley or an extension of him. I think this is inadequate and an interpretation that both of them would have rejected. As was explored in Chapter 7, the movement of influence between them was by no means in one direction: while most interviewees acknowledged +Hurley's influence on Kearney, many also gave examples of Kearney's influence on +Hurley. And while there were similarities in their background – which is why Meer's quote above can be apposite – they came to maturity during different periods of the country's history (+Hurley during the Depression and the dominance of the English-speaking South Africa Party; Kearney during the aggressive assertion of the National Party), and also during different periods of the Church's history (+Hurley during a final period of ultra-Montanism under successive Popes Pius, Kearney during a flowering of openness under John XXIII).

But the key difference is their status within the Church. +Hurley and Kearney shared similar views about ecumenism, about other religions, about justice, about the role of the Church in the world. But the way in which these then expressed themselves is bound to be different: one of them was thrice-separated from the ordinary world (+Hurley was a religious, a priest and a bishop); the other lived the life of an ordinary Christian (even if the work he did was extraordinary). And this is even more significant because Kearney – unlike other young Catholic men who were strongly influenced by +Hurley like Paul Nadal<sup>1431</sup> – chose not to follow him along the obvious path of ordination.

+Hurley himself articulates this important difference as early as 1961 (long before he was working with Kearney) when, in a letter, he recognises lay people as enjoying a flexibility that clergy might not.

I suppose you should have my formal permission to attend meetings of the National Christian Council in Durban because the Catholic Church cannot officially associate itself with that body. ... Next year I hope to have someone in the ranks of the clergy in Durban who would be able to play a much more active part in ecumenical contacts.<sup>1432</sup>

Clearly, as a bishop, +Hurley was able to do things that Kearney could not; but as a lay person, Kearney was also able to do things that +Hurley could not. He had a freedom to manoeuvre and forge alliances which, as +Hurley indicates in the letter above, was harder for a cleric precisely because his views (on ecumenism, for example) were ahead of their time.

One of the critical experiences they shared was the consequence of Kearney's detention in 1985 (see Chapter 5). It is unlikely that Kearney could have had the same impact as +Hurley in pursuing a legal case against the Nationalist Government and successfully challenging their Section 29 order. But it is

---

<sup>1431</sup> Nadal, Paul. Personal interview by author, 26 October 2020 in Durban. (Catholic Monsignor, Vicar-General to +Hurley and Patron/ Trustee of Denis Hurley Centre)

<sup>1432</sup> Denis, Kearney, & Argall, *A Life in Letters*, 142-3 (Letter to Clifford de Gersigny, from Durban, 1 June 1961, typewritten)

also unlikely that +Hurley would have been detained without trial in a similar way to Kearney which is what created the opportunity for the case. Both played essential but different roles in this event.

Besides, even when they did do the same things – e.g. marching for justice – there is a fundamental difference in the perception of an action carried out by a bishop and the same action carried out by a lay person. A clerical mind-set might fall into the trap of thinking that automatically the action by the bishop was more impactful than the same action by a lay person. And that would often be the case. For example, +Hurley took advantage of his status to protest outside Durban City Hall knowing that he was less likely to be harassed by the police and also that his presence was more likely to draw attention to the cause. Kearney was aware of this and encouraged +Hurley to be publicly visible in his protests, such as the Good Friday Services.

But sometimes the reverse was true and it was the action by the lay man that was more unexpected. For example, the Church has plenty of charitable organisations set up by bishops whose existence goes unremarked: part of the impact of the DHC is the fact that it was created and championed by Kearney (and other lay people) in ways that strongly asserted the apostolate of the laity and thus a Vatican II model of Church. Whilst such action by the laity would have been something that +Hurley strongly supported, it would have lost its impact if he was too closely involved.

The relationship between the two of them was thus symbiotic: each benefiting from the presence of the other. In Appendix E, for example, I show that while Gandhi had an influence on +Hurley, and that that in turn influenced Kearney, there was also a direct Gandhian influence on Kearney, in part because of his own close ties with the Gandhi family in Durban.

