

FROM THE UNITED STATES TO THE WORLD, PASSING THROUGH ROME: REFLECTIONS ON THE CATHOLIC CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

Valentina Ciciliot¹

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
Italy
vciciliot@unive.it

ABSTRACT

The official origins of the Catholic Charismatic renewal can be traced to Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA), in 1967, when a group of Catholics were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The movement soon spread to the University of Notre Dame (South Bend, IN) and Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI), and the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI), all of which became centres of the expanding renewal. While the Catholic hierarchy initially distanced itself, this approach was later superseded by the legitimization of the movement, which was achieved due to the work of Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens's mediation between the Catholic Charismatic renewal and the Vatican, and eventually by the centralizing effort pursued by Cardinal Paul Josef Cordes and the Pontifical Council for the Laity. The aim of this paper is to reflect on what happened to the Catholic Charismatic movement from the late 1960s to the late 1980s, how it developed as it moved geographically from the United States to the world, and how it was transformed by passing through Rome.

Keywords: American Catholicism; Catholic Charismatic renewal; Charismatic movement; Léon Joseph Suenens; Paul Josef Cordes; John Paul II.

1. Valentina Ciciliot is a Researcher at Ca' Foscari University of Venice (Italy) with expertise in History of Christianity. From 2016 to 2019 she was a Marie Skłodowska-Curie postdoctoral fellow at Ca' Foscari and at the University of Notre Dame (USA) researching on the origins of the Catholic charismatic movement and its early developments. She is also the author of the book *Donne sugli altari. Le canonizzazione femminili di Giovanni Paolo II* (Viella, 2018) and several articles on Catholicism in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Introduction

Two significant events that occurred during the history of the Catholic Charismatic renewal (CCR) at the beginning of the 1970s and in the late 1980s, respectively, appropriately synthesize the story of its development. In spring 1973, a priest from Belgium named Fr. Michel Dubois was introduced to The Word of God (TWOG) Charismatic community in Ann Arbor, Michigan, as someone who had come from Europe to experience the CCR in person. He stayed with community members in their homes, attended prayer meetings, met with a variety of small groups, and participated in seminars. Only at the end of his visit did he reveal to everyone his true identity: Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, archbishop of Malines-Brussels and primate of Belgium, and one of the four moderators of Vatican II.² The immediate result of the cardinal's visit could be seen in the popular Charismatic magazine *New Covenant*. The June 1973 issue showed a photograph of Suenens alongside Ralph Martin and Steve Clark – two recognized leaders of the movement who were based in Ann Arbor but already well known worldwide – and prominently featured an interview in which Suenens expressed his approval for Catholic Charismatics and his desire to assist them.³ His commitment to the renewal would progressively grow in the immediate future. At his suggestion, the 1973 annual conference for leaders in the Charismatic renewal, which previously had been held in Ann Arbor, was moved to Grottaferrata, near Rome, and the 1975 international conference for Catholic Charismatics, which had been held annually at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana since it began in 1967, was moved to Rome, where Charismatics had their first public encounter with a pope, Paul VI. Eventually, Suenens was unofficially appointed by Paul VI as a special adviser to oversee the reception of the CCR into the Catholic Church, becoming in effect a patron of the movement. Between 1974 and 1986 Suenens collaborated with a commission formed by theologians and leaders of the CCR which produced six documents – known as the

2. Details of the story in Ralph Martin's interview with Valentina Ciciliot in Ann Arbor, 10 July 2018 (not recorded). See also Louise Bourassa, "A Man of the Spirit", *New Covenant* (June 1983), pp. 4–8. Léon Joseph Suenens's biographical details in Elizabeth Hamilton, *Cardinal Suenens: A Portrait* (London: The Catholic Book Club, 1975).

3. "An Interview with Cardinal Suenens", *New Covenant* (June 1973), pp. 1–5.

Malines Documents – as guidelines for the Catholic Charismatic movement as a whole.⁴

In 1984 Suenens was replaced as episcopal adviser of the CCR by Bishop (later Cardinal) Paul Josef Cordes, who was officially appointed to that role in 1984 by John Paul II and who soon linked the CCR to the Pontifical Council for the Laity in his capacity as secretary (1980–95).⁵ In one of his trips around the world meeting with all expressions of the CCR, Cordes went in 1985 to Mount St. Michael in Dallas, Texas, to attend the second leaders' meeting of a newly formed association of communities called International Brotherhood of Communities (IBOC). There were about twenty leaders gathered there when he arrived. As one of the leaders remembered, "He quickly got down to business", telling them that he had just completed a year-long survey of the CCR and had spoken with leaders before going back to Rome to discuss his findings with the pope. Cordes concluded that the historical leadership groups, namely Ann Arbor-South Bend leaders who had fulfilled this role from the beginning but who had just split on the creation of a joint federation of communities, were no longer able to serve as an interface to the church in support of the Charismatic renewal. According to him, leaders of IBOC should be the interface between the Vatican and the movement, and to its covenant communities in particular. Bishop Cordes went on to explain that this could only happen through the creation of a new association of communities: it could not come about through the existing ecumenical IBOC, that was in danger of blurring confessional boundaries, but had to be a new Catholic association that was "authentically Roman Catholic."⁶

4. The Malines Documents' titles and first year of issue: (1) *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (1974); (2) *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal* (1978); (3) *Charismatic Renewal and Social Action* (1979); (4) *Renewal and the Powers of Darkness* (1982); (5) *Nature and Grace. A Vital Unity* (1986) (eventually this document was removed from the collection because of its broader nature); (6) *Resting in the Spirit* (1986).

5. On Bishop Cordes see his autobiography, Paul Josef Cordes, *Tre papi: La mia vita* (Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo, 2015). On the Pontifical Council for the Laity see the booklet *Il Pontificio Consiglio per i Laici* (Città del Vaticano: Tipografia Vaticana, 2012).

6. David A. Peterman, "A History of the Catholic Fraternity", p. 8, pdf file received by the author from Shayne Bennett via email on 16 October 2018. A short version of this article is in <https://godsdelight.org/renewal-history-peterman-sr> (accessed 16 July 2020). See also Brian Smith, *Streams of Living Water: Autobiography of a Charismatic Leader* (Brisbane: Comsoda Communications, 2000), pp. 92–109.

The Catholic Fraternity of Charismatic Covenant Communities and Fellowships (CFCCCCF) was born and “with little choice but to embrace this Papal request” these leaders – with Brian Smith from Australia and Bobbie Cavnar from the United States at the helm – embarked on a five-year process, led by Cordes and the Council for the Laity, of establishing this new fraternity, which soon would become one of the tools for the “Catholicization” – a word used by Cordes himself – of the renewal and the Vatican’s alternative to the emerging Charismatic network being built by The Word of God community – the Sword of the Spirit (SOS).⁷

These two events, which occurred in different historical moments and showed a profoundly different *modus operandi* of the actors involved, although they took place in the same geographical context – the United States – could be seen as paradigmatic examples of the development of the Catholic Charismatic movement. Indeed, what changed within the renewal and the Catholic Church between the late 1960s, when the CCR appeared and the very beginning of the 1990s, when it experienced a downturn and a reorganization of its structures? What were the major forces that influenced it during this time? What was the relationship between the CCR and the Vatican throughout this period? How did the CCR fit within the new-ecclesial-movements paradigm expressed by John Paul II in the 1970s and 1980s? The aim of this article is to investigate what happened to the Catholic Charismatic movement from the origins to the late 1980s, specifically looking at two key ecclesiastical figures involved in it – Suenens and Cordes – how it developed as it moved geographically from the United States to the world, and how it was transformed by passing through Rome.

