



Featured in  
this issue:

short  
responses  
to the last  
issue ..... 2

autonomy of  
philosophy  
..... 3

bulletin  
board ..... 12

## Reviving the renewal

by Steve Kroeger

Is the “Catholic Charismatic Renewal” in the late stages of an inexorable decline toward extinction? If so, why?

During the renewal’s first decade of explosive growth, signs and wonders, joy, evangelistic zeal and fervent praise were profusely present. The eighties were a period of gradual decline in numbers, enthusiasm and—in my opinion—the anointing of the Holy Spirit in the “mainstream” of the renewal. This decline has continued to this day. My strong conviction is that it is not because God has chosen to bring this modern day Pentecost to a halt. Rather, I believe that the anointing of the Holy Spirit, with all the glorious benefits He brings, is even more available and powerful now than at the beginning of the Catholic charismatic renewal in the 1960s. This precious gift of the One who loves us is of such an enormous magnitude that it might reasonably be seen as a new Great Awakening—something of which the charismatic renewal was merely a forerunner.

As a student at Franciscan University in the mid-eighties, I was profoundly blessed through the renewal. The worship there at the time was powerful, vigorous and joyful. I met Jesus in an intimate, personal way and fell head-over-heels in love with Him. I experienced the power of the Holy Spirit overwhelmingly, and was graced to share this with others through prayer for healing.

This time of great blessing was directly related to the ministry of the late (and dearly beloved) Evangelical pastor John Wimber. When he ministered, the sick were healed, demons driven

out and a great number of startling manifestations of the Holy Spirit took place (including falling down, shaking, weeping, laughing, etc.). Reactions varied, but most leaders in the renewal eventually acknowledged that God was pouring out His Spirit in an even more powerful way than at first.

The leadership in Steubenville, both in the covenant community and at the University was, however, in my view, rather cool to this new “wave” of the Spirit. The attitude I saw was, “This is all well and good, but God is doing something else here,” or, “We’ve grown beyond that kind of thing now.”

I remember many conversations with older brothers and sisters in the Lord in which they talked nostalgically about the “glory days” of their initial encounters with God, as if it were a thing of the past. They spoke as if a diminishing fervor and experience of the gifts and power of the Holy Spirit went hand-in-hand with a maturing of faith. Personally, I was (and remain) convinced that normal (biblically normal, that is) Christianity includes the manifest working of the Holy Spirit as evidenced in the charismatic renewal. If my experience differed from the New Testament model, I prayed and fasted, calling out to God constantly for His mercy: “Purify my heart! Transform my mind! Heal the sick! Set the captives free! Revive

us, O God!!!” This continues to be my practice to this day, and I never intend to stop.

I believe that the revival of the mid-to-late 1980’s was an invitation from God, our merciful Father, to receive a fresh, fuller outpouring of His Spirit. Missing that grace has had a serious impact on the experience of the renewal in Steubenville, as I perceive it. Elsewhere, it is still going strong.

*See Renewal on page 10*

**This precious  
gift of the  
One who  
loves us  
is of such an  
enormous  
magnitude  
that it might  
reasonably  
be seen as a  
new Great  
Awakening—  
something of  
which the  
charismatic  
renewal was  
merely a  
forerunner.**



## Thanks for the words about Eastern Christianity

My thanks to Anthony Dragani for his thoughtful article on Eastern Christianity. I am continually surprised by how many faithful Roman Catholics have no concept of how diverse our Faith is. Most Roman Catholics seem to think that the Eastern churches are all Orthodox—if they think of them at all. The Eastern Catholic churches have so much to offer all Catholics. I concur with Mr. Dragani when he says that the Eastern Churches, and especially the Byzantine Church (which I attend), offer solutions to the “traditional” versus “progressive” liturgical debate in the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, most of the issues in that debate do not exist at all in the Eastern churches.

I think Roman Catholics would do well to find the Eastern Catholic churches in their area and experience for themselves what is meant by the Universal Church.

Eastern Catholics are very welcoming, and enjoy every opportunity to explain how our one Faith is expressed differently through liturgy and custom. In this new millennium, I hope Catholics from all churches will open heart and mind to achieve true unity in the Faith, a unity through mutual understanding.

*Katherine E. DeLine  
FUS Class of '98*

*Katherine DeLine will be moving to Rome from Denver in a few months. She is to be married in Gaming, Austria in June.*

## Eastern Christianity and Western Liturgical Reform

The readers of the *Concourse* must thank Mr. Dragani for his Eastern Catholic perspective on Church matters. He has identified an important facet of Catholicism for all Western Christians to ponder: the rich, ancient tradition of the Eastern Fathers. His article, however, misses the heart of the debate in the Roman Catholic Church over the liturgy, and misleadingly suggests that one should understand the recent revision of the Roman Rite in terms of Eastern liturgical forms.

There is no doubt, as Mr. Dragani affirms, that part

of the liturgical movement appreciated the Eastern liturgies and looked to them as models. The rich symbolism of the Eastern Rites, especially the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (attended by Byzantine Catholics such as Mr. Dragani), and the participation of the congregation in Eastern liturgies gave hope to many reformers that the Roman Rite could be renewed or even improved. While many of the reforms that ended in the *novus ordo missae* of Paul VI appear Eastern in their inspiration, the transcendent, mystical spirit of the Eastern liturgies is well hidden in the *novus ordo*. Two examples should suffice.