The relationship between +Hurley and Kearney was so close that we cannot always say where one ends and the other begins, or who has the greater influence on whom. That is why, throughout this work, I have admitted that in looking at Kearney's actions we might sometimes be seeing the result of his own independent motivation, sometimes the impact of +Hurley's influence on him, and sometimes evidence that he is influencing +Hurley.

The complex relationship is summed up by a woman who knew them over many decades – from involvement with the End Conscription Campaign in the 1980s, to acting as a PR for Diakonia through the 1990s and then working closely with Kearney on the promotion of his books about +Hurley and the creation of the Denis Hurley Centre. Illa Thompson comments:

Thinking back, I appreciate the Yin and Yang dynamic between Paddy and +Hurley – they indeed were opposite but interconnected forces. I suspect Hurley admired, listened and deferred to Paddy as much as Paddy did to Hurley. I suspect they influenced each other and were influenced by each other. I think they were a complementary match – spiritually, intellectually, academically and philosophically, which enabled them to work so well together as a result.<sup>1433</sup>

The final point that needs to be made – because it can be otherwise taken for granted – is just how unusual it is for a Catholic bishop of this period to have as a close confidant and collaborator a lay man. And vice versa how unusual it is for a lay person to be so close to a Catholic bishop. In Chapter 7, I mentioned the way in which Kearney drew +Hurley's attention to the friendship between

---

<sup>1433</sup> Thompson, Illa: Personal interview by author, 28 September 2022 in Durban (member of End Conscription Campaign, PR consultant to Diakonia and Denis Hurley Centre)

another Archbishop (Anselm of Canterbury) and a scholar (though also a priest) Alcuin of York. Is it perhaps telling that Kearney has to go back 12 centuries to find a parallel to their friendship?

This is not to exoticise the relationship or to have it overshadow who Kearney was in his own right. But it is to stress that we cannot understand Kearney without understanding +Hurley: and that one of our best ways of understanding +Hurley is through the many pages that Kearney devoted to writing about him.

### Kearney: liminal or situated?

The unusual nature of Kearney's situation in the Church – a former religious, who became a lay man but spent most of his time with clerics – can lead to a way of characterising him that I feel is unhelpful. It draws on the concept of liminality, originally coined by anthropologist Arnold van Gennep and then popularised by Victor Turner.<sup>1434</sup> The concept – based on traditional rites of passage – describes a position which is between two more fixed states (e.g. childhood and adulthood), a transitional space 'at the threshold' (Latin: *limen*). Theologians have taken up this theme to describe the position of a Christian who is living in this world but who is constantly looking to a world beyond.<sup>1435</sup>

Applying the term liminality to Kearney (as some interviewees did<sup>1436</sup>) might be to suggest that he is not really a lay person and not really a cleric and sitting, awkwardly, between the two waiting for his position to be resolved one way or another. It is true – from the comments of people who were interviewed – that there were aspects of his life that placed him closer to the clergy and aspects that placed him closer to lay people. But I would be reluctant to invoke liminality. The danger is exacerbated if this liminal concept is then extended further: to suggest that Kearney was in a liminal space between Catholic and Protestant, or between white and non-white, or between peace-maker and political activist. But each of these dichotomies makes the same assumptions: that the categories presented are fixed and exclusive; and that the only resolution is to choose between one or the other.

I would like to suggest instead that there is a fairer way of describing the complexity of Kearney's position which is not 'either/or' but 'both/and'. Kearney was not a man of separate categories; he was a man of bringing together. This is supported by the frequency with which interviewees talked about how authentic and integrated Kearney was. He did not spend his life in liminal positions that were waiting to be resolved: rather he had a clear position, which because of his authenticity, enabled him to engage with those whose positions were different.