Although there are several historiographical works on the origins of the CCR,⁸ there is a significant analytical gap that this article seeks to

7. Peterman, “A History of the Catholic Fraternity”, p. 8. Cordes argues how in the 1985 visit with IBOC leaders he failed “abbastanza miseramente” (miserably enough) to integrate the Charismatic movement within the church, believing that only later, in 1988, leaders understood the true Vatican intention regarding the establishment of a Catholic fraternity, see Cordes, *Tre papi*, pp. 90–92.

8. The most recent academic books entirely dedicated to the CCR are Susan A. Maurer, *The Spirit of Enthusiasm: A History of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1967–2000* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010) and Denise S. Blackebrough, *La renovación en el Espíritu Santo: orígenes históricos, marco doctrinal, aspectos eclesiológicos* (Salamanca: Secretariado Trinitario, 2006). Alan Schreck, *A Mighty Current of Grace: The Story of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Frederick, MD: The Word Among Us Press, 2017) could also be mentioned here, although it

address. To this day there is no complete history of the movement from its origins to the present day which would seek to contextualize its development within the global relations and networks between Charismatic leaders, Charismatic structures, and the ecclesiastical hierarchies in the Vatican. As will be seen, geographical and cultural aspects were closely linked to ecclesiastical and ecclesiological matters in the history of the CCR, producing a vivid picture of the various historical dynamics that cannot be analysed without a global historical framework.

The Origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: The United States

It has been well documented that the CCR began as a movement within the Catholic Church in February 1967, at Pittsburgh's Duquesne University (PA), during a spiritual retreat where participants experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit.⁹ Through personal contacts, this experience soon spread to the University of Notre Dame, Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI), the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI), and then to many other parts of the country. The Midwest of the United States became an area of expansion and coordination for the movement, and at an ever-increasing numbers of locations, regular (usually weekly) prayer meetings and communities developed. The first and pioneering Charismatic covenant community was the already mentioned The Word of God (TWOG), based in Ann Arbor, soon followed by the

is more a book of memoirs rather than a historiography. The first historiographical attempts were: Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1969); Edward O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1971). A good synthesis is that of Peter Hocken, "The Catholic Charismatic Renewal", in Vinson Synan (ed.), *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901–2001* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers), pp. 209–32.

9. What happened during the so-called "Duquesne weekend", organized by the history professor William Storey and the graduate student Ralph Kiefer, who had already been baptized in the Holy Spirit in a previous Episcopalian prayer meeting, was the crystallization of a phenomenon that had precedents. Although this historical event has gone down in history as the founding moment of the Catholic Charismatic movement, there is diverse documentation on how Pentecostal spirituality was already experienced by individual or small groups of Catholics before 1967, but either not expressed publicly or marginalized where such expressions emerged. That might lead to the conclusion that the Catholic Church was probably not ready before Vatican II and late 1960s to accept such a development within its doctrine and structure.

Notre Dame student community True House (TH) and the People of Praise (PoP) in South Bend, Indiana. Leaders from these communities soon started to structure their movement, establishing in 1969 a formal office, the Communication Center (CC) and the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee (CCRSC, later shortened to National Service Committee (NSC)), that would, among other matters, publicize the CCR and set itself up as a source of reliable information about baptism in the Spirit, group prayer meetings, and the biblical and theological foundations of a Charismatic spirituality. While the CC and the CCRSC mainly kept a North American dimension, the subsequent International Communication Office (ICO, later ICCRO and then ICCRS) was established in 1972 as a worldwide communications organization which could manage international administration, as well as intergroup and communities' relations, and set up benchmarks for all Charismatic prayer groups and communities in the church worldwide. These three offices became the first major organizational tools to spread the embryonic Catholic Charismatic movement and the core of what could be called the "Notre Dame–Ann Arbor model", a model which was recognized from below, by local Charismatic leaders around North America, as a guarantee of legitimacy, but was also consolidated from above, by the evolution of a strong leadership, mainly previously formed within the Cursillo movement, that adopted a variety of large-scale evangelizing agencies, such as the Life in the Spirit Seminar, the Notre Dame conferences, publications, and spiritual retreats.¹⁰ This model has played a key role in shaping the movement as a North American renewal, but over time this North American influence has also been evident in the rest of the movement as well.¹¹

Although it is possible to discuss at length what conditions were favourable for the emergence of the movement in the United States – such as an independent-thinking and strong laity, a ferment for renewing the church, a certain ecumenical background, the countercultural revolution and the hippie subculture in the 1960s, and so on – what is

10. References to the Cursillo movement in the Midwest area in Kristy Nabhan-Warren, *The Cursillo Movement in America: Catholics, Protestants, and Fourth-Day Spirituality* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), pp. 17–18.

11. On the authority and role of the CCRSC within the CCR and internal criticisms of the CCRSC as well see Valentina Ciciliot, "The Origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) in the United States: Early Developments in Indiana and Michigan and the Reactions of the Ecclesiastical Authorities", *Studies in World Christianity* 25.3 (2019), pp. 250–73.

noteworthy here is that its original geographical context would have a distinctive effect on the development of the movement as a whole. In fact, from the beginning, it is possible to distinguish how the differences between North American and European Catholicism – or, more properly, Roman Catholicism – interacted in defining and interpreting what this new movement was. Moreover, the differences between both contexts are clear in the process of legitimizing the movement within the Catholic Church. If at an earlier stage these differences involved a divergence of “style”, or perhaps a “cultural” divergence, soon it became also an ecclesiological and theological divergence regarding the respective roles of the laity, the clergy and the magisterium, and the attitude towards other Christian denominations.¹² The dialectic between these two elements – American Catholicism and Roman Catholicism – would result in a process of “Romanization”, not only in terms of forms but also in terms of content and direction. Here “Romanization” does not necessarily mean “centralization” or “normalization”, but rather a progression by which the language and the theological and conceptual categories of Roman Catholicism were used to translate, and indeed to interpret, this new American Catholic expression. One example among several that can describe this attitude is the genesis of the second Malines Document, which focused on ecumenism. Cardinal Suenens called on Killian McDonnell, a US theologian with strong expertise in ecumenism and the first theological adviser of the National Service Committee (mentioned above), to collaborate on that document in Brussels, Belgium.¹³ McDonnell had already been the drafter of the first Malines

12. A historical suggestion could be to ask if there was a kind of prejudgment of Roman Catholicism towards US Catholicism that could find its origin in the Americanist heresy, which showed how US Catholics could be innovative in reframing Catholic doctrine, and partly consolidated after Vatican II and after the debate on the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. See Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982), and Thomas T. McAvoy, *The Americanist Heresy in Roman Catholicism 1895–1900* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963). For the American debate on *Humanae Vitae* see Mark S. Massa, *The American Catholic Revolution: How the Sixties Changed the Church Forever* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), chapter 3, and Mark S. Massa, *The Structure of Theological Revolutions: How the Fight over Birth Control Transformed American Catholicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

