

VALENTINA CICILLOT

The Origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal in the United States: Early Developments in Indiana and Michigan and the Reactions of the Ecclesiastical Authorities¹

ABSTRACT

The origins of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal (hereafter, CCR) can be traced to Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, PA), in 1967, when two Catholics were baptised in the Holy Spirit. The movement soon spread to the University of Notre Dame (South Bend, IN), Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI) and the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI), all of which became centres of the expanding renewal. Here were the first organisational forms of the movement, such as the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee (CCRSC, later NSC), and several other organised attempts at outreach, such as the Notre Dame Conferences. This article analyses the initial Catholic charismatic experiences in Indiana and Michigan, the formation of

Studies in World Christianity 25.3 (2019): 250–273

DOI: 10.3366/swc.2019.0267

© Valentina Ciciliot. The online version of this article is published as Open Access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction provided the original work is cited. For commercial re-use, please refer to our website at: www.eupublishing.com/customer-services/authors/permissions
www.eupublishing.com/swc

the first charismatic communities and the immediate reaction of the ecclesiastical authorities. While the Catholic hierarchy initially distanced itself, this approach was later superseded by the legitimisation of the movement, which was achieved due to the work of a number of theologians who located the movement's religious practices within the tradition of the Church, to Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens's work of mediation between the CCR and the Vatican and to Pope Paul VI's welcome offered to Catholic charismatics at the Grottaferrata Conference (Italy) in 1973.

Keywords: Catholic charismatic renewal, Catholic Pentecostal movement, Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, covenant communities, United States, University of Notre Dame

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1973, Fr Michel Dubois, a priest from Belgium, was introduced to The Word of God charismatic community in Ann Arbor, Michigan, as someone who had come from Europe to experience the Catholic charismatic renewal 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 approximately five-day 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. Few in the community knew who he was, and his plan for anonymity worked well enough that he was able to have a personal encounter with this new movement in the US, known at that time as Catholic Pentecostalism (later it was widely known as the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, hereafter CCR).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 recognised 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 willingness to assist them.³ The long-term results were obvious as time went on. 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. At the main altar of St Peter's Basilica, Suenens gave his famous official speech calling the renewal 'une chance pour l'église'.⁴ Eventually, he was appointed by Paul VI as a special advisor 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 made up of theologians and leaders of the CCR which produced six documents – known as the Malines Documents – as guidelines for the Catholic charismatic movement.⁵ That period – the second half of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s – was the golden era of the charismatic movement, which was expanding not only throughout North America but also in Latin America, Europe and the rest of the world, gradually acquiring particular indigenous traits and becoming a movement that today has more than 160 million followers.⁶

The focus of this article is to explore the emergence and institutionalisation of CCR in North America, particularly in the US Midwest, and its growing interactions with the wider Church. In fact, the academic historiography of CCR has not properly taken into account the development of the early organisational structures of the movement and the reaction of the ecclesiastical authorities toward it.⁷ Although popular 'insider' historical works, such as the books by Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan and Fr O'Connor, offer insights, these can be considered as primary sources rather than historiographical material.⁸ Also, US historians have paid little attention to the origin of the Catholic charismatic movement, and their research has focused chiefly on its impact on American Catholic laity.⁹ Certainly the development of lay spirituality and lay interaction with social structures in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s forms an essential background to the rise of a charismatic spirituality among Catholics, but a much wider range of factors was involved.¹⁰ Precisely because the significant role of North American lay charismatic leadership, in conjunction with the work of Cardinal Suenens, shaped the history of the charismatic renewal within the Catholic Church, resulting in its early legitimisation and its transnational diffusion, it is worthwhile investigating this story.

DEVELOPMENTS AT NOTRE DAME/SOUTH BEND AND IN ANN ARBOR

It has been well documented that the CCR began in February 1967, at Pittsburgh's Duquesne University (PA), when a history professor,

William Storey, and a graduate student, Ralph Kiefer, were baptised in the Holy Spirit in a charismatic prayer group of Episcopalians. Through personal contacts, the experience of the baptism in the Holy Spirit soon spread to the University of Notre Dame, then to Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI) and then to the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI) and many other parts of the US.¹¹ Beginning in 1967, at an ever-increasing number of locations, regular prayer meetings, usually weekly, and sometimes covenant communities developed, often with many college students participating from the outset. In spring 1967, charismatic Catholics in South Bend and the University of Notre Dame decided to hold a meeting, which was named the 'Michigan State Weekend' and known in retrospect as the 'First International Conference' of the CCR. A group of Catholic charismatics from Michigan State came to the Notre Dame campus to pray, discuss, share stories and celebrate with local Indiana participants. The yearly successors of this conference grew to become multilayered events by which Catholic charismatics fostered and maintained their existence in a self-conscious way. These conferences were held at Notre Dame every year until the 1980s (with a few exceptions, such as the 1975 conference held in Rome) and were internationally respected events during which charismatic spirituality could be spread to committed participants and to newcomers. They were also an opportunity for theologians and a wide variety of charismatic leaders from within the movement to meet together, discussing the progress of the movement and their deepening understanding of its patterns and impact, and devising ways to legitimise their evolving experience and structures within the tradition and structure of the Catholic Church.

In 1969 the leaders who gathered at the Third International Conference agreed to establish a formal office, the Communication Center (CC), that would, among other things, publicise the CCR and establish itself as a source of trustworthy information about baptism in the Spirit, group prayer meetings and the biblical and theological foundations of a charismatic spirituality. At the same meetings, leaders also established the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee (CCRSC, later shortened to National Service Committee (NSC)), with the aim of providing services such as organising conferences for the public and for leadership training, publishing the magazine *New Covenant* and other promotional literature and working to keep Catholic charismatics connected to one another. Fully functioning by 1970, these services were early developments in structuring the CCR movement,

with a primary focus on the North American experience. In 1972 leaders established an International Communication Office (ICO), later International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Office (ICCRO), as a communications organisation which could manage several layers of worldwide administration, intergroup and communities' relations, and set up benchmarks for all charismatic prayer groups and communities in the Church. As they developed, these services were staffed primarily by members of the charismatic groups at Notre Dame (first the True House community and subsequently the People of Praise community in South Bend) and in Ann Arbor (The Word of God community).