Mr. Dragani mentions the free-standing altar as a reform inspired by the Eastern tradition. But the present use of the free-standing altar in the Roman Rite is hardly Eastern in its spirit. In the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the priest does not face the people during the Eucharistic prayer and is even obscured from the view of the congregation during this time by the iconostasis (the wall of icons). The Eastern tradition emphasizes the separation of the priest from the people in the moment when heaven meets earth during the

*See short takes on page 4*



**Editorial Policy**

*The University Concourse* is an independent journal of opinion published by alumni of Franciscan University for members and friends of FUS and Catholic colleges linked to her by a shared commitment to the life of the mind and the re-evangelization of culture in the new millenium. It is designed to encourage fruitful Christian discourse among university men and women. The views expressed in this journal do not necessarily represent those of the editors, nor those of the faculty, staff or administrators of the various institutions at which it is distributed.

We welcome submissions from students, faculty, alumni, staff, administrators, parents, trustees, benefactors or friends, on any topic of interest to a general university readership, provided that they are courteously expressed and framed with a view to advancing the welfare of FUS and her sister schools and/or Catholic culture at large.

We recommend that opinions be kept to fewer than 2,000 words.

Contributions may be sent to e-mail address [katieandjules@attglobal.net](mailto:katieandjules@attglobal.net) or through our website: [www.TheUniversityConcourse.com](http://www.TheUniversityConcourse.com)

Please include your full name, phone-number and e-mail address if you have one.

We will consider printing opinions anonymously or under a pen name; however, in general, we wish to encourage open "face to face" discussion.

In either case, the editors require the full name and phone number of each opinion.

**Editorial Board**

*Editor*  
Kathleen van Schaijik

*Managing Editor*  
Jules van Schaijik

*Design Editor*  
Justine Schmiesing

*Contributing Editors*  
Ben Brown  
Scott Johnston  
Michael Houser  
Mark Fischer  
Susan C. Fischer  
David Schmiesing

**Board of Advisers**

Dr. John F. Crosby, *Chairman of FUS*  
*Department of Philosophy*

Dr. John Holmes,  
*Professor of English at FUS*

Dominic Aquila,  
*Provost, Ave Maria College*

Dr. Susan Treacy,  
*Assistant Professor of Music at FUS*

Dr. Alice von Hildebrand

Dr. John Carrigg

Fr. Ray Ryland

# The nature and autonomy of philosophy

by John Henry Crosby

Mr. Kellmeyer's recent article criticizing the philosophy department at FUS for its lack of theological awareness, reveals certain deep misconceptions and prejudices which I think far more debilitating to authentic intellectual growth than the lack of theological formation which he alleges to find in FUS philosophy students.

(1) Though Mr. Kellmeyer does not deal specifically with philosophy as a *discipline*, the inadequacy of his conception is evident enough. For however deeply philosophy's task is bound up with that of theology, nevertheless as a *discipline* philosophy is essentially autonomous, having its own unique spirit and methods. Pope John Paul II points to this crucial fact when he writes in *Fides et Ratio*: "...even when [philosophy] engages theology, philosophy must remain faithful to its own principles and methods." (par. 49)

The autonomy of philosophy as a *discipline* implies neither that truths discovered by philosophers are immanent to philosophy (in the manner in which philosophical method is immanent to philosophy) nor that they are contrary to truths discovered by theology. Indeed, it is Truth and Truth alone that acts as the unifying *Telos* among all of the disciplines. My point, however, is that even if philosophy and theology share a common orientation towards Truth, it in no way follows that one discipline can be reduced to the other.

The autonomy of the disciplines, moreover, does not imply that they cannot be checked and guided by each other. The notion of "person," for example, which had its origins in Trinitarian theology, has sparked so much original philosophical work that one can justifiably speak of a Personalist Movement in philosophy. On the other hand, philosophy in many instances guides theological thinking. For instance, lending philosophical terminology to the explanation of the Christian mysteries, e.g., substance in transubstantiation.

Here I reach my crucial point: A recognition of the autonomy of philosophy as a discipline *justifies* the raising of the philosophical question about "egoism" in Thomas's ethics. I must go further: Such questions *must* be asked, not rebelliously or disrespectfully, but

since the integrity of philosophy in its pursuit after Truth *demand*s not only the asking, but more importantly, the tireless repetition of questions, as developments in human experience and understanding shed new light on the perennial problems of philosophy.

Perhaps Mr. Kellmeyer will agree with what I am saying. And yet without seriously emending his conception of philosophy I do not see how he can. As it stands, he seems to think that good philosophers should simply adopt the tenets of Church-favored philosophers without examining them critically. This is nothing less than radically anti-intellectualistic.

(2) Mr. Kellmeyer's conception of philosophy is distorted by a misunderstanding of the relationship between *ecclesiastical authority* and philosophy. For one, he seems to forget that the Church *cannot* enforce adherence to any one philosophical system, for the obvious reason that no single system of human thought could exhaust Truth. This of course is confirmed by *Fides et Ratio*, in which John Paul explicitly states that the Church has no official philosophy (par. 76), even if Thomism has had and continues to have a kind of pride of place.

It is perhaps significant that philosophy usually suffers a slump during periods of heavy-handed ecclesiological involvement in philosophical thinking, such as the largely sterile clerical neo-scholasticism of the 19th century.

(3) Related to my second criticism, Mr. Kellmeyer significantly over interprets the status of Church Doctor, making the common yet very serious mistake of identifying Thomistic teaching with Church teaching. Can he really mean otherwise if he claims

that criticizing Thomas' teaching as egoistic is tantamount to claiming that "the philosophy/theology of the Church is essentially egotistical," or that "the Church's own philosophy/theology is self-contradictory and absurdist"?