13. Killian McDonnell was also an official representative in the Roman Catholic–Pentecostal dialogue (1972–92). Biographical notes in <https://collegevilleinstitute.org/residencies/kilian-mcdonnell-writer-in-residence/kilian-mcdonnell> (accessed 16 June 2020). See also Cecil M. Robeck Jr, “McDonnell Kilian”, in Stanley M. Burgess

Document. The document was initially written by McDonnell himself, but some unrecorded disagreements between the two men would result in McDonnell leaving Brussels and would lead to the publication of two separate volumes, both in 1978: that of McDonnell for an American audience entitled *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*, and that with Suenens as the sole author named *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal*, which is known as Malines II.¹⁴ Even if archival gaps do not allow us to reconstruct the entire story and a clash of personalities is certainly involved, the elements of identity and geographical distinctiveness, more than theological diversity, seem to play an important role.¹⁵ As a matter of fact, in a letter written by Ralph Martin to all the consultants surveyed for the document draft, he noted that McDonnell's text had received "different and opposite reactions" and some of the consulted theologians stressed the fact that it was "written in a too much

and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (eds), *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), p. 853.

14. Kilian McDonnell, *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978) and León Joseph Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978).

15. McDonnell himself stated that the problem in Brussels was not theological, but rather due to Veronica O'Brien's role. See his letter to Joseph L. Charron (assistant general secretary and associate general secretary of the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) from 1976 to 1979) in April 5, 1978: "Cardinal Suenens rejected my document for reasons completely external to its merits and demerits, namely Veronica. Ralph Martin and Steve Clark would verify this. Also, I have a letter from the Secretariat on my document which indicates no disapproval. After six months after he rejected my document he hastily wrote a much shorter one than the one asked me to write"; see Catholic University of America Archives (CUAA), United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), box 117, Ministry: Charismatic Renewal, 1976–88 (box 2), Correspondence, General: 1976 to present. Although the role Veronica O'Brien played in Suenens's life and within the initial history of the CCR is undoubtedly relevant, a precise reconstruction of her relationships and actions is hindered by the fact that her documentation at the archdiocesan archives in Malines is still not available for consultation. Suenens's book *The Hidden Hand of God: The Life of Veronica O'Brien and Our Common Apostolate* (Dublin: Veritas, 1994) reported only selected biographical details and memories. See also Archives of the Diocese of Grand Rapids (ADGR), File 1–283, Joseph C. McKinney, Correspondence between Joseph McKinney and Kilian McDonnell, 22 December 1977; 10 December 1977; 7 January 1978; 13 January 1978. Eventually Suenens reconciled with McDonnell, CUAA, National Conference of Catholic bishops (NCCB), Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1969–79, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Letter from McDonnell to Charron, 20 November 1978.

american [sic!] context and cannot be used as such in other countries, especially in Europe, which is essential for a Malines Document". As a result of the entire situation, Suenens decided not to publish the manuscript as a Malines Document, implicitly accepting the assumption that Malines Documents needed a specifically European context, although planned as official and universal guidelines for Charismatics within the Catholic Church as a whole.¹⁶ Interestingly enough, in Malines II Suenens abandoned McDonnell's distinction between ecumenism and non-denominationalism – as setting aside areas of disagreement in the dialogues between Christian denominations – preferring instead to speak of "authentic" ecumenism and "spiritual" ecumenism.¹⁷ However, this lexical change could not be accidental if a broader historical context is taken into account. In fact, the search for unity between Christians through the improvement of the relationships between Charismatics from different churches – and between non-denominational Charismatics as well – was a hot topic in those years. From 20 to 24 July 1977, a massive conference on the Charismatic Renewal in the Christian Churches took place at Kansas City, Missouri.¹⁸ Around 50,000 Christians – with 49 per cent of them being Catholics – from different churches and affiliations came together to celebrate the Charismatic spirituality in such an event that on one hand created advanced ecumenical expectations within Charismatic groups, whereas on the other hand it preoccupied

16. Archdiocesan Archives Mechelen (AAM), Archivum Suenens, Livres, box 40, Oecuménisme et renouveau charismatique (1978), 2. Préparation (2), Letter from Ralph Martin to "Dear", no date.

17. Interestingly, a draft of Malines II dated August 1977, which was considered "essentially ready for publication", is still McDonnell's version, so the distinction between ecumenism and non-denominationalism is still present there. See Archivio Storico del Rinnovamento Carismatico Cattolico presso Ufficio ICCRS, ora CHARIS (ICCRS Archives), Ecumenism, World Council of Churches, Kilian McDonnell, *Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*, Malines Document II, August 1977 and Concerning the current form of the document.

18. See Vinson Synan, "Kansas City Conference", in Burgess and Van Der Maas, *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic Movements*, p. 816. For media coverage see John Blattern, "A Living Prophecy: Report on the Conference", *New Covenant* (September 1977), pp. 4–9; "Charismatic Unity in Kansas City", *Christianity Today* (12 August 1977), pp. 36–7; "Kansas City Conference Demonstrates Unity", *ICO Newsletter* (November 1977), first three pages; "Charismatic Renewal: Up to Date in Kansas City", *America* (24 September 1977), pp. 164–6; Jason Petosa, "Suenens calls gathering ecumenical triumph", in *National Catholic Reporter* (12 August 1977), p. 1 and 4.

ecclesiastical hierarchies, particularly the Vatican, which in contrast to the Charismatic participants perceived some of the stances expressed at the Kansas City Conference as more non-denominational rather than ecumenical.¹⁹ Thus, Charismatic ecumenism contributed to a rising alarmist attitude toward the renewal among ecclesial authorities, along with other two central issues that had a significant weight in the relations between the CCR and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF): the practice of healing and the para-ecclesiastical structure.²⁰

Throughout the 1970s, Charismatic covenant communities grew exponentially and consolidated their leadership in the renewal, at least until the beginning of the 1980s, when the Notre Dame-Ann Arbor model stopped functioning due to the attempt to permanently establish

19. It seems that Jean Jérôme Hamer (secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) from 1973 to 1984) used the term “interdenominational” to describe Ann Arbor- like covenant communities after Kansas City. See CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Letter from Thomas Kelly, associate general secretary of the NCCB from 1972 to 1977 and of USCCB from 1977 to 1982, to Charron, 12 July 1978: Kelly reported his trip to Rome and his conversation with Hamer, who was concerned about “the very tight organization of some of the Charismatics e.g. Ann Arbor, it would prevent the Bishop from exercising his responsibility as *magister vitae spiritualis*. He also sees the Movement as setting up a false opposition between professing and magisterium. Finally, he feels that the new communities are quite improperly called ‘ecumenical’, he sees them rather as ‘interdenominational’”