Thus, I think we can describe him as a lay man (who after all never was ordained and never sought ordination) who at the same time was able to engage confidently with those who were ordained.

We can also say he was a Roman Catholic, never lukewarm in his commitment to his denomination, who at the same time was able to engage confidently with Christians of other traditions; and he was a Christian, sure of the saving power of Christ as Saviour, who at the same time was able to engage confidently with people of other faiths.

---

<sup>1434</sup> For more on liminality, see: Thomassen, Bjørn. "The Uses and Meaning of Liminality", *International Political Anthropology*. (2009, Mar 3:2,1) 5-28

<sup>1435</sup> Russell, Annette. "In the World but not of the World: The Liminal Life of Pre-Constantine Christian Communities", PhD dissertation (UCLA, 2003)

<sup>1436</sup> Warmback, Andrew. Personal interview by author, 21 October 2020 in Durban (Anglican priest, co-worker at Diakonia)

Kearney was a peace-maker, committed to a path of non-violence, who at the same time was able to work with activists of a variety of hues who shared his goals. And he was a political player who knew how to work with a range of politicians, who at the same time was never tempted to join their ranks.

He was a white man, who was conscious of but not ashamed of his cultural identity, who at the same time was able to engage with people of very different cultural backgrounds (even if he did not always have the linguistic skills). And he was a South African who cared deeply for his country, who at the same time was proud of his Irish roots.

Moreover, in each of these aspects of his identity, he was confident enough that he could question some of the assumptions and claims of the institution or the tribe, and not feel he was being disloyal by doing so. +Hurley's great hero was Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a Jesuit priest and scientist whom the Vatican had tried to silence.<sup>1437</sup> At the Council, +Hurley quoted from him in St Peter's calling him 'a loyal son of the Church' – not despite his questioning but because of it.<sup>1438</sup> I think that Kearney would have been proud if, on a similar basis, he was described as 'a loyal son of the Church'.

Kearney was able to hold these multiple positions, without feeling the need to resolve any presumed tension; and he was able to ask hard questions about those positions, without the fear of being disloyal. I would argue that this is because there was an inherent integrity about who Kearney was and what he stood for. That meant that complexities and confusions which might have unbalanced others did not pose a problem for him.

## Integration in Kearney's commitment to justice

There was a pattern of integration in his personality and that was also true of his theology.

In approaching Kearney's life, I started with the lenses of different documents of Vatican II as a way of covering the different aspects of his ministry: thus *Unitatis Redintegratio* could be used to understand his commitment to ecumenism; *Nostra Aetate* to interfaith relations; *Apostolicam Actuositatem* to the role of the laity, *Gaudium et Spes* for the commitment to fighting Apartheid. All of this is true. But this would suggest that each of these was a distinct aspect of Kearney's life, and that each can almost be viewed independently. This might be true of other characters in modern Church history: after all not all those involved in the ecumenical movement are passionate about justice; not all those who care about the role of the laity are engaged in inter-religious dialogue.

Outler, a Methodist observer at Vatican II, had witnessed the way in which people of faith would choose to prioritise one issue over another and thus defeat what they were trying to achieve:

The new generation of theologians profess to be more deeply scandalised by injustice than by disunity (as if they had been forced to such a choice!). ...They ignore the fact that Christians united for justice while separated from each other at the Lord's Table send the wrong message out to a sceptical world.<sup>1439</sup>

But Kearney was committed to all of these issues and more besides. In his case, I would argue, these are not different issues, or even different but inter-related issues; I would suggest that they are in

---

<sup>1437</sup> Denis, "The Historical Significance of Denis Hurley's Contribution to the Second Vatican Council", 211-212

<sup>1438</sup> Hurley, Denis. *Vatican II: Keeping the Dream Alive* (Pietermaritzburg: Cluster, 2005) 172

