DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 329 HE 028 799

AUTHOR Steinfels, Margaret O'Brien; And Others
TITLE Catholic Higher Education: Practice and Promise. Diverse Expressions of Catholic Identity.
INSTITUTION Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-55833-165-4
PUB DATE Nov 95
NOTE 46p.; Papers presented at the Meeting of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (St. Paul, MN, August 3-6, 1995).
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 650, Washington, DC 20036 (1-9 copies $6, 10 or more copies $5 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT ACCU Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education; v1 n1 Nov 1995

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Catholics; *Catholic Schools; *College Role; Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Attitudes; Educational Objectives; Higher Education; Intellectual Experience; Religion; *Religious Factors; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities; Catholic Church; Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This collection provides transcripts of remarks delivered by five participants in the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities' meeting at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota. They include: (1) "The Catholic Intellectual Tradition" (Margaret O'Brien Steinfels), which focuses on the willingness of Catholic institutions to take seriously their religious identity; (2) "Catholic Identity: Emerging Consensus" (Peter Steinfels), which argues that Catholic institutions must actively embrace Catholicism without imposing conformity; (3) "Trust, Cooperation, and Dialogue" (Cardinal Pio Laghi), which maintains that a university is Catholic primarily on the basis of its Catholic institutional commitment, involving all who make up the university; (4) "Initiatives in Campus Diversity" (Edgar F. Beckham), which focuses on the role of Catholic institutions in promoting diversity; and (5) "Observations and Conversations" (J. Bryan Hehir), which examines the important role of the Catholic Church in education and the community as a whole. (MDM)

ACCU

Volume I
Number I
November 1995

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ON CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Association of Catholic Colleges
and Universities
with the University of St. Thomas

Catholic Higher Education:
PRACTICE AND PROMISE
Diverse Expressions of Catholic Identity

Margaret O'Brien Steinfels
Peter Steinfels
Cardinal Pio Laghi
Edgar F. Beckham
Rev. J. Bryan Hehir

August 3-6, 1995
St. Paul, Minnesota

Occasional Papers is a publication of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. It contains original articles and reprints of articles of interest to colleagues in higher education. Editor: Paul J. Gallagher, Managing Editor: Frances S. Freeman. Editorial offices: ACCU, Suite 650, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. Additional copies $6.00 each (1-9 copies); ten or more copies $5.00 each; prepaid

ISBN 1-55833-165-4

INTRODUCTION

The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities' meeting at the University of St. Thomas in August 1995 was described by Peter Steinfels as "potentially as important as Land O' Lakes—a gathering that, if you so choose, has every likelihood of entering the history books as signaling a new moment in Catholic higher education, in American Catholicism and, just maybe, in our society's effort to achieve authentic pluralism."

It will be historic and a landmark, he went on, because of the 450 key people in attendance and "because you leave here not with a statement, not with all the answers, but with a collective will to focus on a common set of questions." And, in the words of David O'Brien, the meeting provided an opportunity to start "a second track of discussion on *Ex corde Ecclesiae* dealing with matters related to everyday college and university work."

"We want to draw attention," O'Brien said, " to our 'practice and promise' in Catholic higher education. We are here to discuss matters of daily concern on our campuses, to think together about our work of teaching and research, admissions and financial aid, student services and campus ministry, community service and faculty and staff development. We will ask how our Catholic commitment and our Catholic connections can continue to enrich our work. . . . Because we want to do more than preserve and maintain our Catholic identity, we want to make it a vital element of our work together."

Peggy and Peter Steinfels set the tone for the three days of the conference in their opening keynote addresses. Their remarks also begin this publication, which includes, in order of presentation, addresses by Cardinal Pio Laghi, Edgar Beckham, and Bryan Hehir.

The ACCU conference was an important milestone in the association's ongoing effort to help its member institutions as they translate Catholic identity and mission into academic initiatives, develop more effective programs of service to church and society, and enliven the dialogue between Gospel and culture—the three challenges for Catholic colleges and universities emphasized by the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, in *Ex corde Ecclesiae.*

As we look to the future, we hope to continue to assist in generating new ideas to share with colleagues on our campuses, including new projects in partnership with member institutions, as well as some concrete recommendations for implementation of supportive projects to be carried out by ACCU.

This compendium of addresses will assist all of us as we engage these challenges.

Paul J. Gallagher
Acting Executive Director

THE CATHOLIC INTELLECTUAL TRADITION

Transcript of address by
Margaret O'Brien Steinfels

In 1988, I gave a talk in this very city to this very organization, or at least a subgroup, the presidents of Catholic colleges and universities, not on this very topic but closely related: "The Church and American Culture: The Challenge to the Catholic Intellectual Community." Seven years have passed. Most of you are too young to have been in the audience, and most of you don't look like presidents—yet. The temptation to repeat myself has been strong.

I dug out that seven-year-old talk. It looked to be one of my very first encounters with a computer. From my errors, I infer that Larousse instead of the American Heritage Dictionary was on my spell-check. My talk was very long, as only computer-generated talks get to be, which probably explains why I have been given a strict time limit this evening.

I went over the usual suspects: John Tracy Ellis and Thomas O'Dea and a few unusual ones, Richard Hofstader and the Vatican. That talk had the usual rhetorical strategies: a golden age of Catholic education (including a glowing account of my education at Loyola University) and a leaden age dulled by the difficulties faced in 1988. In concluding I offered the usual solutions and some unusual advice: Catholic colleges and universities should take *Commonweal* as a model of critical engagement with Catholic intellectual life, and for only $39 a year.

It has become clear that . . . the Catholic identity question is being taken seriously.

As I reread that talk I said: This is good! Then came a voice from heaven: But is it true?

My analysis in 1988 rested on two controversies whose trajectories were then unclear. Since then, each has taken a decisive direction.

The first controversy: Was the Catholic identity of Catholic colleges and universities a question that would be or could be taken seriously? Many people wanted to address the issue, but concern for academic freedom along with a certain defensiveness led them to suppose that an effort to study Catholic identity would be defined primarily by episcopal control, theological narrowness, and moral overreaching. The Curran case was still being adjudicated in 1988, and The Catholic University was a living example of the tensions and dilemmas. It is not surprising if some people felt that addressing the Catholic identity of their institution would be like embracing a porcupine or maybe a skunk.

This anxiety distracted attention from other pressing issues: The erosion of Catholic identity because academic disciplines and accrediting agencies were shaping faculty and curriculum; because faculty and students were becoming more religiously and culturally diverse; because of

Margaret O'Brien Steinfels is editor of *Commonweal*.

the decline in the numbers of religious and priests who expressed that identity; and because there was competition for students. (In defining its market niche, a Catholic school did not usually emphasize its Catholicity, but rather advertised a tradition of service and learning in the spirit of its founding religious community. Thus we have schools in the Jesuit, Benedictine, Mercy, Ursuline, Vincentian, Dominican, Holy Cross traditions, all managing to sound both more benign and more universal than the Catholic tradition.)

Seven years and many discussions later, it has become clear that, despite those anxieties, the Catholic identity question is being taken seriously. Whatever uncertainty lingers around *Ex corde Ecclesiae* and its ordinances, groups and individuals have pressed ahead to look at how colleges and universities see themselves as Catholic. Inevitably some find that they are Catholic in name only, while others are striving to sustain or reappropriate their Catholic identity. Your presence at this meeting and your numbers certainly suggest a willingness to talk about this neuralgic subject.

There was a second unresolved controversy in 1988: How should Catholics understand this identity issue in the context of American intellectual life generally: Were we now mainstream? Or irretrievably subcultural despite the efforts to pursue excellence as defined by the nation's premiere schools? How would loss of Catholic identity affect the church and ordinary Catholics, especially those who attended Catholic colleges and universities?

We have an object lesson in the secularization of the nation's once-Protestant universities, traced in such powerful detail by George Marsden in *The Soul of the University*. I do not think that Professor Marsden makes any explicit link between the current perilous condition of mainline Protestantism and the readiness of denominational bodies over the last century to give up their colleges and universities because they felt so congruent with the culture. But it is hard to imagine that the connection is not there.