20. Concerns about ecumenism and other practices of Catholic Charismatics were evident well before the Kansas City conference. See Bentley Historical Library (BHL), University of Michigan, Tom Yoder Papers, 1967–91, box 5, The Word of God Private Archives in Ann Arbor (TWOG Archives), Documents 1974–5, Letter from McDonnell to Clark, 4 November 1974 (on Hamer’s conversation with McDonnell) and Memo to Service Committee from McDonnell, on Ecumenical Dimensions of the Renewal, 3 December 1974: “There is no doubt that the No. 1 cause of anxiety is the ecumenical aspects of the renewal. If Rome or national hierarchies issue statements which contain grave reservations with regard to the renewal, it will very likely be because of these ecumenical dimensions.” Furthermore, not to be overlooked in this historical context is the controversy surrounding the Shepherding movement and the discipleship question, which began in 1975, not only because of Ann Arbor’s role as arbitrator, but also because of the relations established between Charismatic Catholics and the non-denominational pan-Charismatic leaders of Fort Lauderdale – Don Basham, Ern Baxter, Bob Mumford, Derek Prince and Charles Simpson – which contributed to the realization of Kansas City. Further research needs to be done on their “ecumenical council” and cardinal Suenens’s involvement in it. See S. David Moore, *The Shepherding Movement: Controversy and Charismatic Ecclesiology* (London: T&T Clark International, 2003).

a sole organization, called “association of communities” or “community of communities”, which would have had the aim of gathering Charismatic communities for mutual support on the basis of common values and structures. In this process, the Word of God and People of Praise communities (by this time True House in Notre Dame had been dismantled) realized that they had “significant differences” and decided to go their separate ways. Two groups of communities were formed, the Federation of Communities linked to TWOG, which in 1982 became Sword of the Spirit (SOS), and the Fellowship of Communities related to the People of Praise.²¹ Other communities also expressed the need to link together and between 1983 and 1984 IBOC, mentioned in the introduction, was established in Dallas. The split between TWOG and PoP had consequences not only for the affected covenant communities but for the entire CCR – in the United States as well as in other continents – which had depended on the support they had provided since the very beginning thanks to the Service Committee (the above mentioned CCRSC, then NSC) led by leaders of the two communities. Progressively, services, particularly those provided by the NSC, went into an essential change of leadership, leaving the non-community renewal – the prayer groups – with a void that needed to be filled.²²

Out of this new adjustment emerged a new phase of the CCR, that can be defined as the “diocesanization”, where Catholic clergy in liaison committees and in Charismatic centres played a major role.²³ Although

21. The split within TWOG and PoP is a crucial event for understanding the history of the Catholic Charismatic movement – and maybe not only within the Catholic world – in the 1980s. Leaving aside here the complexity of the historical reconstruction of causes and motivations, the creation of two separate organisms which according to Kevin Ranaghan’s comment, “should be understood primarily as an organizational change to enable people to move forward”, represented a historical breach that helped accelerate the transformation of the CCR in the 1980s and 1990s. Cf. Ranaghan’s quotation (“significant differences” above are also his words) in ICCRS Archives, USA II, 1986–8, National Service Committee-Advisory Committee meeting, 31 May–1 June 1981, p. 18. See also Ralph Martin’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 10 July 2018 (not recorded). Useful considerations also in Matteo Calisi’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 22 December 2018 (not recorded); Ken Metz’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 27 February 2019 (not recorded), and Shayne Bennett’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 22 November 2018 (not recorded).

22. Peterman, “History of the Catholic Fraternity”, p. 6.

23. The US bishops’ pastoral statement on the renewal in 1984, *A Document on the Charismatic Renewal Prepared by the Bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee in Liaison with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, June 1984, and Joseph L. Bernardin, “Come, Holy

in the United States the appointment of a liaison as a tool to monitor Charismatics on a diocesan level had been already encouraged by cardinal Suenens and since the 1969 National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) report on the Pentecostal movement,²⁴ it was only in June 1975 that an official Ad Hoc Committee for the CCR (or for Liaison with (the) CCR) was created with the NCCB's mandate, when cardinal John Krol, as president of the NCCB, established it under the chairmanship of Bishop Gerald Frey of Lafayette, LA.²⁵ The Ad Hoc Committee, along with a steering committee made up of various liaison priests, worked as a coordinating organ between the NSC, local Charismatic leaders, and dioceses. Through its annual symposia, conferences, and meetings, it pastorally anchored the movement to a more parish-based dimension under the bishops' supervision. The already mentioned transformation, if not decline, of the major US Charismatic communities in the 1980s contributed to this process of diocesanization. However, it is important to note that the debate that arose within the US dioceses and possibly accelerated the revisions in Charismatic Catholic leadership did not arise from Charismatic practices alone but also from concerns of the ecclesiastical hierarchy towards certain forms of management of the communities themselves.²⁶ This is evident in many of these communities having

Spirit: A Pastoral Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal for the Archdiocese of Chicago, Pentecost 1988 are two documents that well reflected these changing circumstances. See also James Hitchcock and Gloriana Bednorski, *Charismatics: Catholic Perspectives* (Chicago, IL: Thomas More Press, 1980).

24. "Pentecostal Movement of the Catholic Church in the United States" (1969), in Kilian McDonnell (ed.), *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), pp. 209–10.

25. CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1975, Jan-June, Memorandum from Kilian McDonnell to Joseph L. Bernardin (at that time archbishop of Cincinnati and president of the NCCB from 1974 to 1977), 28 January 1975.

26. See as examples the meeting reports of the Ad Hoc Committee for Liaison with the CCR since 1977. Cf. CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1977, Minutes Meeting of Bishops' Committee for Liaison with Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 3–4 October 1977, New Orleans, and Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Memorandum to Gerard L. Frey (bishop of Lafayette) from McDonnell, subject: Implementing the expanding role of the Ad Hoc Committee, enclosed in the 6 January; USCCB, box 117, Ad Hoc Committee for Liaison with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1981, Minutes Ad Hoc Committee for Liaison with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 17 November 1981, and also The Most Reverend Gerard L. Frey, Letter from McKinney to Frey, 20 December 1977 and Letter from McDonnell to Frey, 8 December 1977.

been put under investigation in the late 1980s and during the 1990s.²⁷ As a result, new leaders emerged, mostly priests, such as Michael Scanlan, president of the University of Steubenville, which became a major Charismatic centre for the entire renewal in the 1980s.²⁸ It was during this phase of the CCR that a new level of Roman Catholic discipline developed, surpassing the previous process of “Romanization”.