(4) While Mr. Kellmeyer admits that Church doctors can make errors, his article implies that such errors are essentially *insignificant*, and that an attack as "sweeping" as egoism is nothing less than an attack on the Church itself. As he writes: "Any FUS person who lays out such a charge is essentially denigrating not only Thomas, but also the Church's understanding of and judgment of Thomas's work."

To me it is not so clear that Mr. Kellmeyer is right in considering egoism so much more "sweeping" than

**[Kellmeyer] seems to forget that the Church cannot enforce adherence to any one philosophical system, for the obvious reason that it would be insanity to think that any one system could exhaust Truth.**

Augustine's teaching on the state of unbaptized children or Aquinas' tri-partite animation theory. Innumerable babies die unbaptized each day and all of us have souls. But even if it were, it is important to recognize that the teaching of the Church certainly does not imply that philosophers are not free to propose fundamental criticisms even of Doctors of the Church.

(5) I have not focused on the problem of egoism in Thomas' ethics since I thought that certain more *fundamental* criticisms of Kellmeyer's article were more to the point. In conclusion, however, I want briefly to clarify the meaning of the term "egoism" as it ought be understood in the context of this discussion. Unfortunately laden with numerous pejorative connotations, the charge of "egoism" should in no way be taken to imply that Thomas advocated selfishness! Such an notion would truly be in fatal conflict with the fact of Thomas' sanctity. But Mr. Kellmeyer clearly does not understand this when he writes that the charge of egoism "assumes that Thomas failed to understand the theological virtue of love..." On the contrary, the charge of egoism against Thomas means that he too exclusively analyzed moral acting in terms of individual happiness and individual moral perfection. Clearly, happiness and perfection are part of the moral life; the charge of egoism, however, is equivalent to asking whether Thomas' conception of moral acting should not per-

haps be expanded, particularly in the light of philosophers who stress the importance of self-transcendence through value-response.

This semester the graduate philosophy students are privileged to be attending a class taught by the eminent Thomist philosopher, Fr. Norris Clarke. Great was my amazement when Fr. Clarke told the class how members of the FUS philosophy faculty had convinced him of an element of *egoism* in Thomistic ethics. Yet instead of burying his head in the sand or wielding the weapons of ecclesiastical authority, Fr. Clarke gladly accepted the criticisms and wrote an article in which he attempted to enrich the Thomistic position in light of what he had gained from his discussions. Now if this is not authentic philosophizing, I do not know what is! It is certainly in the spirit with which Thomas himself philosophized!

In the end, whether or not the criticism of Thomas turns out to be valid, Mr. Kellmeyer ought at least to acknowledge that there is nothing unreasonable or irreligious in raising it. Further, any attempt to stifle its being raised by doctrinal heavy-handedness would impoverish the intellectual life of the Church—theology as well as philosophy. ■

*John Henry Crosby is a student in the FUS MA Philosophy Program.*

You can help support  
the *Concourse*  
by buying books at  
Barnes and Noble  
through our website:  
[www.TheUniversityConcourse.com](http://www.TheUniversityConcourse.com)



## short takes

*Continued from page 2*

Epiclesis. The sense of mystery, awe, and transcendence is profound. Such is hardly the situation in the *novus ordo*. In the *Novus Ordo* the priest faces the people, breaking the ancient Christian liturgical tradition of facing east in worship, and seems more of an uninspired entertainer than one privileged to celebrate the Sacred Mysteries. It is not only traditionalists who have pointed out such things. People as diverse as Cardinal Ratzinger in his new book, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, and Thomas Day in, *Why Catholics Can't Sing*, have made similar critiques of the *novus ordo*.

Mr. Dragani also suggests that the Eastern practice of receiving communion under both kinds while standing was adopted by the reform of Paul VI. Again, this is misleading. The Eastern Catholics who attend the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom receive Holy Communion on the tongue, not in the hand, with their hands crossing their breast as a sign of reverence. They receive by intinction from an ordained minister. The ordained thus fulfill their primary duty of feeding the people the Holy Eucharist. In the present Roman Rite, most Catholics receive the Eucharist in the hand. Then they turn and drink the Precious Blood from a cup. In

most parishes, extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist (who, sadly, are in fact quite ordinary) give communion, and the people make no signs of reverence during or before receiving Christ's body and blood. If the Eastern practice was the model for reform, then something has gone terribly wrong.

The debate over liturgy among Roman Catholics today is primarily about the preservation of the ancient liturgical traditions of the Roman Rite. The mass promulgated by Pope St. Gregory the Great was virtually the same in all its essentials as the mass celebrated until Vatican II. The Eastern Christians, who have so zealously guarded their own liturgical traditions from tampering, should realize that Roman Catholic traditionalists like myself do not ignore the Eastern Rites, but admire them for their adherence to their venerable liturgical traditions. Roman Catholic traditionalists are fighting to restore the traditions of our own Rite. We are not immobilists who want to freeze liturgical development at the Council of Trent, but instead desire a true, organic development of our Rite rather than its whole scale dismantling, which we witnessed after Vatican II. Some may call us close-minded or many other worse things, but we traditionalists desire to worship as our Eastern Catholic brethren do, according to our own traditions. Traditionalists believe that we are being prevented from doing so by intransigent bishops, and those who mistakenly see our criticism of the *novus ordo* as disloyal to the Church.

Adam L. Tate  
FUS Class of '94

## Reflections on the last issue

I would like to comment on several of the articles in the latest issue of the *Concourse*. First, in response to Susan C. Fisher's question, "What is it in the nature of women that makes them prey to the illusion of the 'prince charming'?", I would like to suggest that perhaps we have here the true meaning of the last sentence of Gn 3: 16, "Yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you."