On the other hand, another Protestant historian, Mark Noll in *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, sees one symptom of evangelical Protestantism's debilitating anti-intellectualism in its inability to sponsor a single genuine university rather than strictly confessional colleges. Are Catholic institutions ambling along the same garden path to secularization or, in a few cases, along the alternative path to sectarianism, with the same deleterious consequences, in either case, on the church's life and mission?

Today, how we fit in is no longer quite the right question. It has become clear or clearer, I think, that American intellectual life, depending on your perspective, has broken open or broken down. Conservative ideas and intellectual forces that once seemed marginal even to conservative politics have achieved an influence and coherence that many liberals envy. This influence brings with it a resurgence of talk about traditional values, attacks on the Enlightenment project and a spirit of anti-

modernity. Conservatives in the academy, in think tanks and at journals of opinion work diligently to fill the vacuum created by the fragmentation of the political consensus, largely liberal, that has governed America since the New Deal and our intellectual life since the progressive era.

This fragmentation opens American intellectual life to new questions, new cultural and political configurations, an altered mainstream, if you will. All of us, including Catholic colleges and universities, are in a new ball game, though with the ascendancy of conservative ideas perhaps we face some of the same old "Catholic" temptations.

So seven years later I think there is something new to say (Surprise!), and it is this: Among many, though not all, American Catholic institutions there is now a readiness to take the issue of Catholic identity seriously. And about time! Or perhaps better to say, good thing, because the time frame in which this can be done becomes increasingly narrow.

Most dramatically, religious and clergy are fast disappearing from both classrooms and administrative offices. Who will be invested with the mission of fostering a school's Catholic identity and its connections to the Catholic community? Then there is the generational shift from pre- to post-Vatican II educated Catholics who are moving into those teaching and administrative posts. Without prejudging the outcome, we all know, whatever our age—from our peers, our siblings, our children, our grandchildren, our friends—that this represents a dramatic shift in attitudes toward the Catholic mission of higher education, commitment to the wider church, and basic understanding of "the Catholic thing."

I believe we have a decade—ten years—in which this question of identity must be honestly addressed and definitively taken on as a commitment and core project of institutions that hope to remain Catholic.

We have ten years in which this question of identity must be honestly addressed and definitively taken on by institutions that hope to remain Catholic.

And let me be clear about that: Such a project cannot simply be the work of a few individuals, of small groups, or of special institutes. The whole institution must make a substantial commitment to fostering a Catholic tradition of intellectual life.

Coming at this question as I do from the editorial trenches, I see this project as both exciting and perilous, and I will focus most of my remarks on Catholic intellectual life in general, leaving to Peter the simple task of talking about the specifics of higher education.

Catholic intellectual life is central to Catholic identity. It is fundamental to the life of the church, big C and little c, cathedral and congregation—to its continued vitality and to the church's mission in this culture. This is not a narrow ecclesiastical tradition, but a broad and infinitely useful one. *Commonweal* has fostered and questioned that tradition. Our writers and readers reflect that affection and that criticism. They are university people and journalists, book editors, lawyers, physicians, scientists, politicians; they are bishops, clergy and ordinary Catholics, who in their daily lives practice and depend upon the kind of thinking, reasoning, reflection that make up the Catholic intellectual tradition. Furthermore, this tradition also is explored and appreciated by writers and readers who are Methodists, Episcopalians, Orthodox as well as Catholics, and not

only by Christians—Jews, secular humanists, and those lapsed from every religion known to humankind.

This tradition is carried on, pursued, criticized, developed, wrestled with by people from many different backgrounds. The way they think and write, read and reflect very frequently rests on their education in American Catholic colleges and universities. So along with the preservation of knowledge, the scholarly work of retrieval, the building up of bodies of knowledge and the education of the young, your schools are central to the practice of the Catholic intellectual life. Colleges and universities cannot claim to be Catholic if this tradition is not part of their core understanding; this tradition cannot survive if Catholic colleges and universities do not renew it, maintain it, nourish it, support it, and pass it on.

Catholic intellectual life is central to Catholic identity.

In the past several decades, Catholicism in the United States has become more charismatic, more Pentecostal, more experiential, open to both old and new currents of spirituality and meditation; it absorbs individualistic and congregational attitudes from American religion generally. But Catholicism is also and always has been a church with a brain, with a mind. So as important as these new manifestations may be, it is essential to the church, to its mission in the world, to the lives of ordinary people that there be a vigorous and Catholic intellectual life. And *Commonweal* can't do everything!

Of course, the Catholic identity of Catholic colleges and universities can have many expressions: honoring the founding mothers and fathers; worship and prayer; service projects; works of social justice like basketball and football; campus ministry; statues, medallions and endowed lectureships; the work of notable alum and prestigious faculty. But all of this would be a thin facade if it did not include at its core a living experience among students and faculty of Catholic intellectual life.

Yes, carrying on this tradition is an enormous challenge. You have to overcome bigotry and bias, including especially the prejudices Catholics themselves have against their own tradition. A Catholic intellectual is not an oxymoron. You do not have to be a Jesuit to be a Catholic intellectual. Yes, Catholicism and Catholic ideas have a checkered history. What institution, tradition, idea does not? From Plato to Foucault, from nominalism to deconstructionism, if human ideas have consequences, we can be sure some of them are bad. We have our fair share.

Many people, perhaps some of you, consider that the Catholic intellectual tradition is singular in its intellectual repression and oppression, its narrowness and dogmatism. Well, I say go read a history book! Some of you may be skeptical that the adjective *Catholic* adds anything to an institution or discipline except the judicial authority of ecclesiastical officials. I disagree. For 2,000 years, Christians have struggled in multifarious ways with everything from body and soul to kingship and regicide, from usury to voluntary poverty, and today still struggle with everything from medical decision-making to political theory, from child care to spiritual counsel, from race to gender. It is this tradition that pressed through the

centuries—and reminds us in the Gulf War, in Bosnia—the idea of civilian immunity. The distinction between ordinary and extraordinary care of the sick and the dying remains a viable one because this tradition teaches it.

It is a deep and rich tradition; it is a tradition worthy of our attention and study. If this tradition does not have a place in Catholic colleges and universities, what is it that you are doing? What tradition has a better claim?

All thinkers and thinking are based in some tradition. A tradition is not a browned and dried-up certificate of deposit in the bank of knowledge, but a locus for questioning, a framework for ordering inquiry, a standard for preferring some sets of ideas over others. Tradition is the record of a community's conversation over time about its meaning and direction. A living tradition is a tradition that can raise questions about itself.

What am I talking about? Let me at least sketch what I think the Catholic intellectual tradition looks like.

"The joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the women and men of our time, especially those who are poor or afflicted in any way, are the joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well. Nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts. . . . Christians cherish a feeling of deep solidarity with the human race and its history."

That opening paragraph from *Gaudium et Spes* speaks of our responsibility for all that is genuinely human, for what draws the minds and hearts of women and men. The Catholic intellectual tradition is universal in its breadth and its interests; that is a notion set forth, defended, repeated, and encouraged throughout the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

I quote the quote because there is an odd nostalgia for something like neoscholasticism, if not neoscholasticism itself—a nostalgia for a framework that provided the high level of integration said to have been the guiding light of preconciliar Catholicism. From my post at *Commonweal*, I am inclined to think that we are a long way from holding or even recovering, at least with any integrity, that kind of framework. In a post-positivist, post-Enlightenment world, no body of human knowledge enjoys that degree of authority.

But if we do not have such an integrated system, we do have ideas, habits of mind and heart. We have preferences and predilections, intuitions and practices. We have a history. As *Gaudium et Spes* says, our tradition is not set against the world. But neither is it naively accepting of every current of opinion that washes up on the shores of a pluralistic culture. It helps us to maintain a robust and refreshing level of skepticism. What do I find of value? A tradition where reason and discourse based on reason are honored and practiced.

Let me describe just a few of its characteristics.