Rome

From the beginning the Catholic Charismatic movement attracted the interest of the Vatican, particularly because of its rapid growth. As already mentioned, Suenens played a key role in the early decade of the movement, particularly in its legitimization within the worldwide church. The cardinal’s first contact with Catholic Charismatics came on a visit to New York in early 1973, and later that year, as already recounted, he decided to visit the Ann Arbor community as a priest in disguise. His concerns about the potential isolation of the movement and his urgency about giving it a “go-ahead” push – what he called a “policy of presence” – resulted in the already mentioned Grottaferrata Conference in October, 1973, and eventually in the temporary move of the 1975 international conference for Catholic Charismatics to Rome. His words in a letter to Paul VI are eloquent:

The American hierarchy, the first to be involved, has taken a cautious stand, but an open one; a bishop has been appointed as liaison agent. However, even a “benevolent” attitude “from outside” cannot replace the need of a hierarchical or theological presence at the local level, from “within”. Only being among them can a priest guide them and help them in that discernment of spirits which is both delicate and essential. Instead of remaining on the outskirts as an observer or a critical judge, the bishop must make sure that the flock is not left without a shepherd. Should the sheep stray for a lack of a shepherd, we – and not the sheep – would be to blame. A policy of presence is vital – I would even say urgent – from the very outset, while it is still easy to provide those guidelines which the

27. Only two examples: Ann Carey, “When Does Leadership Risk Becoming Tyranny?”, *Our Sunday Visitor* (14 July 1991) on bishop Albert H. Ottenweller’s investigation of the Servants of Christ the King in Steubenville and Arthur Jones, “Communities Falter Under Heavy Hands”, *National Catholic Reporter*, April 18, 1997 on cardinal James Hickey of Washington’s investigation of the Mother of God Charismatic covenant community.

28. On Michael Scanlan and the University of Steubenville see his *Let the Fire Fall* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servants Books, 1986).

laity are anxious to receive. [...]. This “wait-and-see” policy cannot last, and could in itself bring about errors due to the faulty communication.²⁹

After the above-mentioned events, Suenens kept Paul VI informed of the CCR’s developments, unofficially becoming the adviser of the Catholic Charismatics.³⁰

Although Suenens’s attitude toward the renewal was open and mainly focussed on its wider acceptance, relationships with North American lay leaders and ecclesiastical hierarchy weren’t always harmonious. As correspondence testifies, on the one hand not all Charismatic leaders willingly accepted Suenens’s direct involvement or his “style”,³¹ while on the other hand, precisely because initially Suenens went around the US episcopate to dialogue directly with lay leaders, who in the first phase were much more visible and eager for legitimization, he lost a certain amount of sympathy among the clergy. Only later, when relations with part of the lay leadership became tenser – this happened after 1975, when dialogues with Steve Clark and Ralph Martin became more complicated³² – did

29. Léon Joseph Suenens, *Memories and Hopes* (Dublin: Veritas, 1992), p. 270, Letter to Paul VI, 24 July 1974.

30. Interestingly, theologian Küng stated that Suenens’s commitment to the Charismatic renewal happened when he was “domesticated by Rome and personally immobilized” in his effort of renewing the church following Vatican II. Cf. Hans Küng, *Disputed Truth: Memoirs II* (New York: Continuum, 2008), pp. 254–8. It could be assumed that Suenens’s strong interest in the Catholic Charismatic movement led him, along with other reasons, to find a rapprochement with the pope after their tensions in 1969–1971, as not to preclude the renewal from being welcomed.

31. See Ciciliot, “The Origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR)”, pp. 265–7.

32. Tensions between Suenens and Martin – and Clark as well – may be seen as another example of “Romanization”. Suenens distanced himself from Martin for different reasons, but a main one was the lack of Martin’s will to obey the ecclesiastical authority, both US and Roman, meekly. At a certain point Suenens’s intent seemed to be that of “Catholicizing” Martin. It is legitimate to wonder if there is here at stake a wider dimension of an attitude of superiority of Roman Catholicism towards North American Catholicism. Certainly, this episode shows Suenens’ ecclesiological and theological vision of the CCR different from that of the North American leaders. Cf. CUA, USCCB, box 117, Ministry: Charismatic Renewal, 1976–88 (Box 2), Correspondence, General: 1976 to present, Letter from Suenens to Martin, 9 August 1978. Signs of disagreement still in a letter from Suenens to Martin dated 15 September 1975, Ivi. Cf. AAM, Archivum L. J. Suenens, Renouveau charismatique, Ann Arbor, Word of God, Ralph Martin, Kevin Ranaghan, Steve Clark, Kilian McDonnell, box 87, 1. Ann Arbor, Word of God, Ann Arbor Dossier, dated in November 1977. In this handwritten notes Suenens stated: “we offer you [Ralph Martin] to become really catholic [sic!], really

Suenens open a preferential channel with the US episcopal conference,³³ and among the results of this collaboration was the ad hoc committee for establishing diocesan liaisons with the CCR.³⁴ It seems that these difficulties of interaction on a number of levels clarify what has been already said about the process of “Romanization”. If it is safe to say that while Suenens acted with a certain authority, shaping the Charismatic movement in his own way, he did so with the aim of making it an integral part of the Catholic Church and avoiding possible condemnations. In fact, the threat of a condemnation of the Charismatic renewal was real in 1978, when the CDF seemed to have prepared an opposition document and asked for clarification, especially with regard to ecumenical forms lived within certain covenant communities.³⁵ Beyond the details,

ecumenical”, “we arrived at the ‘clash’ when we repeated our essential two remarks: uncatholicity – unecumenicity” and “a ray of sun: R. [Ralph] saying: our ‘ecumenism’ overshadowed our ‘Catholicism’” (p. 1). It is clear here how ecumenism, which is false, according to Suenens, if it is non-denominationalism (p. 4), is key to understand not only Martin-Suenens relationships but also the whole process of “Romanization” and later that of “centralization”. See also Ralph Martin’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot in Ann Arbor, 10 July 2018 (not recorded).

33. As an example, CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, January–July 1974, Letter from Kelly to John Raphael Quinn (archbishop of Oklahoma City), 8 July 1974. The sense of this letter is that leadership should come from the US bishops.

34. CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, January–June 1975, Letter from Giovanni Benelli (“sostituto”) to Joseph L. Bernardin, 24 April 1975 and Bernardin’s answer to Benelli, 7 May 1975. Suenens asked Benelli to pass on the suggestion of a vigilance commission over the Charismatic movement after the congress in Rome and Bernardin answered that the US bishops were establishing the Ad Hoc Committee for Liaison.

35. CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Ad Hoc Committee on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, Report of Meeting, 9 March 1978; Letter from Suenens to Frey, 9 February 1978; Letter from Quinn to Your Eminence (cardinal Franjo Šeper, CDF), 17 March 1978; Letter from Šeper (?) to Quinn, 19 April 1978. Cf. also Box 117, Committee Meeting, 13 November 1979, Capital Hilton (w/NSC), Ad Hoc Committee for Liaison with the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, Minutes of the meeting, 13 November 1979, Capital Hilton, Washington, DC: here it is possible to read handwritten annotations like “He [Suenens] was tipped off by Paul VI?” and “brought up by Paul VI” and “Hamer has been strongly ‘silent’”. Cf. also AAM, Archivum L. J. Suenens, Renouveau charismatique, Correspondance Suenens, Événement importants, box 85, folder Correspondance importante, Correspondence between Jean-Marie Villot (secretary of State), Suenens, and Paul VI, April 1978; Renouveau charismatique, Ann Arbor, Word of God, Ralph Martin, Kevin Ranaghan, Steve Clark, Kilian McDonnell, box

what is important to underline here is not only how Suenens's timely intervention resolved the situation but also how his mediation generated an accommodating solution – that of denominational fellowships within Charismatic ecumenical communities.³⁶ The establishment within an ecumenical community of a “Catholic fellowship”, alongside fellowships of other Christian denominations, such as a “Lutheran fellowship”, etc., would, in fact, have guaranteed the safeguarding of Catholic identity in contexts of ecumenical experiences such as those within the SOS network, without undermining the ecumenicity of those realities.³⁷ The project, however, did not work in most of the covenant communities where it was applied and soon new urgencies emerged.³⁸

87, folder Ralph Martin (1), Notes of the meeting at the Holy Office on 18 October 1977. Interesting information also in the interviews with Ralph Martin 10 July 2018 and Steve Clark 12 July 2018 (not recorded).

