

Audience Participation

Panel Three Audience

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview>

Recommended Citation

Audience, Panel Three (2001) "Audience Participation," *St. John's Law Review*: Vol. 75 : No. 2 , Article 18.
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol75/iss2/18>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in St. John's Law Review by an authorized editor of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact lasalar@stjohns.edu.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Brother Sulmasy, you mentioned that you did not think that the Hegelian supersessive was all that popular anymore. My sense is maybe this is not a fair description, but there is a real temptation for the Sandel crowd to creep toward that Hegelian idea. It seems to me, without the sort of Christian personalism that the Catholic tradition could be, you are really likely to lead from this sense to this kind of creepy statist Hegelian sense. Thinking back to the first Panel, that is what I see in some of the writing about education these days. It seems to me they are kind of on this road from integral to supersessive. Do you agree with that or is that a problem?

DR. SULMASY: I sort of rushed it at the end and said I think these are some of the possibilities there are. Precisely, toward the danger of moving toward a totalitarian sort of sense and maybe the first step in between that is a Hegelian move, so I think that is right. Part of it is that because there is no, as you are suggesting, no sense of the person, no sense of the good for the person is what I'm classifying as, you know, the common common good within a lot of the communitarians, so all they have, then, sort of an amorphous spirit. And if there's a vacuum there, someone is likely to fill that, so I agree that that is a particular kind of danger.

PARTICIPANT: Is not that similar to what our luncheon speaker mentioned with regard to secular morality versus religious morality in that there is purpose for the believer. I have also heard that there is a space in us as individuals that is created for good for Him. Then there would seem to be that there is also space for the corporate part of our being. We have to remain focused and remember that God created us with purpose. We must realize that the secular world wants to divorce itself from God and creates a synthetic world that is a replica or mirror image of that created by God.

DR. SULMASY: I would agree with the sort of horizontal vertical and maybe that is part of where the teleological common good meets the constitutive integral common good.

Professor Harper was also talking about whether the constitutive common good as being a concept of the mystical body. I was trying to be philosophical there. You have that sort of sense as well. It also raises that question privilege, placing one point of view over another. Another way of looking at that is to suggest that religious views should not be excluded in the virtue of privileging other kinds of secular views.

I believe every ethos implies a mythos; if you have some sort of ethical structure, there is going to be a mythological structure supporting it. Even if that structure is secular, there is will be mythology that has religious like qualities.