I would also like to add my two cents to Anthony Dragani's article. I agree with him when he says that gaining an appreciation of the Eastern traditions is vitally important. One of the main stumbling blocks to reunion with the Orthodox is the fear of many of them that reunion with Rome will mean the squelching of their traditions. Only by learning to appreciate Eastern Christianity fully can we quell this fear and heal the schism. And only by healing the breach with the Orthodox, who are the closest to us, will we ever be able to reunite with the Protestants.

Lastly, I wish to respond to Steve Kellmeyer's little piece. First of all, I think it is wrong to use one great

Christian thinker to denigrate another. Duns Scotus may not be a saint (yet), but he has been beatified. Furthermore, when everyone (including Aquinas!) rejected the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception, Scotus defended it. To reject him because he is not a Thomist is inexcusable, as would be the reverse.

As far as the charge that the philosophy department fails to provide its students with adequate theological foundations goes, this does not fit with my experience as a philosophy major (and now a grad student) here in Steubenville. I read selections from both Bonaventure's philosophical and theological writings in my Franciscan Philosophy and Medieval Philosophy courses. I audited a Texts of Augustine course (offered by the philosophy department) in which substantial portions of *The City of God* and *De Trinitate* were assigned. On my own initiative, I read both books cover to cover (how many theology majors do that?). In my Texts of Newman class we read twelve or thirteen of his sermons. In Renaissance and Early Modern Philosophy we read Pascal's *Pensees*, which include as much theology as philosophy. In my Epistemology class the professor read us an article by the philosopher Josef Seifert about why we believe in Christ—hardly a non-theological topic. In both my Intro to Philosophy class and my Philosophy of the Person class we were assigned books by C.S. Lewis. I even wrote a paper on *The Abolition of Man*. I am currently in Texts of Karol Wojtyla, and I don't think anyone would question whether that will involve theology as well as philosophy. My Philosophy of Love and Philosophy of Religion classes were deemed to have enough theological content to be cross-listed with theology. No, on the basis of my experience with the philosophy department here I must say that the charge that it fails to provide its students with adequate theological groundings is baseless.

Thirdly, I do not agree that the idea that Thomism is egotistical results either from an appreciation for Scotus or a lack of sound theological foundations. Rather, it comes from a false understanding of the "ethics of eudaimonia" as something self-centered. Furthermore, in my philosophical education here at FUS, I have been given a proper understanding of "eudaimonia" as "fulfillment" rather than "pleasure".

But my most serious contention with Kellmeyer's article is his practical assertion that canonization and the status of Doctor of the Church are conferred infallibly. Have we no understanding of Christian Doctrine? Have we completely forgotten the definition of infallibility at the First Vatican Council? Have we become Ultramontanists? Papal infallibility only operates when the Pope, in the exercise of his office as head of the Church and by virtue of that office, defines for the entire Church a matter of faith or morals. The infallibility

of the entire episcopate also applies only to matters of faith and morals, and only when they are taught “always, everywhere, and by everyone” or defined at a Church Council. Canonization and conferral of the status of Doctor of the Church do not fall under either of these categories.

A canonization is a statement that we have determined, to the best of our ability, that a given person is in heaven, and therefore can legitimately be prayed to. Being raised to the status of Doctor of the Church is simply official recognition that one’s teachings are, in general, in line with Christian doctrine. As Kellmeyer himself notes, this does not mean that someone is free from error. This, to my mind, proves my point. It seems to me that if the status of Doctor of the Church were infallibly conferred, then it could only be conferred on a thinker who never committed a single theological error. If this were the case, though, Aquinas would not have been named a Doctor of the Church in the first place. Remember, he did not hold the Immaculate Conception. Thus, I think that Kellmeyer’s assertion that Aquinas was infallibly canonized and infallibly made a Doctor of the Church is deeply flawed and misleading and undermines the position he himself is defending. It is based on a false and quasi-heretical idea that everything that Rome says is infallible rather than only those things which the Church herself teaches to be infallibly taught.

*Michael Healy, Jr.*  
*FUS MA Philosophy Program*

## **How we should imitate St. Thomas in our philosophizing**

I very much appreciated Dr. Lee’s Volume V, issue 8 article about St. Thomas’ view of love. Related to his point, there are those who seem perhaps overly eager to accept an opinion about St. Thomas that would have him being overly stoic in his affections. This would clearly be a mischaracterization. One only need read the Angelic Doctor’s beautiful prayers with their many heartfelt and very deep expressions of love and tender devotion to dispel any thoughts that he had a wintry heart.

Still, I think Mr. Kellmeyer’s article corroborating Dr. Lee’s concern was off base. Kellmeyer seems to fall into the all too common assumption that St. Thomas’ philosophy and theology is *the* philosophy and theology of the Church. The Church simply is not that tunnel-visioned. St. Thomas himself I think would be appalled at the thought of someone implying that everything must be seen preferentially through his mental glasses alone.

The Angelic Doctor certainly is upheld as a marvelous example of faithful scholarship well done, whom many would do well to imitate. And he achieved a coherent vision amazing in its breadth. But as Dr. White points out (I took a course in Medieval Philosophy with him last semester), the Church does not advocate that everyone be a Thomist. Rather, the Church encourages the study of his work because of its high quality, to help discipline the mind in the rigors of careful logical thinking and so that he might be emulated as to his approach.