36. See Ralph Martin (at the request of Suenens), *The emerging charismatic communities: a need for direction*, October 1976, in CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1976 and Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Letter from Clark to Frey, 24 January 1978: “The Federation of Communities: A Progress Report”, December 1977.

37. See Paul DeCelles, “Ecumenism: Part 1”, *Vine&Branches* (October 1996), pp. 10–11. Here the author – one of the leaders of the People of Praise – seems to doubt Suenens's advocacy to the ecumenical fellowship: “Steve and Ralph decided to try to establish a definite relationship between the Catholics in their community and the Catholic Church. They called this group a “fellowship.” Cardinal Suenens, who was the pope's representative to the Catholic Charismatic renewal, was initially quite agreeable to the idea. In any event, they had written some things up in order to start the fellowship. I believe it was at that point that Cardinal Suenens decided not to approve the fellowship officially, and he never accepted their statutes. Having done all that work, however, they were able, with Bishop Povich's agreement, to start a fellowship for their Catholics in Ann Arbor” (p. 10). In any case, the recognition of Catholic fellowships within ecumenical communities was always operated on a diocesan level, in accordance with the Vatican. As an example, when the Pontifical Council of Laity (PCL) gave its unofficial approval to the statutes of the Catholic fellowship of the TWOG, the CDF emphasized that caution must be exercised toward the ecumenical communities: “Together, they affirmed that it is the responsibility of the American bishops, primarily, to exercise their authority with regard to the approval or disapproval of these Statutes”, CUA, NCCB, box 120, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1978–9, Minutes (official) Ad hoc committee for Liaison with the CCR, 13 November 1978, Washington, DC.

38. James Joseph Bulger, “Unity in the Spirit: Contributions of the Charismatic Renewal to Ecumenism”, Senior thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2014, pp. 58–60: “Although the model of denominational fellowships within the broader covenant communities allowed for stronger connections with church hierarchy, it was never

A stronger and more orthodox Catholic identity within the CCR was clearly John Paul II's intention. As a matter of fact, in naming Paul Josef Cordes as Suenens's successor as the official episcopal adviser of the CCR, the pope succeeded in taking action against some ecumenical forms expressed in several Charismatic groups and communities, and in placing the CCR alongside other new ecclesial movements such as the Neo-Cathecumal Way, Communion and Liberation, Focolare Movement, etc.³⁹

Sufficiently explanatory is a letter written by Ken Metz, ICCRO director from 1989 to 1994, to Auxiliary Bishop Joseph McKinney, who was the first episcopal adviser to the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee, in January 1987, where he clearly stated, "My basic suspicion is that the Vatican would like to have the Charismatic Renewal be in some way under its protection/control. I have explained to Cordes and to anybody who will listen that there is no way in which the entire Charismatic Renewal can be a Catholic Organization as other movements can be." Cordes clearly expressed this idea using a different language. In his memoir, he spoke about a "need of maturation", or wrote, as an example, "Ben presto pensai che avrei dovuto incoraggiarli a darsi un certo ordine 'strutturale' per avere un 'volto istituzionale' presente ed efficace nella chiesa" ("I soon thought I should encourage them to give themselves a certain 'structural order,' to have an 'institutional' face present and effective in the church").⁴⁰ In addition, in his oral testimony he expressly used the term "ristrutturazione" (reorganization/restructuring) and the expression "non addomesticamento ma integrazione nella struttura gerarchica della chiesa": ("not domestication, but integration in the hierarchical structure of the church");⁴¹ firstly, recommending a new form for communities recognized by the Council for the Laity, meaning the establishment of the Catholic fraternity; secondly, providing some forms

widely adopted, in part because it separated community members from their local parishes congregations, and also because it did not work well for those whose denominations were a very small minority in a particular community." (p. 60).

39. This brings to mind what the historian Jay Dolan's reflections on John Paul II's imposing a "one-size-fits-all brand Catholicism", Jay P. Dolan, *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 254. On Cordes and his role within the Pontifical Council of Laity see Mercier's article in this issue.

40. Cordes, *Tre papi*, p. 90.

41. Paul Josef Cordes's interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 28 January 2019 (not recorded).

of juridical recognition for the other large Charismatic office, ICCRO, meaning transferring it to Rome, naming it ICCRS and establishing it by statute in 1993 – not without internal resistance, as Metz’s letter notably shows;⁴² and thirdly, formulating a precise theological orientation for Catholic Charismatics, as indicated by the publication of his guidelines in *Call to Holiness. Reflections on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, in 1997.⁴³ Since this process could also be referred to as “Catholicization”, “institutionalization” or “centralization”, it seems that something deeper was at stake: a different ecclesiology which, from the Vatican’s point of view, needed to be put under the aegis of Rome for the sake of integration. In the second half of the 1980s and 1990s the Vatican, which was perfectly aware of the evangelizing dynamic of the Charismatic renewal, was ready to take the lead in its global development.

The Globalization of the CCR: The World

The CCR’s global development began very soon, in the 1970s and mostly from the United States. Although more complex translocal interplays were at work,⁴⁴ the Midwest Service Committee and the Communication Center, along with the covenant communities in Notre Dame and Ann Arbor played a major role when they started receiving an impressive number of requests for information on the CCR in general and on its activities in particular. At the beginning, these requests came almost exclusively from English-speaking countries, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, but soon also African English-speaking countries. This was mostly because the first Catholic Charismatic leaders were North American and their teachings and documentation were

42. See also the correspondence between Metz and Cordes in ICCRS Archives, PCL, Pontifical Council for Laity, 2 (1976–99).

43. See also Cordes’s previous reflection *Charismatic Renewal: A Balancing Force in the Church Today* (South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1985).

44. To stay in the United States, for example, further research needs to be conducted on Francis McNutt’s network – in the 1980s it was structured in the Christian Healing Ministries – which was central in spreading the CCR in Latin America and in other continents. Candy Gunther Brown, “Francis MacNutt and the Globalization of Charismatic Healing and Deliverance”, in Stan Chu Ilo (ed.), *Pentecostalism, Catholicism, and the Spirit in the World* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019), pp. 115–33. See also Edward Cleary, *The Rise of Charismatic Catholicism in Latin America* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2011), particularly pp. 36–41 and *passim*, and Andrew R. Chesnut, *Competitive Spirits: Latin America’s New Religious Economy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 66–9.

produced in English. Eventually, other countries became involved and Charismatic literature began to be translated into other languages. Information and teachings from Ann Arbor and South Bend, via books and tapes, were sent around the world, conveying a precise model of practicing Charismatic spirituality and building Charismatic Christian communities.

