

## Reflection questions for Chapter 2 of *Building Sisterhood*

- Chapter written by Suzanne Fleming, IHM

1. Rosalita Kelly, quoted on page 90, describes Walker as “rather unexpectedly a woman truly lovable.” [See also pp. 88-89, where Fleming describes her as a woman who cared deeply about the sisters.] Fleming goes on to say that Walker “molded the sisters’ congregational identity.” [90] Another way of putting this is that she molded the community DNA. Did these understandings of her surprise you, or is this how you think of Mother Mary Joseph? Does this change your understanding or assessment of Theresa Maxis?

2. In many ways, Connie Supan (“Dangerous Memory”) and Sue Fleming (“She Who Stayed”) are capturing the same story through two different lenses. Do these two perspectives sharpen our focus on a unified IHM history, or do they present us more with contradictions?

-- As Fleming put it: “The French-speaking Maxis was of San Domingan heritage, a Catholic by birth, forceful in her relationship with clergy, often impetuous, free of spirit, and self-confident. The English-speaking Walker was of Canadian ancestry, Anglican by birth, deferential in her dealings with clergy, and circumspect in her decision making.” (pp. 73-74) How did Maxis’ and Walker’s two very different personalities help to shape the community’s DNA? Which do you think was more influential? Which traits do we need as we move into the future?