<sup>1439</sup> Outler, Albert. "Strangers within the Gates". *Vatican II Revisited: by those who were there*. Alberic Stacpoole ed. (London: G Chapman, 1986) 180

fact all the same issue. Just as the Trinity is one Godhead albeit manifesting as different persons, so Kearney's fundamental concern is a single one which then manifests as campaigning for different causes. For Kearney, that prevailing concern is separation and exclusion: and every aspect of his ministry is dedicated to overcoming this. Clearly, his most famous area of ministry was in combating Apartheid, a word which is simply the Afrikaans for 'separateness'. The framers of Apartheid argued not only that people *could* be separated (based on physical characteristics sometimes so arbitrary that a 'pencil test' was needed<sup>1440</sup>) but that they *should* be separated for the good of all. Separateness was not just possible but to be desired and encouraged.

This could not have been further from Kearney's worldview. He believed passionately that people of different colours should not be separated and that is why it was important for him to combat Apartheid. Initiatives such as the 'exposure visits' were not just about sharing information (after all there were other ways of doing that) but sharing space: people of different colours living together for a few days. It is then logical that, after the end of Apartheid, he would use the same energy to show that people of different economic classes should not be separated and so, in his later years, dedicate himself to the fight against poverty. The whites-only beaches of the 1970s were an affront to Kearney but so were the middle-class-only gated communities of the 2010s.

Once we see combating 'separateness' as his prime motivation, then all his other activities fall into line. People of different denominations should not exclude each other and that is why it was important for him to fight for ecumenism. In the same way, though this was a slower realisation for him, people of different faiths should not exclude each other and that is why it was important for him to engage in inter-religious dialogue. (This latter example should not be taken lightly: there are people in the Christian ecumenical movement who are motivated by the idea of reuniting Christendom as a bulwark against Islam, not as a precursor for bringing together the children of Sarah and the children of Hagar.)

Separateness within the Catholic Church was also to be combatted. Parishes might be a useful organising system but, because they are geographic, they tend to reinforce spatial segregation (whether racial or economic or both). That is why Kearney went out of his way to attend parishes outside his area, and also to create diverse small Christian communities as an alternative form of parish. Status also creates separation within the Church. For Kearney, priests, religious and laity should not be separated, and so his fight is not *for* the laity (as opposed to the clergy) but rather for the *laos* (the people of God, the faithful) that all should be united as equal members of one Church: 'the common matrix'. And, one could go further and see his open-ness to suffering – both accepting his own suffering and accompanying others in their suffering – as a response to the understanding that suffering is the ultimate form of exclusion which needs to be redeemed.

The most important way in which Kearney resists separateness is avoiding the trap of dividing the sacred from the secular. This could take two forms: within the Church, it is the attempt to distinguish two spheres of operation, the temporal and the ecclesial. In Chapter 2, we saw how Vatican II documents tie themselves in knots in trying to hold the distinction between the two. But the separation is also a risk for the Church's relationship with the world. If the domain of the Church is purely the 'sacred', then on what basis can it claim influence (or even have a legitimate opinion about) the secular? *Gaudium et Spes* is the final response to this: the Church inhabits all of the world because God inhabits all of the world.

---

<sup>1440</sup> This was the infamous test whereby a pencil was placed in someone's hair and how easily it fell out determined whether they were white, coloured or black. See: Brander Rasmussen, Birgit. *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness*. (Durham NC: Duke, 2001) 133

Frank Chikane states bluntly that for Kearney, there were ‘no boundaries between secular and sacred’.<sup>1441</sup> This is in contrast to what Rademacher sees as an essential (if un-desired) dualism in the Catholic worldview. The approach means that even something as well-intentioned as sacred symbols can have unintentional consequences:

When these earthly symbols are endowed with objective holiness, everything outside the symbol is unholy: Sunday is holy, Monday is not; church is holy, K-mart is not; soul is holy, body is not; priest is holy, lay person is not. Locating the holy runs the risk of constructing a worldview based on the dualism of sacred /secular, supernatural /natural, spiritual /material.