First, reason and faith are not antagonistic or unconnected. In the Catholic tradition we do not accept what we believe blindly or slavishly,

In the Catholic tradition we do not accept what we believe blindly or slavishly, we are urged to think about and to understand what we believe.

we are urged to think about and to understand what we believe. This is in some contrast to the society in which we live. American culture, with its Protestant history, tends to see religion as an expression of the individual, the subjective, the emotional, the immediate. In public life, religion and religious belief are confined to the realm of the private and personal, sometimes in an absolutist reading of the First Amendment, sometimes with the prejudice that religious thought has nothing to contribute. For the revivalist, faith is a personal and private encounter. For many in the cultural elite, as Stephen Carter argued in *The Culture of Disbelief*, faith is understood as a curious avocation, a personal hobby.

It is a loss to the whole society when any religious group accepts that role. In contrast, Catholics—the bishops, but many Catholic politicians and citizens as well—have often brought a philosophical and linguistic sophistication to public policy issues. If, for example, laws that would permit euthanasia and assisted suicide are kept at bay in the United States, it will be because the bishops, Catholic institutions, nurses, doctors, lawyers, ordinary citizens have been willing to express their deeply held beliefs, religious and philosophical, in a reasoned discourse that can build consensus across the whole society.

A second and closely related characteristic: Catholics have a tradition that takes philosophy and philosophical thinking seriously. This meant that from the beginning Christianity had to adapt systems of thought that were alien and even contrary to its religious beliefs and yet were crucial to its mission: that is, rendering its knowledge of God's presence and action in the world in a way that would make sense to others.

We don't usually think of Paul of Tarsus as a philosopher, but there he was in the agora debating Epicureans and Stoics, and in front of the Areopagus explaining the heretofore unknown God. Nor did it stop there. Eusebius, Bede, Augustine, Ambrose, Anselm, Thomas, Catherine, Teresa, etc., right down to our own time: American Catholic colleges and universities in the years after World War II were often the home to diverse philosophical schools—phenomenology, existentialism, Hegelianism, liberalism, pragmatism and Thomism—at a time when secular schools prided themselves on a univocal voice in their philosophy departments. The sometimes imperfect hospitality in our tradition expresses the conviction that a disciplined mind and systematic thought can help discern important things about what is real.

A third characteristic: Our tradition challenges the belief that facts come in pristine form—no baggage, no assumptions, no preconditions, no ends, no language that fills it with meaning. Our culture likes to treat facts as a given, as autonomous, unadorned objective realities; but a fact is an abstraction from something thicker and deeper containing implicit ends, whether or not the researcher, commentator, or scholar acknowledges them. There are virtually no value-free facts, from the construction of public opinion polls to descriptions of brain synapses or histories of the decision to drop the bomb on Hiroshima. The Catholic tradition reminds us that the fact/value distinction is practically a nil one,

although our tradition is tempted sometimes to think there can be fact-free values.

Nonetheless, in our tradition epistemology and ethics are always interrelated. So, for example, the notion that education can be a value-neutral process in which teachers simply convey facts and the students simply receive them, in which behavior is neither right nor wrong but a matter of personal choice, in which judgments are neither better nor worse but simply someone's opinion, is nonsense, as the condition of so many schools grimly illustrates. This same analysis could be applied to psychotherapy, opinion polling, political analyses, medical decision-making, etc.

This brings me to a fourth and last point: It is a characteristic of our tradition, at its best, to resist reductionism; it does not collapse categories. Faith and reason are compatible but not equivalent. Our tradition rejects fundamentalistic readings of Scripture; the human person is neither radically individualistic nor socially determined. Empirical findings are not solely determinative of who we are and what we do. Yes, absolutely: Findings in psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, neurobiology enrich our understanding of the human person and the human project, but they do not exhaust that meaning or determine that trajectory. We are neurons and neuroses, but not only neurons and neuroses; neither DNA or TGF fully determined who we are or what we will do this weekend. There is space for grace and free will, thought, conscience, choice.

The practice of caring for the poor and thinking about caring for them shapes political philosophy and social theory.

Time flies, and the list goes on: Symbolism is taken seriously, so is analogical reasoning; images provide us with alternative ways of knowing. All of these are implanted in minds and hearts by our sacramental and liturgical practices. Our tradition takes mysticism seriously, so we know that ordinary everyday consciousness is not the last word about reality. The practice of caring for the poor and thinking about caring for them shapes political philosophy and social theory. The struggle everywhere to link faith and culture blesses us with an abundance of fictional worlds from Shusaku Endo's *Deep River* to Isabel Allende's *Eva Luna*.

To sum up: Yes, these characteristics can be found in other traditions. Yes, the Catholic tradition has been untrue to them at times or embraced them only kicking and screaming; but finally they have been embraced because our tradition becomes part of the cultures in which it finds itself—it must become part of the culture intellectually as in all other ways. Why? Because of its mission to transform the world, as we read in *Gaudium et Spes* (No. 40): The church, a visible organization and a spiritual community, "travels the same journey as all humankind and shares the same earthly lot with the world; it is to be a leaven and, as it were, the soul of human society in its renewal by Christ and transformation into the family of God."

Today in our culture, where the commodification of human life, human relationships, and body parts goes on everywhere, that engagement, that mission, means keeping the human person at the center of our inquiry. The human person must be seen in his or her social context,

where an implicit and shared understanding of the good can be found and expressed.

All of this is deeply congruent with a religious tradition that is incarnational and sacramental, that keeps before us the idea of a God who acts in history on our behalf, a God who sent Jesus, who lived among us, who taught, who died for us, who rose from the dead and is present in the Eucharist. We are to love the Lord and love one another as he has loved us.

And there's the rub and that's the challenge. Catholic higher education, Catholic identity, Catholic intellectual life, the Catholic Church and its work in the world must finally be the work of a community of believers. In our culture that is a suspect category, nowhere more so than in the university.

CATHOLIC IDENTITY: EMERGING CONSENSUS

Transcript of address by
Peter Steinfels

Twenty-eight years and two weeks ago, about two dozen distinguished Catholic educators, bishops, and religious leaders gathered at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, and issued a statement declaring that "the Catholic university today must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence."

The Catholic university, the statement continued, "must have a true autonomy and academic freedom," but it must also be an institution where "Catholicism is perceptibly present and effectively operative."

No book on Catholic higher education, indeed no history of American Catholicism, is complete without reference to this Magna Carta for modern Catholic higher education. It is there in the record books, so to speak, like the Third Council of Baltimore with its decree on parochial schooling or the founding of The Catholic University of America in 1887.

My thesis today is a simple one: You are attending a gathering that is potentially as important as Land O'Lakes—a gathering that, if you so choose, has every likelihood of entering the history books as signaling a new moment in Catholic higher education, in American Catholicism and, just maybe, in our society's effort to achieve an authentic pluralism.

My thesis today is a simple one: You are attending a gathering that is potentially as important as Land O'Lakes.

If this meeting is to be historic, it will not be due to anything that we can cram into the next 67 hours. It will be a landmark because more than 450 educators, many of you presidents—key people in a web of over 200 schools across the United States and by that very fact key people in a church of 56 million members—because you leave here not with a statement, not with all the answers, but with a collective will to focus on a common set of questions.

Land O'Lakes, we should remember, did not just happen at a four-day meeting. It was the crystallization of a process long under way. We can trace it in the title of Philip Gleason's forthcoming history of Catholic higher education in the 20th century, "Contending With Modernity," and we can trace it in the subheadings of his closing chapters: "Self-Criticism and the Search for Excellence," "The Splintering of the Scholastic Synthesis," "The Contagion of Liberty," and "The Acceptance of Modernity."

Every step in that process was subject to misrepresentations and exaggerations. Every step elicited fears and accusations. Not all those fears were baseless. No great change comes about without introducing or

Peter Steinfels is senior religion correspondent for *The New York Times*.

skirting serious problems, problems that the beneficiaries of that change will eventually have to address.

Nor was that earlier process ever unanimous. It was carried forward by a core of farseeing, risk-taking educators and church leaders. There were only 26 signatories of the Land O'Lakes statement, all male and representing only nine universities.