St. Thomas himself was influenced by a number of different great thinkers who had something valuable to contribute to man’s understanding of the truth of things. For Thomas, truth was the standard he served. No particular man’s doctrine was the absolute arbiter of the truth of things. So to truly do theology and philosophy “according to the mind of St. Thomas,” means to do as he did: to take from *all* the greats of the tradition, so that in their rubbing together they might add perceptive power and expansiveness to one’s own intellectual vision. (For example Thomas took Aristotle and brought his thought into the West using Revelation as the ultimate guide by which to interpret his work, not vice versa. Augustine and Boethius were brought to bear quite frequently in the process. The intellectual crisis initially brought about by the appearance of Aristotle’s works was in part due to an odd artificial dividing line that was maintained between Aristotelian philosophy and revelation.)

Most, if not all, of the great minds of the Catholic tradition have allowed themselves to be shaped and challenged from several different directions. This provides a powerful stimulus for creativity and movement forward into new and deeper insights. Indeed the dialectical process used by the scholastics involved being so thoroughly familiar with the perspectives of multiple authorities on a given subject that one could competently speak through the mind set of these authorities about a particular issue, showing how they agreed and how they differed, and then offer one’s own conclusion, building upon the greater depth surrounding the matter one had achieved by circumscribing it from different angles.

As Dr. White points out, it is a temptation for lesser minds to simply latch on to the system of one great thinker and try and make his approach answer everything. As great as St. Thomas is, to do this would be a mistake that actually stifles intellectual creativity and genuine progress. The method of St. Thomas himself—to be open to new insight from any direction and to be willing to put forth the effort required to judge things always in the light not of any one person, but in light of Revelation (for before anything, Thomas saw himself as a servant of the gospel)—requires great humility and a



desire to work very hard intellectually from a position of submission to ultimate truth. This humility must always include the frank understanding that *no* system of thought, no matter how excellent, is capable of accurately encompassing all that can be known about God and the world. This I believe is a properly Catholic attitude.

*Scott Johnston*  
*Senior biology and philosophy major*

## **Overbearing theology emasculates philosophy**

It was with dismay that I read Mr. Steve Kellmeyer's article regarding the need of "a better theological base" for the philosophy department at FUS.

As I understand Kellmeyer, his basic claim is that if students in the philosophy programs had a better theological formation, they would never assert such a flagrant falsity as "the philosophy/theology of St. Thomas is essentially egoistical."

I do not intend to deal here with the question of whether or not St. Thomas' thought is in fact "egoistical," nor with the semantics of the term. Rather, I would like to take issue precisely with his comment that the philosophy program at FUS needs "stronger theological underpinnings."

In the first place, what Kellmeyer seems to have in mind by suggesting that the philosophy courses ought to be restructured within acceptable theological parameters, is nothing but the subordination of philosophy to theology whenever these two disciplines are found investigating the same issue. Thus, if theology informs us that St. Thomas' thought is not egoistical, then it is sufficient for the philosopher to accept the judgement of the "Queen of the Sciences." He can then either suspend inquiry into the matter, or he can conduct it in such a way that the results support the previously determined theological position.

Allow me to be blunt: the implementation of this view on the proper relation of philosophy to theology would lead to the complete dissolution of philosophy.

Philosophy, by its very nature as the theoretical, critical, and systematic analysis of the core, autonomously intelligible moments of reality, cannot accept positions as true which have not presented their credentials before the tribunal of reason. To do so would be to forfeit its critical character and hence to leave unfulfilled one of the necessary conditions for the practice of authentic philosophical inquiry.

Furthermore, it is not clear to me that even if one did claim that in some way St. Thomas' philosophy/theology is egoistical that one may therefore be com-

mitted to the position that the philosophy/theology of the Church is essentially egoistical. In *Fides et Ratio*, the Pope rightly states that the Catholic Church has no official philosophy. Indeed, it is beyond the competency of the magisterium to claim that this or that philosophical system or method is the true one. The most that the Church can say is that a particular philosophical position is incompatible with revealed truth. With respect to theology, as far as I know the Church has no official theology either, as one must separate the reflections of theologians from the deposit and lived experience of faith. Thus, the first of Kellmeyer's arguments is not sound because there is no (official) philosophy/theology of the Church that could be described as 'egoistical'.

His second argument, that if one holds that Thomism is an 'egoistical' system, one may also be bound to hold that the Church was wrong to pronounce Thomas as a doctor of the Church (given that Catholicism is not a religion that thinks very highly of egoism) seems equally false. Much of St. Thomas' writings do not touch directly or indirectly on the nature of human motivation at all. Consequently, even if St. Thomas presents a rational egoism in ethics and even if this falsifies moral data, it does not follow that the whole basis of his thought is erroneous. Hence, his writings could still serve as legitimate grounds for his being recognized as a distinguished teacher of Catholicism. Furthermore, it is entirely possible for a thinker to distort or to fail to capture the essence of love or of morality in his theoretical opinions, while nevertheless possessing a deep understanding of these essences on the basis of his own lived contact with the data. To claim that St. Thomas did not understand love adequately on the theoretical plane is therefore not degrading to Thomas, or to the Church's understanding of and judgement on Thomas' works.

Let me conclude by returning to the original question: does the philosophy department at FUS need stronger theological foundations? It seems to me that Kellmeyer's article has only succeeded in demonstrating the reverse to be true.

*Oliver Heydorn*  
*FUS MAPHilosophy Program*

## **A different interpretation of the social encyclicals.**

Thomas Storck's article "Distributism, state power and papal teachings" was thought-provoking and interesting. His call for a wider reading of and meditation upon the Catholic social encyclicals is certainly worthy of support. However, there are several thoughts that



occurred to me as I read his piece.