In globalizing itself, the CCR was perceived in two different ways, something like a coin with two faces. On one side, it was understood as a movement from the “outside”: in countries where an ecumenical familiarity (or comfort level) was not well developed – mostly countries where Catholics were the majority and ecumenical dialogue had progressed slowly and only after Vatican II – it was recognized as a movement based on strong influences of Pentecostalism, and in some cases the reactions towards it were initially difficult. On the other side, it was seen as a movement from the “inside”: something “in the air”, already present in local Catholic spirituality, easy to make it indigenous and integrated within the local structure as a local expression – in those countries where ecumenical sensitivity had been cultivated thanks to a longstanding proximity between different Christian denominations. In those areas the inculturation process was at a grass-roots level and reactions toward it were less adverse. Therefore, in English-speaking countries, such as Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, just as it had in in the United States, the existing ecumenical familiarity resulted in greater receptiveness towards the Charismatic experience within the Catholic Church than in other countries, such as Italy or Mexico, where the hegemony of the Catholic Church tended to hinder the development of ecumenical dialogue, at least before Vatican II. In fact, Charismatic spirituality spread more easily where ecumenical receptiveness was already well developed.

Two other key aspects in making the CCR global were hospitality and contacts via local liaison persons. The Word of God, for example, hosted thousands of visitors from every continent, beginning in its very first years. Statistics are significant: there were 890 people visiting in 1971; 1,126 in 1973; 1,507 in 1974. Some international leaders spent time with TWOG leaders, some of them living in a household with community members, attending seminars and meetings, and then going back to their countries in order to try to replicate the same experience.⁴⁵ Another option to contact local groups or to start new prayer meetings

45. TWOG Archives, Archive, Faith & Renewal, Faith & Renewal Closeout, folder Guest records, 1986, Guest Statistics.

and communities was to approach the person in the diocese who was in charge of the relationships with the CCR. If this method was sometimes problematic, particularly where the liaisons developed suspicion or mistrust of local lay leaders or external support, it worked well in countries where the Catholic Church had already developed long-standing structures.⁴⁶

These initial evangelizing efforts were sometimes spontaneous. People who received the baptism in the Holy Spirit moved throughout the United States and to other continents – partly aided by the services offered at Notre Dame/South Bend and Ann Arbor. Certainly, the establishment of the Sword of the Spirit (SOS), already mentioned, and the group of communities linked to the People of Praise played an important role in defining evangelizing strategies. For example, within a short time, Sword of the Spirit grew to some 90 communities in 28 countries, with a unity based on common teachings, mission, and structures. One of SOS's outreaches, the Hispanic Missions (*Misiones Hispanoamericanas*), was a remarkable instrument for shaping the movement in Latin America in the 1980s. Its goal was the evangelization and spiritual renewal of Hispanics in the United States, Canada, Spain and throughout the Americas, within a Catholic context.⁴⁷ Doug (Paco) Gavrilides was the director and helped to energize Hispano-American communities within the US and Latino communities in Latin America. Hispanic Missions provided training for evangelizers and leaders, retreats for married couples, evangelistic rallies, youth rallies, community groups, and conferences. Its strategies consisted of primarily working with recognized local leaders. While some of those local leaders already knew about TWOG and had visited Ann Arbor before building a local community and eventually joining the SOS and receiving the energy of the Hispanic Missions, others had experienced the Charismatic spirituality independently and later came across The Word of God's network.⁴⁸ Although TWOG offered a formation process that was intended to be "like Ann Arbor" in its essence, the process tended to respect the uniqueness of every place. In other words, it was a movement imported mainly by local people and not exported by the US

46. Doug (Paco) Gavrilides's interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 13 July 2018 (recorded) and Gary Soromik's interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 10 July 2018 (not recorded) are crucial sources for this section.

47. The Catholic context is underlined here because the Sword of the Spirit was constituted mainly by ecumenical communities, even if Catholics were the majority.

48. See BHL, Tom Yoder Papers, 1967–91, box 2, Hispanic Missions, 1980–87.

Catholic Church in a colonialist mode. According to testimonies,⁴⁹ this cultural sensitivity was always a work in progress and gradually North American leaders learned how to deal with indigenous sensibilities. Financially, TWOG paid the cost of these missionary efforts via a mission title on members and sent mostly single men – the majority of them were members of a group named the Servants of the Word, a brotherhood within the community made up of single men – as well as single women. Such commitments of money and personnel were required for very practical reasons: frequent travel was necessary in order to be constantly present for the local in-progress communities.

Possible dangers involved in the creation of a para-missionary structure independent of the ecclesiastical hierarchies was however always a concern, as ICCRO council consultant and later president Fr. Diego Jaramillo reported in 1983, when he complained about *Misiones Hispanas* in Latin America because it was not “united closely enough with other groups in the Renewal in different countries.”⁵⁰ His complaint also offers a glimpse into the rivalry between Charismatic agencies. In fact, with SOS, the missionary organizational configuration progressively and profoundly changed, moving towards a higher conformity for member communities (which were called branches), associate communities and affiliated groups (for groups which entered into a relationship with SOS for the purpose of receiving formation in community life and determining whether the group should become a branch). This process was implemented through leaders’ meetings, common teachings, council decisions, formation requirements, etc. This pyramidal and hierarchical structure was reflected in a document entitled the *Covenant of the Sword of the Spirit*, and was constituted by numerous offices and committees such as the council, the administrative committee, the policy board, the mission board, the judicial panel, the constitutional commission, head coordinators, etc.⁵¹ Consequently, more deep misunderstandings arose

49. Doug (Paco) Gavrilides’s interview with Valentina Ciciliot, 13 July 2018 (recorded).

50. ICCRS Archives, Council Meetings, 1978–86, I–XIII, folder Council Meeting VIII, 1983 Rio de Janeiro, Minutes meeting of the International Council of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 8–11 November 1983, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, p. 5.

51. BHL, Tom Yoder Papers, 1967–91, box 5, *Sword of the Spirit*, Constitution, 1977–89, The Constitutional and Governmental Decisions of The *Sword of the Spirit* (draft); *Sword of the Spirit*, Policy and Structure, 1983–7, North American Outreach, March 1985, Catholic Charismatic Renewal Division, 8 January 1985; *Sword of the Spirit*, Newsletters, 1985–6; *The Sword of the Spirit*, Status of the group, 8 January 1985; *Sword of the Spirit*, Branches, Misc., 1977–87.

not only between the Charismatic covenant communities that existed within and outside of the network, but misunderstandings with Rome as well. Certain ecumenical experiences, governances and management of authority in SOS contributed without a doubt to the establishment of the aforementioned Catholic Fraternity as the Vatican's fully orthodox Charismatic counterforce, even if one leaves aside the history of the split that occurred between TWOG and SOS in 1991–2 and the criticism of authoritarianism and coerciveness within SOS.⁵²