I believe that a similar process is now taking place. Well over five years ago, I began an investigation that, after many months of interruptions, became a front-page story in *The New York Times*. I began with the intention of reporting on the challenges faced by all sorts of colleges and universities in maintaining a religious identity: Southern Baptist, Baylor and Southern Methodist; Mormon, Brigham Young; and Jewish, Yeshiva; no less than Catholic, Fordham, DePaul or Santa Clara. In the end we limited the story to Catholic schools. That was where the action was, where a whole family of schools seemed to be tottering on the edge of fateful change.

Frankly, what I discovered as I spoke with deans and presidents and faculty members left me stunned.

At the higher levels, there were repeated assurances that the commitment to Catholic identity had in no way weakened, although there was widespread admission that it might be more difficult to implement under current circumstances.

At the faculty level, in some quarters I found frustration and anger at the perceived loss of Catholic identity. Among other faculty members, I found resentment at the very idea that the Catholic identity of their institution meant anything beyond what they considered one or two vestigial theology courses and certain ceremonial flourishes—in other words, meant anything that might actually bear on their own teaching and research.

I found a non-Catholic political scientist wondering why, in view of the richness of Catholic thought and experience in relating God and Caesar, the government department at his Catholic university should be interchangeable with that of any first-rank secular school.

I found faculty members who said that job candidates with Catholic backgrounds or known interests in relating their research to religious or ethical questions would actually be at a disadvantage, because the philosophy department did not want to look too Catholic or the biology department did not want to give the impression of letting religious considerations intrude into strictly scientific decisions.

Above all, I found confusion and euphemism and evasion and a tremendous sense that the subject could not be discussed openly and candidly.

So it came as no surprise to me when I later read a speech in which Father Malloy of Notre Dame warned there was "no guarantee at all" that within the next 50 years most Catholic institutions of higher education would not "shuck off their religious identity as they become more academically sophisticated."

"If it happens," he added, "it will not be by way of a vote, but simply by default."

My 1991 article reported the agitation and debate over this issue already under way, but I may have underestimated what is today obvious. Slowly, steadily, a consensus about this new set of challenges for Catholic higher education has been emerging—by no means among everyone but, as at Land O'Lakes, among a core of thoughtful leaders.

It is noteworthy how many different ways the issue is described: People speak of the Catholic identity or mission or character. They speak of many Catholic institutions being at risk, or threatened, or uncertain, or problematic, or in need of clarification or reassertion, or in danger of becoming purely formal or ritualistic, and so on.

Those variations reflect, first of all, the wide variety of Catholic institutions and the corresponding differences in which their concern about Catholic identity is manifest.

A campus like Notre Dame, a kind of island unto itself with an overwhelmingly Catholic student body, differs even from a Georgetown, immersed in the life of the nation's capital and with a much smaller proportion of Catholic students. And both differ radically from a school like New Rochelle with its multiple campuses and its mix of a traditional college-age, liberal-arts student body with a far greater number of adult degree-seekers, many of them part-time, from minority groups and not Catholic.

Large universities with national aspirations, with extensive graduate programs or with prominent professional schools, confront a very different dynamic than small liberal-arts colleges.

The multiple ways of stating this concern also reflect the sensitivity surrounding it. What are the right words to indicate urgency but not alarmism or panic? To many educators, suggestions that their traditional religious mission was in any way at risk seem to disparage all that they have devoted their lives to and to ignore the very real accomplishments of recent years. Indeed concerns about Catholic identity have not infrequently been advanced with an accusatory edge—as though, who is to blame were a more important question than what can we do—and with a dubious nostalgia for a lost golden age.

Concerns about Catholic identity have not infrequently been advanced with an accusatory edge . . . and with a dubious nostalgia for a lost golden age.

No wonder savvy and sensitive educators have groped for tentative language, shied from sweeping and dramatic claims, even at the risk of underplaying the urgency of the problem.

But the new consensus goes beyond this core concern. Let me suggest eight more components of it:

1. You can't go home again. A return to the past is neither desirable nor possible, not in terms of the long-lost homogeneity of students' religious knowledge and background nor in terms of the embarrassing conformity once enforced by fiat.

2. The intellectual and academic environment has changed. Peggy has described some of those changes. They include what has been described as the shift from epistemology to community as foundational for inquiry.

In "Exiles From Eden," Mark R. Schwehn, professor of humanities and dean at Valparaiso University, writes: "The answers to basic human questions such as what we know, or how should we live, or in what or whom shall we place our hope have come to depend, for a large number of intellectuals, upon the answer to a prior question, who are we?"

This is another form of the realization, as Alasdair MacIntyre has argued and Peggy mentioned, that all thinking is tradition-based, all inquiry tradition-directed. This in turn has led to the recognition that there is no college or university pure and simple. There are different kinds of colleges and universities, "beholden to diverse educational traditions," according to David Burrell. The Catholic university and the Enlightenment university may not be exactly the same creature, although a crucial test for either, as Burrell also points out, is the extent to which its tradition is open to free inquiry and does not rule some queries out antecedently.

Catholic identity in institutions of higher education must be manifest in their intellectual life as well as in their liturgical celebration and pastoral services.

Last year, Rebecca Blank, a distinguished MIT-trained neoclassical economist from Northwestern, gave several lectures at Notre Dame, mostly dealing with poverty. But the subject of one lecture was how her religious convictions—she is an active member of the United Church of Christ—affected her work as an economist. Professor Blank began by saying how glad she was to be able to give a lecture at Notre Dame that she couldn't give at Northwestern. Why not? First, she said, because probably no one would come. Second, she said, because if some people did come, they wouldn't know what she was talking about. And third, she said, because her dean would probably drop by to remind her that Northwestern (which, of course, was founded by Methodists) was a secular institution.

3. Catholic identity in institutions of higher education must be manifest in their intellectual life as well as in their liturgical celebration and pastoral services. As Catholic colleges and universities strove to make sure that their academic offerings were comparable to those of secular schools, and as confidence collapsed in the so-called neoscholastic synthesis of the 1940s and '50s, Catholic identity was increasingly associated with campus worship, campus ministry, community service, and the tone and regulation of student life.

In many cases, those responsible for such activities rose to the challenge even as they often had to struggle for respect and resources. But part of today's consensus, I believe, is that this is not enough. As Peggy emphasized, Catholic Christianity is a tradition of the mind as well as the heart and will.

Today's consensus has gone beyond polemical questions like: Is there a Catholic mathematics, a Catholic chemistry, a Catholic accounting, or a Catholic business administration? It recognizes that the rich Catholic intellectual heritage which should be communicated, explored, questioned, revised, and renewed does not pertain in precisely the same way and to the same extent to every field and discipline. But while that heritage could be less obviously relevant to chemistry and accounting than to

political theory or literature, even chemistry and mathematics departments, let alone business administration, might be hospitable to certain philosophical, ethical or cross-disciplinary reflections and conversation that are unlikely to occur elsewhere.

4. Catholic identity must be something that pervades the work and life of a college or university and is not limited to the theology department. It is a tragedy that efforts to implement *Ex corde Ecclesiae* have so misdirected energy and attention to the certification and standing of theology professors. With most Catholic schools requiring no more than two semesters of theology, those courses could meet the severest standards of orthodoxy without guaranteeing any significant grappling with the Catholic heritage if it is not present elsewhere in the curriculum.

5. The future of Catholic identity will ultimately rest in the hands of the laity and in the hands of the faculty. By the year 2001, it is estimated that there will be an average of 14 Jesuits working on each of that order's campuses. Sponsoring religious orders, especially when enlivened by a vision, can yet wield a tremendous influence, but unless a campus exhibits a willingness rare in late 20th-century academia to submit to an authoritarian style, no vision can be implemented and perpetuated without the assent and support of a majority of faculty members. "The Catholicity of our institutions," Father Malloy has said, "will in the end be determined by the faculty."

Theology courses could meet the severest standards of orthodoxy without guaranteeing any significant grappling with the Catholic heritage if it is not present elsewhere in the curriculum.