Mr. Storck says that “the papal, and perforce the Catholic, approach to state power in the economy cannot be reduced to Dr. Schmiesing’s principle of ‘less rather than more state intervention.’” It is true that Catholic teaching not only allows, but actually demands, that the state play a role in the social order, including the economy, in order to promote the common good. However, the Catholic notion of subsidiarity *by its very definition* leads to “less rather than more state intervention.” Subsidiarity demands that the primary responsibility for the economy remain in smaller, more localized institutions (including the family), and the state should intervene only at the point where the smaller institutions cannot deal effectively with a particular issue or task. It is not the case that responsibility for the social order lies with the state, which in turn delegates manageable tidbits to local entities; the opposite is actually more accurate.

Mr. Storck claims that the guilds were the epitome of the intermediate institutions called for by the social encyclicals and should be resurrected. However, it is very reasonable to interpret papal praise for the guilds much differently: not as a call for the re-creation of guilds themselves, but rather as a call for the creation and development of non-governmental institutions, or “intermediate bodies,” that serve the same purposes the guilds once did. John XIII wrote in his social encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, “Above all, it must be emphasized that enterprises and bodies of this sort, in order that

they may survive and flourish, should be continuously adapted—both in their productive structure and in their operating methods—to new conditions of the times.” (No. 87) The guilds of old cared for orphans and widows, they encouraged the cultural and spiritual development of their members, and they helped to provide education and training to young people, among other valuable functions. Perhaps our current economic, political and cultural situation makes it very difficult for one institution to accomplish all of these tasks, but there do exist organizations performing one or more of these guild-like activities. The Knights of Columbus is one example of such an organization.

Finally, Mr. Storck writes that “If we accept that a normal family life allows a mother to devote herself full-time to the care and education of her children, what can we say about an economy that makes a normal family life so difficult for so many?” There are two problems with this statement and its implied conclusions. First, it seems that a major reason that “normal” family life is so difficult today is not the injustice of our economic system but rather the excessive materialism of our culture. It could be argued that most American families could live on the income of one spouse, but instead of living within their means, many Americans succumb to the temptations of our materialistic culture that establish bigger homes, fancier cars, Disneyland vacations, fashionable clothing, and restaurant meals as “needs.” These “needs” often compel the wife to secure a job outside of the home.

The second problem is with Mr. Storck’s notion of “normal family life.” While the social encyclicals clearly teach that the economy should be structured so that the mother is not required to leave her children in order to earn money outside of the home, it does not follow that the mother needs to be able to devote *all* of her time to the care of her children. In the agrarian economy that dominated western society prior to *Reverum Novarum*, the mother not only cared for and educated her children, but she also contributed to the economic well-being of the family by feeding livestock, helping with the harvest, and performing other economic tasks. Even if the family lived in a town, the mother tended a garden, prepared food for winter storage, made clothing, and perhaps even sold some of her produce or handiwork in the marketplace. If the mother had focused exclusively on nurturing and educating her children, the family would not have survived.

The industrial revolution wreaked havoc upon the family not because it forced the mother to contribute to the economic well-being of the family (she had always done this), but rather because it moved the primary economic activity out of the home and into the factory and office, thereby creating a situation where



the only paying work existed outside of the home, so that mother was forced away from her primary child-rearing responsibilities. Ironically, the descendants of the industrial revolution—the computers, modems and telephones of the information age—are the very tools that have made it more practicable than ever for a mother to work in her home on a part-time basis and still make the care of her children her primary task. Perhaps Mr. Storck’s “normal family life” is an ideal which could be sought after, but it is not demanded by Catholic social teaching.

The knowledge and enthusiasm for the social encyclicals that Mr. Storck displays are admirable. However, a careful reading of the encyclicals does not necessarily lead one to the concrete applications that Mr. Storck has described. The encyclicals offer challenges first of all to the faithful: do not succumb to materialism, recognize the universal destination of all created goods, and understand the dignity of work. Secondly, the encyclicals offer general principles which the laity are to embody in social structures: the common good, subsidiarity, and the freedom and dignity of the human person. Mr. Storck is absolutely correct when he observes that it is not “the case, as some have asserted, that somehow *Centesimus* represents the overturning of all the previous documents—as if the Church had suddenly disavowed all that she formerly taught. *Centesimus* is firmly in the same tradition as its predecessors.” The timeless principles of Catholic social teaching will never change. But the prudential conclusions reached from that timeless tradition will surely vary from place to place and from generation to generation.

*David Schmiesing  
FUS Class of '92.*

*David Schmiesing, brother to Kevin Schmiesing, serves as Director of Business Services at FUS. He is a contributing editor of the Concourse and the father of four children.*

## **Broadening the Distributism Discussion**

Thomas Storck’s excellent article will hopefully provoke more discussion on a crucial issue for Catholic social philosophy. However I think a new direction is called for. It is important to engage the issue of a humane economic order on a level higher than that of dealing with the distribution of property. The problem with liberal economists is not that they are wrong. If fact, they have real truths to communicate which are important in the age in which we live, truths that must be utilized in our theoretical quest. The problem is

that these truths are within a certain sphere of inquiry, and must be placed in the totality of personal existence. Economists do not often like to do this, because it diminishes the importance of what they have to offer. But any thinking on a personalist economy must start from the willingness to go beyond economics.