Some of the basic organisational principles and ideation of the CCR reflected the influence of the Cursillo movement, at that time a successful and growing movement in the US, particularly in the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend (where Notre Dame is located) and in the Diocese of Lansing.¹² As it happened, many of the early charismatic leaders were active in the Cursillo programme in South Bend, had received extensive training, had formed personal relationships, and were committed to renewal in the Church before the CCR began. The connection between the Cursillo and the CCR must be highlighted, since it has not yet been adequately appreciated. For example, Ralph Martin and Steve Clark worked for the National Secretariat of the Cursillo between 1965 and 1970, and Paul DeCelles, professor of physics at the University of Notre Dame and later one of the main leaders in the People of Praise community, headed the movement in the South Bend area. Through the Cursillo, many of those who eventually became leaders in the CCR already saw themselves as possible agents of renewal and change within the Church, as lay activists. The relationship was so tight that the majority of the attendees at the so-called first Notre Dame charismatic conference in 1967 were simultaneously involved in charismatic prayer meetings and in the Cursillo (or the Antioch Weekend, which was a shorter form of the Cursillo, designed for college students).¹³ Despite the differences and the subsequent initial distrust evidenced by some Cursillo members towards the Catholic charismatic movement, the spiritual and also organisational background of the Cursillo is, in fact, evident throughout the first phase of the CCR. Consider, for example, the key features in the North American Cursillo, particularly in the Midwest, such as the focus on the Holy Spirit and a decisive faith experience in an encounter with Christ, ecumenism, work for renewal of the Church, desire for community, and lay activism, and the development of the same features within the CCR. What is

noteworthy is that the early institutional forms of the CCR, with which it was endowed in a voluntarist but not purely accidental way, played a key role in defining the initial patterns of leadership. Early CCR leaders were North American and were therefore at home in moulding the movement as a North American renewal, but over time this North American influence was apparent in the rest of the renewal as well.

At the same time, considering the importance of this Catholic charismatic leadership on the larger scale does not contradict the fact that, for most prayer groups, contact with national CCR leaders was rare, perhaps occurring only at a conference once or twice a year. In fact, the charismatic renewal was a grass-roots movement with little effective leadership for many years. However, although national leaders had little impact on the day-to-day experience of people in the prayer groups, they did slowly but progressively have a definable impact and wield an important influence on the public face of the CCR, particularly when it came to developing general principles in the areas of ecumenism, relations with the Church, and theological distinctions.

The leadership role gradually undertaken by the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee can be understood by reference to the letters that local community leaders wrote to CCRSC members, often requesting a piece of pastoral and theological advice on such matters as how to establish prayer groups, how to guide people into baptism in the Holy Spirit, how to manage communities, or how to resolve conflicts. Similarly, local leaders were eager to know if this or that group or this or that conference or other charismatic activity was supported by the committee, as a sort of 'certification of legitimacy'. To cite one example, in a letter to Charismatic Renewal Services (CRS was the corporate name of the services offered by the CCRSC), received on 3 July 1972, Doug Bridges, a leader of a prayer community in Lantzville, Canada, asked for information regarding a Canadian national conference being organised by William Turner, a leader in Ontario. Bridges wrote, 'Before taking any action, we are anxious to know whether you are aware of this movement, is it connected in any way with Notre Dame and whether anyone in your communities will be working with them?'¹⁴

Evidently, some connection with the Notre Dame people was seen as providing a sense of security, legitimacy and orthodoxy to far-flung prayer groups. This also seems to illustrate the progressive construction

of the 'Notre Dame–Ann Arbor model' – a model which was recognised from below, by local leaders around North America, as a guarantee of legitimacy, but was also consolidated from above, by the evolution of a strong leadership that was adopting large-scale organisational tools, such as publishing and distributing manuals for the Life in the Spirit Seminar,¹⁵ along with preparing and distributing other publications and cassette tapes and organising and staffing regional leaders' conferences, theological seminars and spiritual retreats. In addition, various leaders from Indiana, Michigan and other locations travelled around the US and abroad to promote and bolster the movement. Finally, it is safe to say that, although the CCRSC could not command, it could definitely influence and convince.

Even so, these early leaders did not escape criticism from within the CCR itself. There was a minority perception, expressed by some local leaders of prayer meetings, that they were attempting to centralise the CCR and even to build up a sort of parallel church with a parallel hierarchy of authority. It was not by chance that Ann Arbor was later called 'the charismatic Vatican' and that a number of Catholic theologians expressed their concerns about the possible development of para-ecclesial structures and eventual sectarianism. For example, a meeting in Costa Mesa (CA) on 20 August 1972 illustrates a level of disagreement among local leaders with respect to collaborating with Notre Dame and the Service Committee, with some of them expressing a willingness to do 'their own thing' without the interference of a powerful and monolithic structure such as they perceived the Ann Arbor–Notre Dame model to be.¹⁶ The centralisation issue is still vivid in a fairly long correspondence between James (Jim) Byrne, a leader of True House, and Fr Joseph Lange, a charismatic leader in Allentown, Pennsylvania. In supporting his idea on regionalisation and a less centralised organisation for the CCR, Fr Lange suggested a sort of comparison between the Service Committee and the Roman Curia:

I'm somewhat disturbed by the approach of the Service Committee primarily because it seems to be directive. I think all of us are grateful when anyone offers service. A regional leaders conference offered by the Service Committee would be welcome. On the other hand, there seems to be a tinge of 'we'd like to keep this thing under our control' in the statement of preferences and the statement of desire of 'we would like to pull things together'. It immediately conjures up in my mind the images of the old Church ... With reference to regionalization,

what I am trying to say is that I would prefer the Service Committee would take the time and trouble to search out and identify the available leadership in regions, encourage them to do something and offer support. I don't think it needs to be done out of 'Rome'.¹⁷

Likewise, some criticism focused on the obvious pattern of the CCRSC recommending the same leaders and speakers time after time. Some saw this as possible early signs of a dangerous cult of personality, but it was also an issue that brought up questions of self-promotion and 'stardom' for some especially popular leaders. For instance, in March 1972 George Martin, a member of the Advisory Committee, which was an auxiliary committee of the Service Committee, made some half-humorous comments with regard to regional conferences being held for local leaders in the CCR:

No evaluation on regionals, except to say that to the extent there was disgruntlement at the midwest [sic] regional that Steve [Clark] and Ralph [Martin] weren't the speakers, I think that this may be a bad sign. (Next I would expect that everyone would be carrying around 'Quotations from Chairman Steve' and conferences would begin with an honor guard carrying in a portrait of Ralph). The last statement probably should be apologized for, but I have a prejudice that the dangers of even passively letting a cult of personality arise are great enough that positive counteraction is warranted.¹⁸

Similarly, in a letter to Jim Byrne and Joel Kibler, another leader of True House, in March 1973, Fr Edward O'Connor, CSC, a charismatic theologian at Notre Dame, pointedly expressed his growing concern:

I recommend that every effort be made to locate people with a reliable gift of prophecy in other parts of the country, and invite them, rather than relying on the same old group that have been in that position again and again. We are generating too much of an attitude of clique-ishness and of taking the position of a control board, letting only our own voices be heard.¹⁹

Fr Francis MacNutt,²⁰ who was a proponent of the charismatic renewal, particularly with regard to the healing ministry, and who in the 1970s visited different charismatic groups around the country, clearly seized on this issue with two meaningful questions: 'How much to follow the model of others ['the model of Ann Arbor'] – how much pluralism + freedom will there be as the movement develops[?]'²¹

THEOLOGICAL WORKS AND THE LEGITIMISATION OF THE CCR

In spite of this hesitation and criticism, in the 1970s the charismatic communities in Notre Dame, South Bend and Ann Arbor significantly increased and consolidated their leadership positions. In fact, as only one indication of charismatic explosive growth, the number of participants at the annual Notre Dame conferences exponentially increased: in 1967, it was attended by about 90 people; in 1968, 100–150; in 1969, 500; in 1970, 1,500; in 1971, 4,500; in 1972, 11,000–12,000; in 1973, around 22,000.²²

With the rapid development of the renewal, a question of constant concern among the leadership was how to guarantee the legitimacy of the CCR as a Catholic movement. First of all, it is impossible to underestimate the role of several theologians, mainly priests, who at the very beginning studied the history of the charismatic tradition within the Catholic Church, first assessing its orthodoxy, but also warning of possible dangerous tendencies, such as biblical fundamentalism, elitism and emotionalism.

Fr O'Connor was a key figure in this regard. He was a Holy Cross priest, professor in the Theology Department at the University of Notre Dame and author of *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*, published in 1971, which was, together with the book *Catholic Pentecostals* by South Bend leaders Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, one of the very first published attempts to explain and historicise the movement. He was also a member of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee from its beginning until the end of 1973. O'Connor was not only a guide for students and members of the Notre Dame-centred True House community, such as Jim Byrne, Peter Edwards and Joel Kibler, as well as being a public defender of the movement, but above all he was able to communicate effectively with American bishops, sensitising them to appreciate the fact that the CCR was consistent with Catholic theology and had its roots in the tradition of the Church. In addition, he was also the first mediator between the movement's lay leaders and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. His correspondence not only shows his consistent efforts to keep several bishops informed about the CCR, particularly Bishop Leo Pursley of the Diocese of Fort Wayne–South Bend, and his regular efforts to inform his fellow CSC priests and the highest representatives at the University of Notre Dame about the charismatic activities on campus, but also his crucial and fundamental role in the preparation of the American bishops' first statement on Catholic Pentecostalism, issued in 1969.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) assigned the task of preparing a document on Catholic charismatics to its Theological Commission, headed at that time by the bishop of Lansing (MI), Alexander Zaleski, who had also been chairman of the NCCB's Committee on Doctrine since 1966. O'Connor was asked by Zaleski to assemble all the material he could for the theological committee. He sent to Zaleski, among other things, a very effective *ad hoc* document, 'The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church: A Theological Assessment', which was abundantly quoted in the final version of the bishops' statement, as well as other material from Kilian McDonnell, OSB, and George Martin, who both became, as we will see, prominent figures within the movement. The statement, which appeared in the form of a report on the 'Pentecostal Movement of the Catholic Church in the United States', was favourably disposed toward the movement, and its conclusion was 'to allow it to develop'. It prudently encouraged the active participation of priests in CCR prayer groups, recognising the rapidly expanding movement as authentically Catholic, with a strong biblical basis, a good understanding of the role of lay ministry in the church, and an intense search for growth in the spiritual life. Even so, the report did not fail to highlight dangers and risks, such as the problematic search for signs and wonders (most attention focused on glossolalia, or speaking in tongues, prophecy and healing), elitism, sensationalism, emotionalism, biblical fundamentalism, and leaderism.²³

In many respects, as Notre Dame priest Fr James Connelly, CSC, reported, the favourable attitude of the US hierarchy towards the movement was perceived at that time as something unexpected within other Christian denominations, particularly after the reaction against charismatic spirituality expressed by the Episcopal Church in the 1960s.²⁴ His conclusion was that the movement was more easily accepted within the Catholic Church because the Catholic theologians, as opposed to Protestants, stressed a continuity with Church history, showing the importance of the Holy Spirit in Vatican II and the open relationship of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church toward religious experiences similar to the charismatic one.²⁵

Eventually, Fr O'Connor's resignation from the CCRSC in late 1973 caused a minor crisis among Catholic charismatics, partly because the reasons he expressed for his resignation concerned the CCR leaders' authority and to a certain extent the soundness of the movement as a whole as a Catholic entity. Despite the fact that O'Connor's motivations were complex and also affected by personal interrelationships with the

other leaders of the movement, there is no doubt that one of the driving factors was his concern about the position that the Service Committee was taking, 'a position of unchallenged leadership that thrusts upon it the burden, the responsibility and the temptation of providing spiritual guidance for many thousands of people'. According to him, the Service Committee was:

too young and too rich in potential for any one body to be able to draw up a simple blueprint for it now. There is need of a diversity of approaches to it and of caution in our statements about it. I fear also that what began as service may be shifting subtly and unconsciously into a kind of domination. In the eyes of many, the Service Committee seems to have become a kind of private magisterium or pastorate for the Renewal.²⁶

If he had become, in his role as militant theologian within the CCR, the guarantee that the Service Committee worked with a soundly Catholic spirit, he withdrew from it when he no longer felt that he could offer such assurance.²⁷