6. The question of Catholic identity is therefore inescapably linked to hiring policies. This is a point of enormous delicacy but also of enormous importance.

George Marsden, whose history of the secularization of the nation's Protestant colleges and universities is required reading for anyone seriously interested in this question, has put the matter unflinchingly:

"Once a church-related institution adopts the policy that it will hire simply 'the best qualified candidates,' it is simply a matter of time until its faculty will have an ideological profile essentially like that of the faculty at every other mainstream university. The first loyalties of faculty members will be to the national cultures of their professions rather than to any local or ecclesiastical traditions. Faculty members become essentially interchangeable parts in a standardized national system.

"At first," Marsden continues, schools "can count on some continuity with their traditions based on informal ties and self-selection of those congenial to their heritage. Within a generation, however, there is bound to be a shift, and since departmental faculties typically have virtual autonomy in hiring, it becomes impossible to reverse the trend and the church tradition becomes vestigial."

For a long time I thought that what Marsden so bluntly points out was the great unmentionable. Nothing else was as likely to provoke heated charges of discrimination or of violations of religious or academic freedom as the suggestion that the religious factor, whether in terms of personal commitment or in terms of scholarly interests in research and teaching, should play some part in hiring decisions.

Are you going to check baptismal certificates, monitor Mass attendance, banish wavering or lapsed Catholics, exclude non-Catholics or make them second-class campus citizens? Are not religious convictions, outside of theology, extraneous to responsible scholarship? Are not schools in danger of violating equal opportunity statutes, losing federal funds, or being subject to civil suits for discrimination?

I do not take those concerns and protests lightly, even if they can often be, as I found, reflexive rather than reflective, and sometimes showing unseemly haste to acquiesce in questionable interpretations of the law. And let me be clear: So far there is no consensus about how to respond to these concerns. Where there is consensus is that the hiring question, no matter how explosive, must be faced.

Sustaining and revivifying Catholic identity is chief among Catholic higher education's challenges for the near future.

There is also consensus that this is not an either/or situation, that a wide range of choices regarding "religious heritage as a factor in hiring" exists between the total banishment of religious considerations or the diplomatic, "Here's our mission statement. Are you comfortable with it?" to the confessional-oath policies of some evangelical schools.

"The puzzle," writes Marsden, "is how to hold the middle ground. How is it possible, short of reverting to repressive strictures of earlier days, to maintain a vital religious presence, including an intellectual presence, in a modern university? Is there any way to retain the balance of being a university that is both Catholic and open to many other points of view?"

Having recognized the problem, the next most important step in this whole process toward a new era may be for a group like ACCU to organize a systematic and authoritative review of the options, one conducted, say, by a blue-ribbon committee whose members' scholarly credentials and parallel commitments to both Catholic identity and the academic are impeccable.

But those observations already indicate a seventh point of the consensus.

7. Catholic identity must embrace scholars of other faiths and of no faith not simply as admissible presences in Catholic higher education but as essential to its purposes. It is clear that in many cases Protestants, Jews, adherents of other religions, and agnostics and atheists may bring critical scholarly insight and good will to the Catholic campus mission far beyond what many Catholics offer.

8. The whole process of clarifying and strengthening Catholic identity can be easily undermined by the intervention of nonacademic ecclesiastical authorities. Catholic identity simply cannot be imposed or assured by fiat. It must be implanted by persuasion and sustained, ultimately, by love. If that cause is associated with nonacademic control over academic matters, the effort is half-lost before it has begun.

Let me summarize what I believe constitutes today's consensus.

At its core is the realization that sustaining and revivifying Catholic identity is chief among Catholic higher education's challenges for the near future and has already inspired an outpouring of positive initiatives, from campus-based and national discussions to the establishment of a host of new institutes and programs.

Around this core, eight points:

First, there is no return to an imagined golden age.

Second, a changed intellectual context, with a growing appreciation of community, tradition, diversity and multiculturalism, offers opportunities to explain the intellectual and educational integrity of Catholic higher education to the academic world.

Third, the issue is one of intellectual life, of focus in research and teaching as well of student affairs, campus worship and ministry, and community service.

Fourth, the issue is far broader than the place and character of theology in the school.

Fifth, the issue ultimately will be decided by the attitudes of lay people and of faculty.

Sixth, the place in hiring of religious commitment and religious interests and competencies in research and teaching must be confronted, and clear, meaningful policies developed.

Seventh, such policies must include, not exclude, non-Catholic scholars.

And eighth, infringements of academic autonomy by church authorities will be counterproductive.

At this point I hear someone asking: If we're agreed on so much, what's the big problem? In fact, I see not one big problem but four middle-sized obstacles. Some already have been suggested in my remarks.

The first, for example, is the defensiveness, the suspicion, the leaping to conclusions, the feeling of being under attack that can be stirred by these discussions or by even the most tentative proposal to make an institution's Catholic mission a significant factor in the hiring or tenure process. Fortunately, an increasing number of you are showing that a calm, open, participatory approach, untainted by the threat of premature or imposed solutions and more concerned about creating the future than defending the past, can create the atmosphere essential to a viable discussion.

The second obstacle is something that journalistic noses become quick to detect. Being a proper Boy Scout, I will simple describe it as the SD factor, for self-deception. Other, more rowdy types might want to initial it differently.

I sensed SD factor when I found in conversations about hiring that the impressive official version differed radically from what actually happened in the trenches. What but SD explained the official devotion to Catholic identity that was accompanied by promotional brochures and catalogs, by ads in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, by fund-raising campaigns in which all reference to *Catholic* had been either entirely eliminated, reduced to the minimum or duly obscured behind a word like *Jesuit*. Sometimes I was reminded of men who slip off their wedding rings when they go on business trips.

Less difficult to discuss but harder to confront are the entrenched power and national cultures of the academic disciplines and professions

to which George Marsden referred. You know better than I the extent to which the disciplines, not the particular schools, define what is to be considered excellence, organize the subcategories of fields, and control the real loyalties, aspirations and career paths of faculty.

It is not only the problem of the job candidate in economics who is deterred by her discipline from developing a subspecialty in economics and theology or even cultivating an interest in interdisciplinary conversation of that sort. It is also the problem of the economics department members who feel that their own reputations vis-a-vis their discipline's standards (and therefore their marketability) might be tainted by actively recruiting someone with a theological interest. There is a conflict here that must be acknowledged and confronted head-on.

Over 200 schools have a much better chance of accomplishing collectively what would be a very risky expedition for one or two or a dozen isolated institutions.

Finally, there also is a similar conflict with secular academia over academic freedom. I am in firm agreement with the Land O'Lakes statement's affirmation of excellence, autonomy, and academic freedom, as well as an effectively operative Catholic presence.

Unfortunately, there are notions of academic freedom widespread in the United States that, practically speaking, hold these defining aims to be incompatible. Historians have not missed the anti-religious—and I might add, anti-Catholic—strain that has run through both the academy's formal and informal understandings of academic freedom. George Bernard Shaw quipped that a Catholic university was a contradiction in terms, while John Henry Newman argued at length why a secular university was a contradiction in terms because it excluded from its scope a central set of questions and area of knowledge. We know which view is more popular, the sound bite or the argument.

I am not suggesting that Catholic educators work themselves into a lather of victimization over this fact. They simply need to recognize that in their world serious misunderstanding and, yes, even bigotry still sometimes operate—and to be prepared to name and challenge it when necessary.

Different images come to my mind when I try to sum up this gathering. A launching pad. A frontier. A mountain valley. They all suggest a point reached with difficulty but now the staging area for a departure into new, uncharted territory.

You need to overcome the doubts, anxieties, nagging uncertainties that beset anyone daring to attempt something new. There is, after all, a world out there of people, many of whom we respect, absolutely convinced that there are no other alternatives in higher education except narrow institutions of indoctrination and the religious featurelessness of most college and university life. To defy that conventional wisdom, to explore the unexplored, you need to know the direction you want to travel, but you also must be willing to move forward without a fully filled-in map, without all the answers, without, in your case, a new synthesis, a grand educational theory or a guaranteed route through all the tangles of academic freedom, faculty fears, and a church struggling with pluralism.