It is not unusual to hear Catholic laity say: ‘We take care of the material things so Father can take care of the spiritual.’ In Catholic parishes, the people who distribute the Eucharist in the sanctuary are called ministers, the members of the SVDP who feed the hungry are not called ministers; lectors who serve in the holy sanctuary are called ministers, members of the Legion of Mary are not. Jesus on the other hand ministered in the streets, not in the Temple. He served as Lector once, but mostly ministered in the secular world of lepers, lawyers, fishermen, Samaritans, outcasts, prostitutes and tax collectors.<sup>1442</sup>

Rademacher sees this tendency to dualism as something which goes right back to the person of Christ and the inherent dualistic language in which he is described:

In relating ministry to the incarnation, we need to ask whether ministry is an extension of Christ’s divinity, of his humanity, or both. Because of the over-emphasis on the divinity of Christ, it is difficult for many Catholics to really include the humanity of Christ in their definition of Christian ministry. A Christology without duality seeds God’s presence in the whole man, Jesus Christ. His saving activity lies not in the fact that a divine nature bears a human nature, but in the human nature, and above all, in the human person himself.<sup>1443</sup>

Goldie says something similar when she questions the idea of two parallel orders (that of creation and redemption). She commends Congar’s idea that it is through temporal activity that lay people will carry out their ecclesial vocation: “This gives a way out of the interminable disputes between the partisans of incarnation and eschatologism.”<sup>1444</sup>

This is the approach of Kearney: a clear commitment to an integrated theology in which temporal activity and ecclesial vocation are hand in hand.<sup>1445</sup> Since integration is the opposite of separateness, it provides an alternative to the racial, economic, denominational, religious or hierarchical separateness that Kearney wishes to challenge. Although in Kearney’s writings he does not explicitly make this point, there is an underlying theme to his worldview that provides theological justification for the principle of integration. I think there are three bases for this:

- First, God’s act of creation (which he repeatedly saw as ‘good’)<sup>1446</sup> connects the sacred and the secular from the beginning of human history

---

<sup>1441</sup> Chikane, Frank. Personal interview by author, 14 September 2021 via Zoom. (Secretary General of SACC 1987-94)

<sup>1442</sup> Rademacher, *Lay Ministry*, 127

<sup>1443</sup> Rademacher, *Lay Ministry*, 127

<sup>1444</sup> Goldie, Rosemary. “Lay, Laity, Laicity: a bibliographical survey of three decades”. *Elements for a Theology of the Laity. The Laity Today – bulletin of the Pontifical Council for the Laity* (1979, 26) 118

<sup>1445</sup> This is explored more in Appendix B: Vatican II and the Laity.

<sup>1446</sup> Gen 1: 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 24 31

- Second, the humans that God creates are all equally born in the image and likeness of God (so there is no justification for separation between humans)
- And third, as indicated above by Rademacher, the incarnation of Christ challenges the idea that the divine and the human (the sacred and the secular) cannot be brought together

Dych challenges the dualism which objectifies God into another object, and so creates the pseudo-problem of how to put God and humans back together.

It is the dualism in our theology of faith, and of hope and charity as well, that creates the necessity of putting things together that never should have been separated in the first place.<sup>1447</sup>

From the false dualism of sacred and secular potentially come a range of other false dualisms which are also contrary to an integrated theology: it is not faith vs reason but faith and reason; not work or prayer but work and prayer; not *kerygma* or *diakonia* but *kerygma* and *diakonia*; not faith or action but 'faith in action' (the title of Kearney's anthology); not faith or justice but the 'faith that does justice' (as promoted by the Jesuits). In fact, this last phrase is the context of Dych's exploration of dualism and he sees the statements of *Gaudium et Spes* as going some way to resolving that dualism.