Reactions to O'Connor's resignation show how much his insights and his work on behalf of the CCR were appreciated and respected in the first phase of its development. His resignation shook up Bishop Zaleski to such an extent that he temporarily suspended some canonical practices undertaken to regularise The Word of God community in Ann Arbor.²⁸ It also resulted in a certain malaise among some local groups, as evidenced by a letter sent to Ralph Martin from Mrs Louise Menard, a reader of *New Covenant*, in November, 1973:

But now that we do know [about O'Connor's resignation], the majority of us here in Northern Ontario, are also deeply disturbed by this news. I cannot believe that we 'Northerners' are the only people involved in the C.C. Renewal, who have deep respect and confidence in Father O'Connor's ability as a servant because of his sound theological background and unquestionable loyalty and devotion to the Church ... Here in the diocese of Timmins, we have in the past three years had great difficulty in involving priests in the C. C. Renewal (we also have a terrific shortage of priests) but the few priests who have become involved, have all been influenced by the Holy Spirit working through Father O'Connor, either by reading his books or listening to his talks on tapes. This news about his resignation has made many of us quite uneasy and we are wondering.²⁹

By the same token, the bishop of Sault Ste. Marie in Canada, Alexander Carter, in November 1973 wrote sadly to O'Connor, expressing his concern: 'Your departure from the Committee removes the reassurance we all had. We shall have our guidelines clear and positive.'³⁰

However, another important step that contributed to legitimising the leadership of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee and the Notre Dame, Ann Arbor and South Bend charismatic leaders was the decision by the Service Committee in 1971 to name Auxiliary Bishop Joseph McKinney of Grand Rapids (MI) as episcopal advisor to the CCR, and in 1973 to name as its theological advisor Fr Kilian McDonnell, OSB, a theologian and director of the Collegeville Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research (and at that time non-charismatic).³¹ Their work consisted in providing the charismatic leaders with pastoral and theological support and in promoting within the CCR a sound Catholic theology and solid relationships with the American hierarchy and eventually with the Vatican.

Bishop McKinney, who was soon called 'Mr Charismatic Renewal' and 'orthodox watchdog for charismatic Catholics',³² was the first auxiliary bishop to speak in favour of the CCR and to spread it among his fellow priests and bishops through meetings, retreats and conferences. Like many other charismatic leaders, he was involved in the Cursillo in the 1960s, turning to charismatic spirituality thanks to a retreat organised by Fr George Kosicki, a Basilian who was a skilful promoter of the movement among the US hierarchy in the first decades of the CCR's history.³³ McKinney collaborated in different ways with Fr Kosicki's Bethany House of Intercession, a community of priests interceding for fellow priests with a charismatic approach, based in Providence, Rhode Island. His role as a representative of the US hierarchy with regard to the charismatic movement, although it had never been recognised as official, was central in initial contacts with the Vatican.

A picture of incertitude and naïveté in approaching the Vatican milieu is recognisable in the following episode. McKinney was invited to participate in the Grottaferrata Conference in October 1973 by Catholic charismatic leaders. He made sure to notify the Revd James S. Rausch, general secretary of the NCCB, who apparently did not know anything about it. In answering Rausch's letter, McKinney expressed his feelings that Rome would soon be taking a definite interest in the renewal, and the American bishops might then find themselves in an embarrassing position because of their silence (in fact, as will be seen below, no official

position had been taken since the 1969 statement, which in 1972–3 was considered out of date and insufficient by many prelates, due to the constant development of the movement). McKinney wrote that he would have decided to attend the meeting simply ‘to save the American hierarchy embarrassment. Cardinal Suenens and Archbishop Hayes (Halifax, Nova Scotia) are going to attend so I felt it imperative that a member of the American hierarchy be there.’³⁴ A proposal for an ‘official’ way to proceed arrived later, in July, when Rausch thanked McKinney for sharing his information, suggesting that he communicate to the Holy See his participation in the conference via Jean Jadot, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States from 1973 to 1980, and making ‘it clear that the Bishops’ Conference has not elaborated any special machinery for dealing with the Charismatic Renewal, but it has acknowledged your designation by the charismatics as their episcopal advisor’.³⁵

Eventually McKinney decided to address Pope Paul VI directly with a personal letter in August 1973 – but without acting entirely on a personal basis, given that he sent a draft of the letter to Archbishop Cardinal John J. Krol of Philadelphia (PA) and Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit (MI) for approval. The Pope instructed Cardinal Giovanni Benelli to answer. Paul VI was ‘happy for the highly-valued direction that you [McKinney] have given as Episcopal Advisor to the leaders with whom you have been in contact’, and he knew ‘that this has been done with attentive and solicitous pastoral care in union with the Hierarchy’. He was also ‘over gratified for your [McKinney’s] willingness to keep the Holy See informed of the developments that occur’, but ‘at the same time it is necessary to emphasise the necessity of your constant pastoral care as Episcopal Advisor, exercised together with that of the Hierarchy, so that every activity and experience in this Renewal may be in perfect conformity with authentic Catholic teaching and may promote the living oneness of ecclesial communion.’³⁶

These words reported by Benelli seem to contain a summary of the whole story: despite the fact McKinney had actually saved the US Catholic hierarchy from the embarrassment of not having any members present at the first meeting of the Pope with Catholic charismatic leaders, most of whom were North Americans, the Pope was careful to reiterate his position that an auxiliary bishop who was involved in the movement and played a mediating role with the Vatican must exercise this function together with the whole hierarchy (in fact,

he twice repeated the words ‘Episcopal Advisor’ and ‘with the hierarchy’), monitoring primarily the orthodoxy of the movement. However, this episode also shows how McKinney constantly advocated for Rome’s recognition and the legitimisation of the CCR. Subsequently he also tried to mediate tensions and preserve unity when the two main communities, The Word of God and the People of Praise, in the late 1970s clashed and took different paths.³⁷

Likewise, since the beginning of the movement Kilian McDonnell had recommended to Catholic charismatic theologians that they use the categories of their own theology, not borrow concepts and terminology from Pentecostalism, in an attempt to locate the new spirituality solidly within the Catholic tradition.³⁸ He continued to give a ‘theological stability’ to the renewal by supporting the work of the theologians involved in it who had gathered together once a year since 1969, when they first met at St. Benedict’s Abbey in Benet Lake, Wisconsin.³⁹ He was also the author of the ‘Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal’, a concise document presented and circulated during the Grottaferrata Conference which had been suggested by Suenens and signed by many Catholic theologians involved at different levels in the movement.⁴⁰ Mostly he intervened to clarify the ecumenism that the movement was theorising about and practising, insisting on the difference between ecumenism and non-denominationalism.⁴¹ The same concern and a clear distinction between the two terms are also present in the second Malines Document. This is not surprising, since Suenens called on McDonnell to collaborate on the document in Brussels, to the point that it seems that the document was initially written by McDonnell himself. As will be seen briefly below, some disagreements between the two men would lead to the publication of two separate volumes, both in 1978: that of McDonnell for an American audience, *Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism*, and that with Suenens as sole author, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal*, which is the second Malines Document.