Parallel to the development of communities' networks, the International Communication Office (ICO) became a reference point for Charismatic prayer groups. Although it wasn't conceived as an outreach of TWOG or PoP but as an office of the whole CCR, in its initial life those communities influenced it, thanks to Ralph Martin, who was a leader of TWOG and the first director of the ICO. It operated in Ann Arbor until it was moved to Brussels before being transformed into the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services (ICCRS) and moving to Rome in 1980 (in 2018 it was merged with another Charismatic service committee to create CHARIS). In 1977, it was joined by an international committee to supervise its work, which later became the ICO Council, with the responsibilities of working with Suenens in his capacity as episcopal adviser to the office; of overseeing communications between the ICO and the Vatican, and of sponsoring and planning international events, particularly in developing countries. Soon the ICO became influential not only for its managerial skills and coordination responsibilities, but also because local leaders around the world sought to keep in touch with it as a source of information, teaching and orthodoxy. In its initial efforts, its most far-reaching and essential success was the international leaders' conference in Grottaferrata and then Rome, and eventually it was also well known for its training programmes. If at an earlier stage it was mostly funded by the US via the NSC and staffed by North Americans, it progressively became more international and forcefully closer to the Vatican's aspirations, as seen under Cordes's mandate. Its papal recognition through the Pontifical Council for the Laity in 1993 as a private association of the faithful can be seen as part of a disciplining process of the entire Catholic Charismatic movement.

52. Steve Clark's book *Unordained Elders and Renewal Communities* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976) contributed to increase the theological and ecclesiological tensions between SOS and the Vatican (and, as seen before, between Clark and Suenens as well).

Conclusion

From a broader perspective, the Catholic Charismatic movement fits perfectly within several deep and irreversible changes affecting Christianity in the twentieth century, which touched Catholicism as well. The process called by sociologists “pentecostalization” or “charismatization” of Christianity has been well explored, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere. The CCR can be considered the Catholic answer to this dynamic.

The reflections proposed here have primarily sought to offer a general view that takes into account the different historical and geographical dynamics of the CCR, but also that combines the vision of the centre – Rome – with that of the peripheries – primarily North American Catholicism. As documented in simplified form, a process of “Romanization”, which characterized the first decades of the CCR, was eventually replaced by a stronger control by the Vatican in a disciplining effort which was more appropriate to John Paul II’s ecclesiology and pastoral vision. The diversity of approach between Suenens and Cordes says something not only about the difference of their personalities, but also about the historical development of the Catholic Church and American Catholicism as a whole from the immediate end of Vatican II to the late 1980s. This supports the idea that the Catholic Charismatic movement is an important lens through which to explore Catholicism in its global dimension.

To conclude, with reference to the title, the United States and US Catholicism were the starting points of the Catholic Charismatic movement. Thanks to León Joseph Suenens, Catholic Charismatics for the first time passed by Rome, but they didn’t stop for long, just long enough to make themselves known, and they continued their development despite Rome. During the 1980s, by contrast, with Paul Josef Cordes, Rome took the reins, becoming the centre, at least for a large part of the renewal.

In recent years, within Pope Francis’s pontificate, the context has profoundly changed. Catholic Charismatics are nowadays numerically more visible in the Southern Hemisphere, and Europe – and perhaps we can dare to claim the Vatican itself – is not the centre of Catholicism anymore. Surely, a new phase for Catholic Charismatics has already started.

Acknowledgements

This article is an offshoot of the project “The Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR): An Historical Analysis Between US and Europe”

(CAT-CAM), which has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 654994.

Bibliography

- Blackebrough, Denise S. *La renovación en el Espíritu Santo: orígenes históricos, marco doctrinal, aspectos eclesiológicos*. Salamanca: Secretariado Trinitario, 2006.
- Brown, Candy Gunther. "Francis MacNutt and the Globalization of Charismatic Healing and Deliverance." In Stan Chu Ilo (ed.), *Pentecostalism, Catholicism, and the Spirit in the World*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019.
- Bulger, James Joseph. "Unity in the Spirit: Contributions of the Charismatic Renewal to Ecumenism". Senior thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2014.
- Chesnut, Andrew R. *Competitive Spirits: Latin America's New Religious Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ciciliot, Valentina. "The Origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (CCR) in the United States: Early Developments in Indiana and Michigan and the Reactions of the Ecclesiastical Authorities". *Studies in World Christianity* 25.3 (2019): 250–73. <https://doi.org/10.3366/swc.2019.0267>
- Clark, Steve. *Unordained Elders and Renewal Communities*. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- Cleary, Edward. *The Rise of Charismatic Catholicism in Latin America*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813036083.001.0001>
- Cordes, Paul Josef. *Charismatic Renewal: A Balancing Force in the Church Today*. South Bend, IN: Greenlawn Press, 1985.
- Cordes, Paul Josef. *Tre papi: La mia vita*. Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo, 2015.
- Dolan, Jay P. *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195069269.001.0001>
- Fogarty, Gerald P. *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982.
- Hamilton, Elizabeth. *Cardinal Suenens: A Portrait*. London: The Catholic Book Club, 1975.
- Hitchcock, James and Bednorski, Gloriana. *Charismatics: Catholic Perspectives*. Chicago, IL: Thomas More Press, 1980.
- Hocken, Peter. "The Catholic Charismatic Renewal". In Vinson Synan (ed.), *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901–2001*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Küng, Hans. *Disputed Truth: Memoirs II*. New York: Continuum, 2008.
- Massa, Mark S. *The American Catholic Revolution: How the Sixties Changed the Church Forever*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199734122.001.0001>
- Massa, Mark S. *The Structure of Theological Revolutions: How the Fight over Birth Control Transformed American Catholicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190851408.001.0001>
- Maurer, Susan A. *The Spirit of Enthusiasm: A History of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1967–2000*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010.

- McAvoy, Thomas T. *The Americanist Heresy in Roman Catholicism 1895–1900*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963.
- McDonnell, Kilian (ed.). *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, vol. 1*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980.
- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- Moore, S. David. *The Shepherding Movement: Controversy and Charismatic Ecclesiology*. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Nabhan-Warren, Kristy. *The Cursillo Movement in America: Catholics, Protestants, and Fourth-Day Spirituality*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2013. https://doi.org/10.5149/9781469607177_Nabhan-Warren
- O'Connor, Edward. *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*. Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1971.
- Ranaghan, Kevin and Ranaghan, Dorothy. *Catholic Pentecostals*. Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1969.
- Robeck, Cecil M., Jr. "McDonnell Kilian". In Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (eds), *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Scanlan, Michael. *Let the Fire Fall*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servants Books, 1986.
- Schreck, Alan. *A Mighty Current of Grace: The Story of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal*. Frederick, MD: The Word Among Us Press, 2017.
- Smith, Brian. *Streams of Living Water: Autobiography of a Charismatic Leader*. Brisbane: Comsoda Communications, 2000.
- Suenens, León Joseph. *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978.
- Suenens, Léon Joseph. *Memories and Hopes*. Dublin: Veritas, 1992.
- Suenens, León Joseph. *The Hidden Hand of God: The Life of Veronica O'Brien and Our Common Apostolate*. Dublin: Veritas, 1994.
- Synan, Vinson. "Kansas City Conference". In Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (eds), *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Tipografia Vaticana. *Il Pontificio Consiglio per i Laici*. Città del Vaticano: Tipografia Vaticana, 2012.