You need to go forward together. Over 200 schools have a much better chance of accomplishing collectively what would be a very risky expedition for one or two or a dozen isolated institutions.

American Catholicism's array of colleges and universities, absolutely unparalleled in the world, was not created without risk taking and readiness to venture something new. Make this gathering worthy of that history. Make it the moment where it becomes obvious that, through your creativity, enlivened by God's spirit, there can be something new under the sun in higher education.

TRUST, COOPERATION, AND DIALOGUE

Transcript of address by
Cardinal Pio Laghi

It is my pleasant duty to greet in my own name and in that of the Congregation for Catholic Education, over which I preside as prefect, the many hosts to whom we are indebted for this symposium dedicated to the theme of "Catholic Higher Education: Practice and Promise—Diverse Expressions of Catholic Identity."

In the first place, may warm and fraternal good wishes go to the archbishop of St. Paul, John Roach, and to the coadjutor archbishop, Harry Flynn. To Father Dennis Dease, the president of this University of St. Thomas and to its faculty members, and to all the members of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, with its leadership.

I have already had the opportunity during the homily of the opening mass and in our common work during these three days both to express my gratitude for the invitation to be present with you and to assure you of the interest with which the Congregation for Catholic Education follows this symposium. We know that what is taking place here during these days represents the convergence of efforts that have been going on for some time now in Catholic university circles in the United States.

There have been the various initiatives of the University of St. Thomas in recent years to penetrate the concept of Catholic identity of the university according to *Ex corde Ecclesiae* and to share these ideas ever more broadly among faculty members of this university and of others as well. The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, for its part, also gave a significant place in its annual meeting for 1994 to a consideration of *Ex corde Ecclesiae.* Besides, many of the association's more than 200 members have participated in the regional dialogues between bishops and university leadership which have taken place during this period of reflection on and the drafting of local principles and guidelines for the application of the apostolic constitution.

The Congregation for Catholic Education sees that the present symposium takes place then in the context of varied and serious efforts on the part of Catholic colleges and universities in the United States and the bishops of the country to arrive at an appropriate local application of *Ex corde Ecclesiae.* Nor can we forget the attention which has been given to the apostolic constitution these past few years on the pages of the ACCU's periodical publication *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education.*

If I may be allowed one further preliminary remark. It concerns the importance that the Congregation for Catholic Education and I person-

Cardinal Pio Laghi is prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education.

ally attach to the Catholic universities in the United States. Your Catholic universities find themselves not only in a nation of important cultural influence worldwide, but also in a university system in this country which is highly regarded throughout the world. It can be said that often both your smaller Catholic colleges and your larger Catholic universities are very favorably recognized in relationship to their respective secular peers. This represents the fruit of much striving for excellence in recent decades, and credit for this is owed to not a few among the participants in this symposium. Besides these factors, about one-fourth of the Catholic institutions of higher study of the world are in this country (234 out of a total of 930).

In my remarks this afternoon, I wish to offer some reflections on the topic which has occupied us now for two full days of presentations, both in plenary assembly and in smaller working groups. I shall formulate my ideas under the general heading of the ecclesiology of the Catholic university, that is, the identity and the mission of the Catholic university.

What is taking place here represents the convergence of efforts that have been going on for some time now in Catholic university circles.

THE CONSTITUTION'S ECCLESIOLOGY

When we speak of Catholic identity and then of its diverse expressions with regard to the Catholic university or college, we find ourselves necessarily dealing with an ecclesiological question. For this reason it seems important at the beginning of such a discussion to identify the ecclesiological perspective with which the apostolic constitution *Ex corde Ecclesiae* is imbued.

It can be said that the apostolic constitution on Catholic universities, as would in fact be expected, assumes the ecclesiological perspective of the Second Vatican Council and specifically of the two expressions of the integral vision of the church given by the council in the dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium* and in the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et Spes*. Both constitutions present the church and its mission: one ad intra (nature, structure, identity) and other ad extra (mission).

In this vision, the role given to the church as the new people of God should be underlined; this notion highlights the church's living in history and being incarnate in time. As the International Theological Commission has pointed out in this regard, the church is at the same time "mystery" and a "historical subject." "The characteristic of 'mystery' indicates the church as proceeding from the Trinity, while that of 'historical subject' applies to the church insofar as it acts in history and contributes toward directing history." It is through the historical subject that the mystery is made manifest and operative ("Selected Ecclesiological Themes on the Occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Conclusion of Vatican Council II," 3.2).

The Catholic university should be seen within this twofold perspective. It must therefore both accept the divinely established institutional nature of the church as well as assume its own proper role—in fidelity to its nature as a university—in the mission in and for the world which the church receives from her Founder.

CATHOLIC IDENTITY

As is well known, a congress was held in Rome in April 1989, under the auspices of the Congregation for Catholic Education, which brought together delegates of the Catholic universities and representatives of the bishops' conferences. Some present here today were part of that gathering. During the meeting, as well as in the course of a more limited subsequent one, three different directions emerged with regard to what constitutes the Catholic character of a Catholic university or college, three different approaches to the ecclesiology of the Catholic university.

One approach held that the Catholic university should be considered as an expression of the very reality of the church itself. While it was recognized that there are valid notions contained within such an approach, this position was not accepted by the assembly. It was judged to need a more mature theological reflection. Nevertheless, it was recognized that this position has the merit of underscoring the fact that the Catholic university is in the church and has a bond with the church which is essential to the university's institutional identity, as *Ex corde Ecclesiae* would later state (No. 27).

The second approach to emerge during the congress located the Catholic character of the university solely in the fact that the university was inspired by Christian principles. This approach was overwhelmingly rejected as inadequate for distinguishing a Catholic university from any other which chooses to be guided in one way or another by Christian principles.

A third approach presented itself in the congress, and this one remains the key to understanding the Catholic identity of the university as embodied in the apostolic constitution. This position holds that the university is Catholic primarily on the basis of its Catholic institutional commitment, involving all who make up the university.

Pope John Paul II has on a number of occasions spoken in this way of the Catholic identity of the university. He did so at Xavier University in New Orleans in 1987, when he said, "The Catholic identity of your institutions is a complex and vitally important matter. The identity depends upon the explicit profession of Catholicity on the part of the university as an institution, and also upon the personal conviction and sense of mission on the part of its professors and administrators" (*Teachings of John Paul II*, Vol. 10, 3, p. 450).

TO BE WITHIN THE CHURCH

The Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People of the Second Vatican Council, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, expresses a principle which also moves along the lines of the ecclesiology underlying *Ex corde Ecclesiae* and which can be applied as well with regard to the Catholic university. It is that "union with those whom the Holy Spirit has appointed to rule the church of God (cf. Acts 20:28) is an essential element of the Christian apostolate."

This principle expresses a necessary ingredient of the Catholic identity of any institution or undertaking that is called Catholic. This is certainly not meant to diminish the originality or the integrity of the contribution made by other persons and institutions to the life of the church or the service which the church renders to society. It is rather to set forth clearly that, without a bond of communion with the hierarchy, an institution cannot bear the name Catholic (cf. *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, 24).

In the case of Catholic universities, the juridical expression of this bond with the church may vary, for example, according to the diverse acts of establishment by which the university comes into being: whether by the Holy See, the episcopal conference, a bishop, a religious institute or other ecclesiastical or laypersons (cf. *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, General Norms, Art. 3). What is the same for all Catholic universities, however, in the words of the Second Vatican Council just quoted, is the existence of a bond of communion, a "union with those whom the Holy Spirit has appointed to rule the church of God." Catholic identity as such involves a relationship with the church and specifically with the institutional church.

The responsibility for maintaining and strengthening the Catholic identity of the university rests primarily with the university itself.