## Conclusion

Each of the identities mentioned above – Catholic, Christian, man of faith; Marist, lay man; teacher, administrator, activist, peace-maker, founder; priest, prophet, leader – are aspects of Kearney's ministry. Rademacher uses the term minister to refer to any Christian engaged in ministry (not just the ordained) and provides a way of unlocking the question of how to remember Kearney. He points out that that ministry will vary over time and come from different sources: called by the community, called by someone in authority, defined by place, defined by function, and only sometimes created by some kind of certification or ordination. But he then asks if there is any substantial difference between these:

What is the difference between a service and a ministry, are there official and non-official ministries? What is the difference? What does official add to or subtract from ministry?<sup>1448</sup>

The whole pilgrim church is a community of ministers to the reign of God. The church is not meant to be a minister to itself. For this reason many ministries will not be *official* church ministries.<sup>1449</sup>

Kearney's life was a life of ministry – and a life in which he was minister in various ways – the absence of an official title for most of his ministries does not in any way subtract from his ministry.

Goldie sums up a similar idea, perhaps more poetically:

---

<sup>1447</sup> Dych, William. "The Dualism in the Faith of the Church". *The Faith that does Justice - examining the -Christian Sources for Social Change*. John C Haughey ed. (New York: Paulist, 1977) 65

<sup>1448</sup> Rademacher, *Lay Ministry*, 3

<sup>1449</sup> Rademacher, *Lay Ministry*, 20

Finally, after losing sight of the laity as an 'ecclesiological category', after seeing their specific character absorbed into 'laicity' or 'secularity' considered as a dimension of the *whole* Church, we shall meet them again as a 'pastoral category', in all the diversity of their lay vocations: members of God's people, of the body of Christ, 'living stones making a spiritual house', responding in a personal vocation to the call of God addressed to them, through and within human history.<sup>1450</sup>

Kearney's vocation was lived out within human history: within a particular period of history that was epoch-making for the Church and for South Africa. His vocation was specific and his spirituality specific, nurtured by the social, political and ecclesial circumstances in which he found himself. He was thus greatly helped by his proximity to a fellow Christian who was also very clear about his vocation, and who understood how to nurture vocation in others. And as Kearney learnt from +Hurley, so others learnt from Kearney.

Nevertheless, despite the appearance of hero-worship, Kearney was fundamentally modelling himself on Jesus Christ who is the source of all ministry in the New Testament:

Throughout Acts, any community task, from serving at tables to the preaching of the apostles, can be called a ministry, *diakonia*, since all of this is service for God in the community. Luke emphasises that service among the Christians comes from the Lord (God has assigned the lot *kleros*, even to Judas) and it involves service rather than hegemony.<sup>1451</sup>

The variety of the ways in which Kearney lived out his ministry – through so many changes in the life of the Church and of South Africa – reinforce the view that discipleship is a commitment to the unknown. The true mark of Kearney's discipleship was, in fact, not what he did, or how many people he impacted, or even the ways in which he delivered. The true mark was his willingness to go where he was led.

This takes more faith than being a priest, prophet or leader. It takes more faith than being a teacher. It takes more faith than being a Marist or a lay person or a married man. It is the faith in Jesus Christ that enabled Kearney to set off and keep changing direction without actually knowing what the final destination was. This is the vocation that Jesus warns Peter will be his fate in the coda to the 4<sup>th</sup> Gospel (Jn 21:18). And it is an understanding that Kearney was already aware of from a relatively young age. In 1973, Kearney ends his dissertation with Illich's own words and they could also be a way of summarising Kearney's life:

We leave home on a pilgrimage. But it is not the pilgrimage of the West which leads over a travelled road to a famed sanctuary. It is the pilgrimage of the Christian East which does not know where the road might lead and the journey end.<sup>1452</sup>

---

<sup>1450</sup> Goldie, "Lay, Laity, Laicity", 108

<sup>1451</sup> Osborne, *Ministry*, 13

<sup>1452</sup> Kearney, "Towards a Critical Analysis of Ivan D Illich's *Deschooling Society*", 133