CARDINAL SUENENS’ ‘POLICY OF PRESENCE’

Cardinal Suenens first heard about the charismatic renewal from Veronica O’Brien,⁴² a close associate, who travelled to the US in November 1972, and had conversations with a number of charismatic leaders, in particular Ralph Martin in Ann Arbor and Kevin Ranaghan in South Bend.⁴³ The Cardinal’s first contact with Catholic charismatics came on a visit to New York in early 1973, and later that year,

as described above, he decided to visit the Ann Arbor community as a priest in disguise.⁴⁴ His concerns about the potential isolation of the movement and his urgency about giving it a 'go-ahead' push resulted in the Grottaferrata Conference, referred to earlier, in October 1973. As Suenens wrote in his memoirs, O'Brien worked with Cardinal Benelli 'to ensure that the Holy Father's attitude to the Renewal was one of benevolent neutrality, in contrast to the hostile reactions of those around him and in the United States', and together they opted for Grottaferrata as a more neutral venue than Rome. They also obtained a private audience for charismatic leaders with the Pope himself. In his turn Suenens kept Paul VI informed of developments.⁴⁵

The 'policy of presence' or of actively 'being among them' pursued by Suenens was clearly several steps beyond the 'wait and see' policy recommended by the American bishops in their 1969 statement. As a matter of fact, the difference in the Cardinal's attitude is perfectly summed up by several American bishops' statements. For example, Bishop Leo Pursley, when he later recalled his attitude toward the renewal in the early years, explicitly affirmed, 'I have followed a policy of watchful waiting',⁴⁶ and Cardinal Dearden affirmed, in answering Luigi Raimondi's request that the US Episcopal Conference remain vigilant on the various manifestations of Pentecostalism in general, and Catholic Pentecostals in particular, 'as you can see, he [John F. Whealon, chairman of the Committee on Doctrine] recommends that we should continue our policy of simply observing the Movement, without either approving or disapproving it.'⁴⁷ As already mentioned, by 1972 the statement on the Catholic charismatic movement issued in 1969 appeared out of date and lacking sufficient theological evidence either to condemn or to approve the movement. Several bishops asked for a further study with the aim of updating their position.⁴⁸ Officially, the request for a new appraisal of the CCR was made by Bishop John R. Quinn, chairman of the Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices, and in fact the responsibility for preparing the new guidelines was assigned to him in 1972. For this new appraisal Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin sent a questionnaire to all the US bishops. However, as it is possible to read in a letter to McKinney, who asked for the result of this survey: 'Most Ordinaries who replied, while far from dissatisfied with the movement, felt that the neutral stance recommended by the Committee on Doctrine is the correct one.'⁴⁹ In other words, the majority of the US prelates supported a cautious and relatively disengaged approach to the Catholic charismatics.

In stark contrast, Suenens perfectly expressed his alternative position in a letter to Paul VI of 24 July 1974:

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 laity are anxious to receive. There is a temptation for local priests to remain uninvolved and simply to observe, with more or less benevolence, on the pretext that their bishops are also merely observing as they wait instructions from Rome. This 'wait-and-see' policy cannot last, and could in itself bring about errors due to the faulty communication.⁵⁰

The leaders in Ann Arbor promoted Suenens' direct involvement, but this intervention was neither unanimously accepted nor guaranteed. Plans for Suenens' presence at the Notre Dame Conference in 1973 were debated.⁵¹ On 20 February 1973 Jim Byrne wrote to all the members of the Service Committee to discuss the organisation of the Conference. Under the label 'special problem' he disagreed with Ralph Martin about inviting Cardinal Suenens, affirming:

I think that this requires very careful consideration. The Cardinal stands for a number of things in the Church and with the hierarchy and the Vatican. By associating ourselves with him, we are saying something about ourselves. I am inclined to think that it would be a serious mistake to tie ourselves to his star. I believe that we should not invite him at this time, but wait until others of prominence in the Church can be invited as well.⁵²

In spring 1973 the Jesuit Charles (Charlie) Arnold-Bell, a priest from New York City who was active in the charismatic community at Fordham University, wrote to Byrne to express concerns regarding Suenens' presence at the June Conference, mainly because the Cardinal was not 'a neutral person in the Church', and he went on to state, 'among a

sizeable group of the Church's most faithful children his name is anathema.' According to Arnold-Bell, accepting the Cardinal as the main speaker would have alienated bishops, clergy and laity. In reassuring him, Byrne tried to say that 'there is another side of things', that the Cardinal decided on his own to attend the conference, which was after all a public event, and the Service Committee chose not to prevent his attendance. In addition, O'Connor and Byrne apparently spent an afternoon with the Cardinal when he was visiting Ann Arbor and 'both of us left convinced that what had taken place was the will of the Lord.'⁵³ In that summer, O'Connor wrote to Ralph Martin, still expressing his disagreement with Suenens' involvement:

I would like to reiterate strongly my conviction that it would be a serious mistake for us to take Cardinal Suenens as the standard-bearer of the Renewal among the hierarchy. Whatever be said about his personal dispositions, he has an image acquired through his activities over the years, and this public image is a weighty factor to be reckoned with. It is the image of a man who has taken a public stand of disagreement with the Holy Father on weighty issues after the Pope had pronounced himself solemnly ... The patronage of such a man will alienate important sectors of the Church from the Renewal, and link the Renewal up with an attitude which I believe the majority of people in it would eschew.⁵⁴