In this light we can appreciate the words of the Holy Father Pope John Paul, spoken in this country and repeated in the apostolic constitution, where he states that bishops, even when they do not enter directly into the internal governance of the university, "should not be seen as external agents but as participants in the life of the Catholic university" (No. 28). It would be impossible for the university to remain Catholic—as it would for any other institution in the church—if it were to lack this relationship with the institutional church.

While the Catholic college or university is related to the entire ecclesial community, to its legal and civil context, and to the higher education academy, the apostolic constitution directs special attention to the relationship between university and church authorities. *Ex corde Ecclesiae* itself provides a useful framework to address this specific relationship:

> Bishops have a particular responsibility to promote Catholic universities and especially to promote and assist in the preservation and strengthening of their Catholic identity, including the protection of their Catholic identity in relation to civil authorities. This will be achieved more effectively if close and pastoral relationships exist between university and church authorities, characterized by *mutual trust, close and consistent cooperation, and continuing dialogue.* Even when they do not enter directly into the internal government of the university, bishops 'should be seen not as external agents but as participants in the life of the Catholic university' (No.28).

Each of the three elements in the pastoral relationship of bishops with Catholic colleges and universities as described in *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, No. 28—mutual trust, close and consistent cooperation, and continuing dialogue—is very important and warrants special attention.

No. 27 of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* gives the synthesis of this ecclesiological principle as it refers to the Catholic university. There we read that "every Catholic university, without ceasing to be a university, has a relationship to the church that is essential to its institutional identity." The constitution goes on to specify that the relationship in question is to both the local and the universal church, "assuming consequently a special bond with the Holy See." The constitution states, "One consequence of its essential relationship to the church is that the *institutional* fidelity of the university to the Christian message includes a recognition of and adherence to the teaching authority of the church in matters of faith and morals."

The vision of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* is that the church calls upon the Catholic university to share in its mission.

Faithful to the ecclesiology of *Lumen Gentium* and to the underlining there of the doctrine of the new people of God, *Ex corde Ecclesiae* envisions the responsibility for the Catholic identity of the university as shared by the entire university community. "The responsibility for maintaining and strengthening the Catholic identity of the university," we read in Article 4 of the general norms, "rests primarily with the university itself. While this responsibility is entrusted principally to university authorities . . . it is shared in varying degrees by all members of the university community and therefore calls for the recruitment of adequate university personnel, especially teachers and administrators, who are both willing and able to promote that identity."

The Catholic university is in society, but it is also in the church. It breathes the life of the church, and the church is responsible for it. Indeed, the apostolic constitution of the Holy Father, echoing the ecclesiological perspective of which we have been speaking, calls upon the whole church to support and assist Catholic universities in their development and renewal.

THE CHURCH'S MISSION

In addressing the ecclesiological notion of the Catholicity of the university, we have thus far reflected upon the *esse* of the university as Catholic. We should turn now to this *esse* as foundation of its *agere* as Catholic. Also in the case of the Catholic university this latter must follow the former as the familiar scholastic principle states: *agere sequitur esse.*

The role and the task of the university insofar as it is Catholic are connected with the very function of a university in itself. A university, as is commonly agreed, has the institutional functions of research, teaching, and service to the wider society. These roles constitute the very being of a university. In the case of a Catholic university, the Catholic character of the university enters into this institutional and public threefold function.

The vision of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* is that the church calls upon the Catholic university to share in its mission. In so doing, the church entrusts to the Catholic university tasks connected on the one hand with the proper role of a university with its threefold function, and on the other, tasks which touch the mission of the church itself.

The presence of the church in the world of the university takes place, then, in a way which is appropriate to the nature and the finality of the university in its rendering a public service.

In this light, No. 13 of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* enumerates four essential characteristics of the Catholic university which are common to all Catholic universities notwithstanding the juridical differences deriving from the way in which they were established or the varieties in their forms of governance. These characteristics render the university capable of its objective of assuring in an institutional manner—in a public manner—a Christian presence in the university world, confronting the great problems of society and culture. Allow me to repeat these characteristics as I have on a number of other occasions, and which, as you know, were formulated in the final document of the second congress of the delegates of the Catholic universities held in Rome in 1972. They are:

1. A Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university community as such.
2. A continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute by its own research.
3. Fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the church.
4. An institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family in their pilgrimage to the transcendental goal which gives meaning to life.

From the perspective embodied in these four characteristics there derives the idea expressed in the next paragraph of the apostolic constitution, namely that:

> It is evident that besides the teaching, research and service common to all universities, the Catholic university, by institutional commitment, brings to its task the inspiration and light of the Christian message. In a Catholic university, therefore, Catholic ideals, attitudes and principles penetrate and inform university activities in accordance with the proper nature and autonomy of these activities. In a word, being both a university and Catholic, it must be both a community of scholars representing various branches of human knowledge and an academic institution in which Catholicism is vitally present and operative.

These two elements of identification, *university* and *Catholic*, are not to be seen as in opposition nor even in tension, but as in harmony with one another. The underlying conviction for this affirmation is that truth is one, and there cannot be contradiction or disharmony between what is true scientifically, philosophically, or historically and what is known from Christian revelation as handed on by the church, as all truth has its source in God.

In the ecclesiological vision of the Catholic university which we have been seeking to sketch here, this is the guiding principle of the *agere* of the university as Catholic, consequent upon its Catholic *esse*.

DIVERSE EXPRESSIONS OF IDENTITY

I believe that up to this point we have been reflecting not upon diversity in the expression of Catholic identity, but upon those aspects of our theme which must be common to all Catholic universities.

Diversity of expression of the Catholic identity of the university, however, is a subtitle of this symposium, and I wish to address a much briefer word in this regard. In some of the panel sessions of these past two days, this topic was addressed in a specific way. Once we are agreed on what is common in the identity and mission of all the Catholic institutions of higher study, as this is set forth in Part 1 of the apostolic constitution, it is necessary to acknowledge the differences, for example, which the various cultural situations create for Catholic universities, as well as the cases in some parts of the world where Catholic universities cater to a student body overwhelmingly of a religion other than Catholic or Christian.

I appeal for your continued commitment to ensuring the presence of the church in the world of culture.

There also are, even within similar cultural and religious contexts, different manifestations of Catholic identity. I believe that many of the topics proposed for the panel sessions and the special topic discussions reflect the diverse ways in which Catholic identity of the university can be expressed.

One of these would be the influence of the particular charism of the religious institute connected with the university: the way in which, for example, concern for the education of the poor, characteristic of a particular religious congregation, helps guide the admission of students and the awarding of burses; or the manner in which a principle of the spirituality of the religious family may characterize the approach taken in campus ministry.

Another possibility of diversity in the expression of Catholic identity of the university can be had in the conception and implementation of the curriculum. Guided by the principle common to all Catholic universities that "the education of students is to combine academic and professional development with formation in moral and religious principles and the social teachings of the church" (General Norms, Art. 4, Par. 5), each institution must realize this in the way most conducive to its own curriculum and specializations.

CONCLUSIONS

Allow me to conclude by repeating my gratitude for the opportunity which this presentation has given me to trace out for you an idea which determines significantly the approach and practice of the Congregation for Catholic Education concerning Catholic universities: that of the ecclesiological base of *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. Charged by the Holy Father in the constitution itself with its application, the congregation considers it an important obligation to call attention to this key of interpretation of the

constitution, as well as to the ties which this document has with the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. Such has been my intention here this afternoon.

To you, the presidents, deans, members of faculties, staff members of Catholic colleges and universities present here this afternoon, I appeal for your continued commitment to ensuring the presence of the church in the world of culture, enabling the Gospel to penetrate and regenerate the mentalities and dominant values of this nation as we all prepare ourselves to cross the threshold of the year 2000.

28

INITIATIVES IN CAMPUS DIVERSITY

Transcript of remarks by
Edgar F. Beckham

I want to begin by offering my heartfelt thanks to the planners of this event. I really am very pleased to be here, and I'm deeply honored that I can represent the Ford Foundation, which has played a role in moving us all along the journey that was referred to earlier and that brings us here. I'm particularly grateful, perhaps to myself, for having made a good choice in deciding to arrive yesterday, not only because it allowed me to escape that terrible heat wave on the east coast, but because I had an opportunity to listen to Peggy and Peter Steinfels. I thought their presentation was uplifting, and I also thought it was daunting, so daunting that as I thought about the profound challenge that they were placing before you, I said to myself: "This is tough. Thank heavens I'm not a Catholic."