We must start from this openness because any study of human persons involves the value-complexes towards which they are related. Economics itself supposes a certain set of values which center around the problems of property and its distribution. That is, the more property, the better. This involves its own set of value distinctions, e.g. efficiency is good because it allows more total goods to be produced, certain uses of property are bad because they hinder the maximum production of goods.

Of course human persons are more than possessors of goods, and the value-complexes to which they are related is not confined to the sphere of ownership and production. Yet our social ethos, that is the prevailing value-complexes which exert psychic pressure to conform with them, renders different values more difficult to find. Other values are not on the surface of our lives, so to speak. An illustration of this might be seen in the production of pens. Currently pens are so cheap as to be practically community property: “Need a pen? Here take mine.” Our immediate thought is that this is terrific; we would not want it any other way. However I suggest this is because we do not immediately sense certain values which might have dropped out of the equation.

Consider for a moment this thought experiment: imagine an earlier society where pens and paper were scarce. Also imagine that these pens were predominately made of gold or silver, and were practically works of art. I submit that the handwriting of those lucky few to use these writing implements would probably not be sloppy, but beautiful. The words written would be carefully deliberated upon, and would be eloquent most of the time. The subject matter written on would usually be important or serious. There would be a greater respect for the written word.

As this imaginary case illustrates, there would be a different complex of values at work in the ethos of this society. It is not due wholly to the real factors of the scarcity of goods: if we suddenly made drastic changes in the writing supply industry in the United States these changes would not follow. The point however is to try to discern the true nature of liberal economic theory. Does it concern only the production and possession of property, well-integrated into the life of human persons, or does it rather affirm its own set of values, its own ethos which it seeks to inculcate in society, perhaps at the expense of

the perception of finer values?

I believe this line of thought deserves reflection and discussion as the search for the best economic order goes on in the pages of the Concourse. If we stay on the level of the distribution of property, the only solution for the problems of capitalism will be statism. Or at least it will be perceived this way by liberal economists. Yet we want to agree with these same economists that statism is not the answer. A better approach, perhaps, is first of all to discover the true nature, the assumptions and value-complexes, of capitalism and liberal economic theory.

*Philip Harold  
FUS Class of '00*

*Philip Harold married Rachel Durbin (also class of '00) in June. The couple are living in Washington, DC, where he is pursuing a PhD in Political Science at Catholic University and she teaches junior high history.*



## Renewal

*Continued from page 1*

I had the great joy of helping out with several FUS youth conferences in the late nineties, and saw first hand the amazing work of revival taking place among the youth who attended. I have recently heard exciting news about the work of the Spirit at FUS from a new student who recently attended her first Festival of Praise. It strikes me as odd that, by contrast, the ministry of the Spirit evident there is not being experienced to a great measure by the local community surrounding the University.

What actually prompted the writing of this article was reading the charismatic/traditionalist debate, specifically Kathleen van Schaijik's moving article, "Keeping our Worship in Step with 'What the Spirit is Saying' to FUS." I understand her sentiments, while disagreeing with some of her points. Here was a perfect example of something I saw over and over in Steubenville: There is a worldwide revival of staggering proportions taking place, yet there are many who are lamenting the decline of the charismatic renewal!

I recently organized a large prayer meeting (I call it a revival meeting, but Fr. Ed Wade calls it a Festival of Praise) at the "Catholic Charismatic Center" in Houston, Texas. My hunger was great for a place to worship with abandon in spirit and in truth in an environment of expectant faith. I have been leading worship, using primarily Vineyard music (with "flat" melodies, "trite" lyrics, and "inept" instruments as critics would say), seeking to come with humility and honesty before the One who loves us. God, in His graciousness, has been faithfully pouring out His Spirit in our midst. For example, one of my children, age 8, had been questioning the existence of God before our first prayer meeting. He was distracted (as were the other young children who came with us), and I don't think he sang a single song. When he was prayed with, he began to shake and fell to the ground. He was unable to stand for perhaps 40 minutes. He had never seen anything like it before and was rather frightened, initially, as were numerous people in Scripture (including the Blessed Mother) when encountering the Divine (even angels seem to elicit such a response). The fruit of that experience? He no longer questions the existence of God!

This is not an isolated example. In the Catholic Church, I have seen it primarily in youth ministry "piggy-backing" on the Steubenville youth conferences. However, if you simply do a search on the internet (say, "revival," "Holy Spirit"), you can stay busy for days reading about one example after another, along with scathing criticisms by the more

conservative brethren among us.

It is appropriate here to briefly define as well as I can what I mean by “revival.” I see revival as the rekindling or intensification of the Holy Spirit’s manifest activity among God’s people. It is related to the New Testament usage of the term “Reign (or Kingdom) of God.” The reign of God is, to paraphrase Fr. Francis Martin, the environment in which the majesty and saving power of God is known and *experienced*. Revival is the “rekindling or intensification” of this reality in our midst. The primary manifestations of the Spirit to be sought and expected are repentance, contrition, love, reverence, joy, adoration and an abundance of spiritual gifts (the “ministry gifts,” especially healing).

What about the cycles of renewal and decline throughout salvation history, including Church history, as noted by Mrs. van Schaijik in the aforementioned article? Do they point to the inevitable extinction of those realities and practices common to the Charismatic Renewal?