Although one can explain O'Connor's reluctance by noting the different theological orientations of the two – O'Connor was known for his conservatism, while Suenens was part of the progressive wing within the Roman Curia – and his fear regarding the relationship between the Cardinal and the Pope after the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, these are not the only plausible explanations. In a later correspondence between McDonnell and McKinney, when McDonnell was in Brussels working with Suenens on the second Malines Document on ecumenism, the signs of a deeper rift can be glimpsed. In December 1977 and in January 1978, in discussing McDonnell's problems with Suenens, or more accurately with Veronica O'Brien, McKinney stated that 'as much as I admire the Cardinal, I do have to say that I have reservations about his style of dealing with the Renewal. The Cardinal-protector concept does not exactly set well with me,' and later:

I understand that Veronica O'Brien played a key role in the whole difficulty, whatever it is. I believe that she is the real "chink" in the

Cardinal's armor ... I guess, while I appreciate the very significant contribution that Cardinal Suenens is making to the Renewal, I know that I basically do not believe in his style. There is too much of a tendency to be manipulative, from my point of view.⁵⁵

Finally, in a letter to Fr Tom Forrest, president of the ICCRO (formerly ICO), dated 9 November 1982, McKinney again expressed his views of years earlier: 'I, myself, continue to have great difficulty with what I would call the Cardinal Suenens approach that seems to fall more under the label of Cardinal protector than that of shepherd willing to walk with his sheep and discern with them as they make their pilgrimage through life'.⁵⁶

Here Bishop McKinney's thoughts open up the possibility of a broader reflection on these historical dynamics. Perhaps there is a glimpse into the differences between North American and European Catholicism (or, more properly, 'Roman' Catholicism): a divergence of 'style', perhaps a 'cultural' divergence, but also an ecclesiological divergence regarding the respective roles of the laity, the clergy and the magisterium, a divergence which had established itself above all after Vatican II and particularly after the debate on the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, which had been considered to be very harsh in the United States.⁵⁷ The support of Rome, which was initially requested as a form of legitimisation by some Catholic charismatic leaders after legitimisation was not forthcoming from the North American ecclesiastical hierarchy, would come with a heavy price tag – potential control and centralisation.

The reins, however, were now in the hands of a cardinal, and in any event the Vatican would not have waited much longer to publicly show its favour towards a lay movement that was spreading like wildfire on every continent. It was in connection with the Rome International Charismatic Renewal Conference in 1975 that Suenens, apparently at O'Brian's suggestion, proposed that the International Communication Office be moved to Brussels (and later to Rome) and also that a covenant community be established in Belgium that included members of the People of Praise and The Word of God who moved there from the US. It took a while for all the relevant North American bodies to agree to these changes and for the various organisational arrangements to be made. This involved Ralph Martin living outside the United States for several years and Steve Clark and Kilian McDonnell living outside for a year. It also occasioned the organisational changes in 1975–6 that resulted in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee

becoming exclusively a North American committee with a different membership. Whether it was simply the need for some kind of international structure that ended the pre-eminent position of the early North American leaders (although in various ways they remained active in the renewal as individuals and often on the Service Committee as well) or whether it was an attempt to align the CCR with the Vatican, the period of exclusively North American leadership was over. Even so, its legacy had shaped and would continue to shape the worldwide charismatic renewal as a whole.

Valentina Ciciliot is a Marie Skłodowska-Curie postdoctoral fellow at Ca' Foscari University, Venice (Italy), and at the University of Notre Dame (US). She is currently researching the origins of the Catholic charismatic movement and its early developments. She is also the author of a book and several articles on Catholic sanctity in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

NOTES

1 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.

2 Testimony of Ralph Martin's. Traces of the story also in Louise Bourassa, 'A Man of the Spirit', *New Covenant* (June 1983): 4–8.

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

4 The expression is also present in Paul VI's speech to Catholic charismatics during the 1975 conference, on May 19: 'Comment alors ce "renouveau spirituel" ne pourrait-il pas être une "chance" pour l'Église et pour le monde? Et comment, en ce cas, ne pas prendre tous les moyens pour qu'il le demeure?': https://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/fr/speeches/1975/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19750519_rinnovamento-carismatico.html (accessed February 2018).

5 The titles and year of issue of the Malines Documents are (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 not included in the collection because it is not directly related to the charismatic renewal; (6) *Resting in the Spirit* (1986).

6 On global expansion see Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Simon Coleman, *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and Thomas J. Csordas, 'A Global Geography of the Spirit: The Case of Catholic Charismatic Communities', *International Social Science Journal* 63 (2012): 171–83. No more recent official statistical data are available. In 2013 *Catholic World Report* estimated 160,000,000 Catholic

charismatics: see http://www.catholicworldreport.com/Item/2269/the_charismatic_renewal_and_the_catholic_church.aspx (accessed February 2018).

7 The only recent academic publication on the history of the Catholic charismatic movement is Susan A. Maurer, *The Spirit of Enthusiasm. A History of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal, 1967–2000* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010), but the author did not use archival material and did not analyse the key events at the University of Notre Dame and in South Bend.

8 Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (Paramus, NJ: Paulist, 1969); Edward O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1971).

9 See James M. O'Toole, *The Faithful. A History of Catholics in America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2010), 227–30, and Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 433.

10 As an example, the CCR has been seen as a 'new form of postconciliar piety' which 'sought for new ways of affiliating and intensifying religious aspirations' in *Prayer and Practice in the American Catholic Community*, ed. Joseph P. Chinnici and Angelyn Dries (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000), especially part 4, 181–289 (citation 267).

11 Among memoirs and first sociological studies there may be noted: Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*; O'Connor, *Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*; Joseph H. Fichter, *The Catholic Cult of the Paraclete* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1975); Kenneth H. McGuire, 'People, Prayer and Promise: An Anthropological Analysis of a Catholic Charismatic Community' (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 1976); Richard J. Bord and Joseph E. Faulkner, *The Catholic Charismatics. The Anatomy of a Modern Religious Movement* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 1983); René Laurentin, *Catholic Pentecostalism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1977); Meredith B. McGuire, *Pentecostal Catholics. Power, Charisma and Order in a Religious Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982); Patty Gallagher Mansfield, *As by a New Pentecost. The Dramatic Beginning of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press of Steubenville, 1992).