No one can deny the downward trend that has been seen since the renewal peaked in the 1970’s. The Catholic experience of the Charismatic Renewal became institutionalized in various forms, primarily prayer groups and covenant communities. The initial zeal was tempered both by growth in true wisdom and by fear of repeated rejection. Also, there has been the fact of, at times, quite poor theological explanation of what was happening in the renewal. This was theology as it functioned among the earliest Christians: seeking to explain, in the light of Scripture and Tradition, a present experience of God’s work in our midst. Suddenly, experiences read about in Scripture were coming alive in ways not predictable ten years prior to the renewal. Prior to the renewal, people read about tongues and their eyes glazed over. What on earth was Paul talking about? The only framework for explaining these experiences initially available to Catholics in the renewal was provided by classical Pentecostalism. Those more sensitive to Catholic theological tradition rightly objected to many of the formulations supplied by the early charismatics. Theologians, after experiencing what has continued to be called (unfortunately, in my opinion) “baptism in the Spirit,” gradually came to a more mature theological understanding of this experience.

In any case, the renewal’s undeniable decline was interpreted by too many as divinely-intended: God

**The renewal’s undeniable decline was interpreted by too many as divinely-intended: God never meant for His manifest presence and power remain to among us; the gifts of the renewal were a sort of bait He used to attract large numbers of people to Himself.**

never meant for His manifest presence and power to remain among us; the gifts of the renewal were a sort of bait He used to attract large numbers of people to Himself. Once they came to Him, the bait was no longer necessary. Now is the time for “maturity.” I think there is a different explanation.

In my opinion, the decline was indeed partially due to a predictable loss of enthusiasm. Emotional enthusiasm, though precious while it lasts, is not a lasting foundation for a movement. It was also partly

due to sociological factors. The young college-age leaders within the renewal got married, began having children and seeking to build community with like-minded peers. Friends congregated with friends for support and common prayer, forming tightly-knit groups of different sorts. When efforts became less “outward-directed” (evangelistic) and more “inward-directed” (community building), one of the key growth elements of the movement virtually disappeared. Growth was eventually achieved almost exclusively by institutionalized means such as “Life in the Spirit Seminars,” as well as centers of renewal, such as Franciscan University, which sponsored increasingly effective conferences.

In the lives of individual participants in the renewal, there is always the normal experience of undulation. We experience times of great intimacy with the Lord and other times when we are uncertain that He even exists! We grow discouraged by the real or apparent ineffectiveness of our faith and practices. For example, a person will only pray with expectant faith over a limited number of people for healing without results before the expectant faith deteriorates into frustration and cynicism. Praise and worship are difficult at times—perhaps for long, dry periods of time. In addition, there is the simple fact that we often must move away (i.e., for a job) from a place or group that has bolstered our faith in an exceptional way. Whatever the cause, the fact is that many of us will either experience a reawakening or we will effectively “drop out” of the renewal.

All these factors contribute to the decline we have witnessed. But I don’t think that God will leave it at that. In fact, I believe that we are actually at the very earliest stages of a tremendous revival! Much wisdom has been gained in the 33 years since the “Duquesne Weekend.” Just as many parishes have been blessed by vibrant prayer groups, many have also benefited from the collapse of their “charismatic” prayer groups.

If you missed earlier portions of our discussions, don't worry! All our articles can be found on-line at [www.TheUniversityConcourse.com](http://www.TheUniversityConcourse.com)

## subscriptions

To receive a subscription to the University Concourse please send your name and address to:

The University Concourse  
Attn: Jules vanSchaijik  
300 West Forest Ave.,  
Ypsilanti, MI, 48197

## Found in the editor's mailbox (we're not making this up!)...

"Hi. My name is Kim and I'm a producer at THE QUEEN LATIFAH SHOW in New York. I recently read your article "The horror of polygamy..." and wanted to let you know that we are doing a show on the issue of polygamy and plural families next Tuesday, Nov. 14th. I wanted to find out a little more about you and see if it's a show you might want to be a part of. Please call me toll free ASAP or e-mail me and let me know how I can reach you. I look forward to hearing from you".

(Just goes to show how far writing for the Concourse might take a person! :->)

We're looking for articles from AMC, OLCC, Ave Maria of the Americas, St. Mary's and AM Law School students and faculty too. Don't be shy! Let us know your ideas.



Spiritually gifted, faith-filled people began to get heavily involved in their parishes, revitalizing portions of their parishes in the process. (This is certainly true of our parish in Houston!) Nonetheless, the "former charismatics" are increasingly hungry for a rekindling of the old fire. They love the Church, receive life in the sacraments, love Mary and the Saints and revere the Magisterium of the Church. But in their hearts there remains a sense of loss. Though they do not necessarily use the term, they thirst for revival! They yearn to praise and worship the Holy One wholeheartedly in the midst of other grateful worshippers and to drink deeply of the Lord's manifest presence (the "glory of the Lord" referred to in Scripture).

I do not wish to oversimplify the internal development of the Catholic charismatic renewal by implying that the above has occurred in all cases. The Church is strewn with those who have been wounded through a heavy-handed resistance to the renewal on the part of pastors and other parish leaders. Thriving prayer groups have at times been effectively "squashed," or have perished through pastoral neglect. The pass-

ing of such precious works of God is truly tragic, though He can even receive glory in the midst of such evils.

Those who thirst must now come before the Lord in repentance and seek Him with all their hearts. Instead of seeing the Spirit as an "optional extra" (a "spirituality"), they must acknowledge their desperation and cry out to the Father for a renewed, fuller anointing of the Spirit. They must join together with others who similarly hunger and worship Jesus—with great humility and gratitude—crying out with one voice for revival. He who spared not His own Son, but gave Him up for us all will graciously hear our prayers. ■

*Steve Kroeger graduated from the FUS MA Theology Program in 1988. He now lives in Houston with his wife, Maureen (Ferguson, '87) and their 4 children.*