12 Cursillo is a Spanish Catholic movement founded in 1944 in Majorca by Eduardo Bonnín Aguiló (1917–2008) with the aim of renewing the church by training Christian leaders. It was imported into the United States in 1957 and was organised on a national basis in 1965. See Kristy Nabhan-Warren, *The Cursillo Movement in America: Catholics, Protestants, and Fourth-Day Spirituality* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), particularly chapter 1, 20–55, and 2, 56–83. For a sociological perspective see Marcene Marcoux, *Cursillo: Anatomy of a Movement. The Experience of Spiritual Renewal* (New York: Lambeth, 1982).

13 The Antioch Weekend was created by Martin and Clark. Jim Cavnar and Fr Charles Harris, CSC, revised the drafts. For some background on the first Catholic charismatic leaders see Jim Manney, 'Before Duquesne: Sources of the Renewal', *New Covenant* (February 1973): 12–17.

14 University of Notre Dame Archives (UNDA), James E. Byrne Papers (JEB), box 1, folder Canada – Corres. 1972, Letter from Doug Bridges to Charismatic Renewal Services, received on 3 July 1972.

15 The Life in the Spirit Seminars are a series of talks and discussions utilised as seven-week preparation for praying to be baptised in the Spirit. See Stephen Clark,

Team Manual for the Life in the Spirit Seminars (Notre Dame, IN: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1971).

16 UNDA, JEB, box 1, folder California (Southern) – Misc. Information on Prayer Groups, Meeting in Costa Mesa, 20 August 1972. See other examples in Letter from Jim Byrne to Jerry and Claire Harvey (leaders of the San Diego Renewal Community), 19 October 1972; Letter from Jim Byrne to Joyce Seiver (leader of the Orange County Renewal Community), 14 August 1972, UNDA, JEB, box 1, folder California (Southern) – (Corres.): Ellingwood, Harveys and J. Seiver; Kortenkamp; L. Kunz; etc.

17 UNDA, JEB, box 1, folder Advisory Committee – I through M 1971–1973, Letter from Joseph Lange to Jim Byrne, 20 October 1971.

18 UNDA, Edward O'Connor Papers (EOC), 1/22, International Conference – 1972, Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee, Comments from the Advisory Committee, 16 March 1972.

19 UNDA, EOC, 1/23, International Conference – 1973, Letter from Edward O'Connor to Jim Byrne and Joel Kibler, 22 March 1973.

20 Francis MacNutt's biography is in http://christianhealingmin.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=488:francis-macnutt (accessed February 2018).

21 UNDA, JEB, box 1, folder Advisory Committee – Father Francis MacNutt 1970–1973, Letter from Francis MacNutt to Jim Byrne, 20 November 1971.

22 Data taken from 'The Charismatic Renewal among Catholics. Data Sheet', January 1973, in UNDA, James T. Connelly Papers (JTC), box 1, folder Chap. 9: Cath. Pentecostals.

23 See the document in Kilian McDonnell (ed.), *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980), 209–10. See also the special issue on the bishops and the CCR in *New Covenant* (September 1971), particularly the 'Report of the American Bishop', 7, and 'Interview with Bishop Joseph McKinney', 10–16.

24 See James T. Connelly, 'Neo-Pentecostalism: The Charismatic Revival in the Mainline Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches in the United States, 1960–1971' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1977). For other statements from different Christian denominations in 1960 to 1974, see also McDonnell (ed.), *Presence, Power, Praise*, vol. 1.

25 Connelly, *Neo-Pentecostalism*, 289–339.

26 Letter to the Advisory Committee of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee, 20 December 1973. He had already sent a letter to US and Canadian bishops on 25 October 1973, 'A Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee for the Bishops of the United States and Canada'. Both documents in UNDA, EOC, 2/06, Charismatic Renewal and Correspondence – 1972–1973.

27 O'Connor, 'A Statement on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee for the Bishops of the United States and Canada', 2.

28 Letter from Robert D. Lunsford (special diocesan liaison to The Word of God) to Kenneth J. Povish (recently appointed bishop of Lansing), 25 November 1975, in Archives of the Diocese of Lansing (ADL), Charismatic Renewal, folder Word of God 1974–1976.

29 *New Covenant* did not report news stories, and no statement about the resignation had been issued by the CCRSC. Cf. UNDA, EOC, 2/13, Resignation of Edward

D. O'Connor, C.S.C. to the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Service Committee – 1973–1975, Letter from Louise Menard to Ralph Martin, 12 November 1973.

30 *Ibid.*, Letter from Alexander Carter to Edward O'Connor, 2 November 1973. Some of his words were also reported in Louise Menard's letters mentioned above.

31 For his biography see <https://collegevilleinstitute.org/residencies/kilian-mcdonnell-writer-in-residence/kilian-mcdonnell/> (accessed February 2018).

32 For example, 'The Bishop and the Charismatics', *The Grand Rapids Press* (23 February 1991).

33 The Revd George Watha Kosicki, CSB, was born in Detroit in 1928 and in 1946 became a member of the Basilian Fathers. He studied theology at St. Basil's Seminary, Toronto, and later became professor of biochemistry at the University of Windsor, Ontario. He was also a member of the CCRSC from 1970 to 1975. Along with Fr O'Connor, he tried to sensitise the ecclesiastical hierarchy regarding the CCR. See his documents and publications sent to the NCCB, Catholic University of America Archives (CUAA), National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1969–1979, Box 120, folder NCCB: Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1969–1971.

34 Archives of the Diocese of Grand Rapids (ADGR), File 1–283, McKinney, Joseph C., Letter from James S. Rausch to Joseph McKinney, 18 June 1973, and Letter from Joseph McKinney to James S. Rausch, 27 June 1973. The documents in this file are from Tom McKinney's collection (Joseph's brother), not inventoried at the time of the archival visit.

35 ADGR, File 1–283, McKinney, Joseph C., Letters from James S. Rausch to Joseph McKinney, 20 July 1973.

36 ADGR, File 1–283, McKinney, Joseph C., Letter from Joseph McKinney to His Holiness Pope Paul VI, 7 August 1973; Letter from Giovanni Benelli to Joseph McKinney, 30 August 1973; Letter from Joseph McKinney to Giovanni Benelli, 13 September 1973.

37 The disagreement between The Word of God and the People of Praise could be explained by a different vision of modernity and authority. The South Bend community was more comfortable in the contemporary culture, while the Ann Arbor community developed an opposition to pluralism and modern society, opposing a strong authority 'flowing through the ranks from powerful leaders'. See Julia Duin, *Days of Fire and Glory. The Rise and the Fall of a Charismatic Community* (Baltimore: Crossland, 2009), 179.

38 See Kilian McDonnell and Arnold Bittlinger, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an Ecumenical Problem* (Notre Dame: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1972), 29–53, particularly 31–2. See also Kilian McDonnell, 'Catholic Pentecostalism', *Dialog* (Winter 1970): 35–54, and Kilian McDonnell (ed.), *The Holy Spirit and Power. The Catholic Charismatic Renewal* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975).

39 Kilian McDonnell, *Catholic Pentecostalism: Problems in Evaluation* (Pecos, NM: Dove Publications, 1970).

40 UNDA, EOC, 1/24, Rome Conference 1973, 'Statement of the Theological Basis of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal'.

41 See Kilian McDonnell, *Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism* (New York: Paulist, 1978), and Léon Joseph Suenens, *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal. Theological and Pastoral Orientations*, Malines Document 2 (Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1978). See also Steve Clark, 'Perspective: Ecumenism', *New Covenant* (July 1979): 22–4.

42 Veronica O'Brien (1905–98) was born in Ireland but lived mainly in France and Belgium. She founded the Legion of Mary in Nevers, France, in August 1940. Eventually she took an active part in the development of the CCR in Belgium, France and the United States, becoming a close friend of Suenens. She was also a special counsellor of the International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Office (ICCRO). In 1982 she founded, with Suenens, Fiat, a Catholic charismatic organisation, the main focus of which is the rosary and devotion to Mary. Suenens wrote her biography in *The Hidden Hand of God. The Life of Veronica O'Brien and Our Common Apostolate* (Dublin: Veritas, 1994). See also <https://associationfiat.com/about-fiat/the-founders/veronica-obrien/?lang=en#> (accessed March 2018).

43 Although Suenens wrote in his *Hidden Hand of God*, 218–24, that it was Veronica who first mentioned to him the Catholic charismatic movement in the early 1970s, there seems to be another version of the facts. Harold S. Cohen, a charismatic Jesuit chaplain at Loyola University and leader of the New Orleans charismatic community, apparently sent some literature about the charismatic renewal to Suenens in the spring of 1969, and he also invited him to the January 1970 leaders' meeting and the Notre Dame conference in June. Other cardinals who passed through New Orleans were informed about the renewal by Cohen, such as Miranda of Mexico, Gray of Scotland and Casariego of Guatemala. In August 1971 Cardinal Casariego had a visit with Paul VI, during which he gave to the Pope some material on the charismatic renewal received from Cohen (see the books by Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, Edward O'Connor and Ralph Martin, along with Patty Gallagher's notes). Paul VI told him that he would have two cardinals study the material and report to the Pope concerning it. It is highly probable that one of the two cardinals was Suenens. See 'Contact with Bishops in New Orleans', *New Covenant* (September 1971): 6, and 'Cardinal Casariego's Visit', *New Covenant* (January 1972): 5. This story is also supported in a letter of 15 July 1971 from Al Mansfield to the CCRSC, in which he wrote that Casariego, *en route* to the Vatican for an audience with Paul VI on 20 August, brought literature on the Catholic Pentecostal movement prepared by Father Cohen, including letters from Cohen and Patty Gallagher, UNDA, EOC, 1/13, Charismatic Renewal – 1971.

44 See Léon Joseph Suenens, *Memories and Hopes* (Dublin: Veritas, 1992), 267–8, and James S. Torrens, 'Admiring Cardinal Suenens: A Report', *America* (22 June 1996): 3–4.

45 Suenens, *Hidden Hand of God*, 225–6.

46 Diocese of Fort Wayne–South Bend Archives (DFWSBA), Bishop Pursley Papers, 1929–1984, box 31, folder 1, Letter from Leo Pursley to Joseph McKinney, 7 June 1975. Pursley's tone was still circumspect and diffident when in April 1976 he wrote to his auxiliary in South Bend, Joseph Crowley, responding to the question of why he decided not to participate in the Notre Dame conference in May: 'I don't feel any urgency about shouting "Praise the Lord" with the Pentecostals', Letter from Leo Pursley to Joseph Crowley, 3 April 1976, DFWSBA, Leo Pursley's papers, Box 20, Folder 57.

47 CUA, Box 120, folder NCCB: Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1969–1971, Letter from John Francis Dearden to Luigi Raimondi, 10 May 1971. Raimondi was Apostolic Delegate to the United State from 1967 to 1973. Jean Jadot was his successor.

48 See CUA, Box 120, folder NCCB: Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1972 Jan – March, Letter from John S. Spence to Joseph L. Bernardin, 7 February 1972.

49 CUAU, Box 120, folder NCCB: Ad Hoc Committee: Catholic Charismatic Renewal 1972, May – Dec, Letter to Kilian McDonnell from Thomas Kelly, NCCB associate general secretary, 12 May 1972.

50 Suenens, *Memories and Hopes*, 270.

51 There was also a misunderstanding as to when the Cardinal would be scheduled to speak at the 1973 Notre Dame conference. UNDA, EOC 2/10, National Service Committee, Center for Communication and Service – 1972–1973, Letter from the International Communications Office to Léon Joseph Suenens, 18 June 1973.

52 UNDA, EOC, 1/23, International Conference – 1973, Letter from Jim Byrne to all the members of the Service Committee, 20 February 1973.

53 UNDA, JEB, box 1, folder B 1971–1973, Letter from Jim Byrne to Charlie Bell, 12 April 1973, and Letter from Charlie Bell to Jim Byrne, 26 March 1973.

54 UNDA, EOC, 1/24, Rome Conference – 1973, Letter from Edward O'Connor to Ralph Martin, 22 June 1973.

55 ADGR, File 1–283, McKinney, Joseph C., Correspondence between Joseph McKinney and Kilian McDonnell, 22 December 1977; 10 December 1977; 7 January 1978; 13 January 1978.

56 ADGR, File 1–283, McKinney, Joseph C., Letter from Joseph McKinney to Fr Tom Forrest, 9 November 1982.

57 An earlier controversy between North American Catholicism and the Vatican arose with the Americanist heresy, about seventy years earlier. See Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982), 115–90, 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.