This challenging quest for Catholic identity in which you are engaged is about the most worthy challenge that I can imagine.

But seriously, this challenging quest for Catholic identity in which you are engaged, one that embraces all of faith and all of life, one that nurtures a continuing dialogue between the Gospel and culture and makes that dialogue central to the life of your institutions, is about the most worthy challenge that I can imagine, and I commend you for it. And I want to stress that, as far as I'm concerned, there is no essential difference between that quest and the pursuit of excellence. In fact, I would suggest that the dialogue in which you are engaged should be what defines academic excellence.

Now, I learned something else yesterday from the Steinfels—that it is permissible to be just a little bit irreverent about Jesuits. So I want to tell a little story that some of you have heard before which, in my mind, is somewhat antecedent to the launching that I referred to a minute ago. It was about three or four years ago, I guess, that I was invited by Carol Heard-Green and others at Boston College to address a group of Jesuit deans. In fact, I almost ran away from the occasion when I was told that just about every Jesuit dean in the country was at that meeting. I found that very intimidating. So I thought that I would try to get on their good side by noting at the outset that I have often said I wished I had been educated by Jesuits. And before I could finish my statement, there was a bit of a stir in the room, a kind of puffing up, you might say. But then I felt that I had to give the final part of my statement, which was: But every time I say that to a Jesuit, he says, "Oh, no, you don't."

That meeting at Boston College was memorable for another reason. At the end of my description of a fledging campus diversity initiative that had been launched recently by the Ford Foundation, I was asked what I

Edgar Beckham is a program officer for education and culture at the Ford Foundation.

considered to be a very trenchant question by one of the deans. Namely, do Catholic institutions have an easier time or a harder time in efforts to promote diversity? And I quickly said they have an easier time, and I felt that I owed an explanation, as I feel I do now.

Catholic institutions have an easier time precisely because they are not culturally neutral or objective. They have an easier time precisely because they have an historical location in cultural time and space, because their traditions are identifiable and definable even if the identities and the definitions remain subject to critical scrutiny and are subjects of controversy. Catholic individuals, Catholic groups, Catholic institutions that are questing after their Catholic identity have a particularly rich opportunity to be what I call honest partners in the discourse on diversity.

That point was driven home to me a number of years ago, when I had what might be described as a startling conversation with a rabbi. One of my responsibilities at Wesleyan was to hire rabbis, priests, and ministers. This particular rabbi and I became close friends. And on one occasion, we were talking about my grappling with my own Christian identity. And the rabbi leaned forward out of his chair and asked, "Edgar, do you accept Jesus Christ as your personal Savior?" Well, being a Congregationalist, that question was like a bullet, and I dodged and weaved and hemmed and hawed and cleared my throat and squirmed in my chair and gave what, for me, was a very unsatisfactory answer.

In the discourse on diversity on college and university campuses, is the institution the playing field or a player? And my answer is that the institution is both.

But I went away from that conversation knowing one thing and one thing well. My answer may have been unsatisfactory, but there was no doubt that I owned the question. And it was my ownership of the question that provided the basis for a continuing dialogue about my Christian identity.

Peter Stanley, the current president of Pomona College and formerly my boss, who hired me to oversee the campus diversity initiative at the Ford Foundation, once posed the following question: In the discourse on diversity on college and university campuses, is the institution the playing field or a player? And my answer is that the institution is both.

I realize that that's ambiguous, that it creates some confusion, but I believe that the acknowledgment that we are not merely neutral and passive playing fields, but that we are active participants in the search for identity, and that our history and our traditions create our cultural stake in the quest, provides the healthiest condition for the discourse on diversity to continue.

And of course, that makes Catholic institutions very much like all other institutions that lay claim to an historical, cultural identity—Jewish institutions, the many varieties of Protestant institutions, women's institutions, historically black institutions, to name a few. So, I do believe that your search for your identity does make the quest after diversity easier, but it also imposes upon you an even heavier burden, and it's the burden of leadership. Because, you see, your dedication to the search for your Catholic identity confers upon you, in my judgment, an obligation to play a leading role in the discourse on diversity in American higher education.

And perhaps you ought to consider a partnership with some of those other kinds of institutions that also assert a cultural identity, because it may well be that if you join forces with them, you can be an even more powerful voice.

Now, you've noticed, I'm sure, that I use the term diversity. And I know that in many of your materials you use the term multi-culturalism and sometimes pluralism. I find myself from time to time using the term intercultural discourse. But I'm finding myself liking the term diversity more and more.

I used to use it because it was a convenient way of summarizing the many strands of identity, the legacies of belief and behavior that we carry with us into the world and that define us to ourselves and to others in multiple simultaneous terms: gender, race, religion, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, the range of our physical and mental abilities, and other dimensions of our experience.

And for a long time, diversity was a relatively safe term to use, because it did not immediately conjure up the sordid history of prejudice and oppression that attaches so insistently to many of these dimensions of identity. But unfortunately, diversity is no longer a safe term. It, too, now engenders controversy, and I think for two main reasons.

One is that it's pretty abstract. It demands definition. It demands a delineation of the characteristics that are being included. And the problematic part is that if you include too few, then you will exclude someone, and they will be angry. And if you include too many, you will inevitably offend someone.

If we think about two platforms from which we can launch a discourse on diversity, I would call one the intellectual platform, the other the social justice platform. If you're operating from the intellectual platform, you wouldn't exclude anyone. In fact, you would welcome anyone who brings an identity with them into the discourse. But suppose you are operating from the social justice platform. You privilege certain characteristics over others, according to the degree of disadvantage that various groups have suffered. And there you can get a clash between one voice that would say include everyone and another voice that would say provide benefits to those who have suffered most.

But the second reason for diversity being controversial is, I think, more significant. It's often argued that diversity denotes nothing more than difference, and therefore, it divides us, undermines our commonality, and makes it more difficult for us to achieve community. I want to challenge that notion on two grounds.

First, it seems to me that it's not the elements of identity that divide. On the contrary, the elements of identity stimulate interest. They attract our attention and can bring us closer together. It's the historical misuse of those dimensions of identity that have caused all the problems, and in the current discussion of affirmative action, for instance, it seems to me that race is not the issue. If race were the issue, then those who oppose affirmative action would be right. We shouldn't use race in that way. It's

such a weak and inconsequential category to begin with. Why use it? But it's not race.

It's history. It's the history of the abuse of race as a category, which has resulted in the disadvantage. And so, the issue is not the category. The issue is our misuse of the category through our history. And that history is a part of our tradition and must be a part of our search for our identity.

To get into the second reason for challenging the notion that diversity divides us, I want to start with the simple proposition that plants are diverse. And I don't think that's a particularly ambiguous, controversial, or confusing statement. All I mean to imply is that plants are plural and there are differences among them.

And if I were to say that animals are diverse, I would mean about the same thing. But what if I say plants and animals are diverse? I have introduced ambiguity. I may mean that plants and animals are different from each other, but isn't it more likely that I mean that plants are diverse among themselves, and that animals are diverse among themselves? Let me try this with something that is not plural.

I hope it's not presumptuous of me to suggest that the search for Catholic identity is a search for Catholic diversity.

Suppose, for instance, I suggest that Jupiter and Mars are diverse. Since neither is plural, does the statement not prompt the question: Diverse what? To which I could give the answer, diverse things in the sky, diverse heavenly bodies, diverse planets. What I'm suggesting is that the term diversity does more than denote difference. It also points to an underlying category in which multiple diverse elements participate. Diversity implies both difference and that participation in the unifying category, and it represents these twin implications simultaneously. So I hope it's not presumptuous of me to suggest that the search for Catholic identity is a search for Catholic diversity. If the searching neglects difference, it is impoverished. If it neglects its commonality, it nullifies its meaning.

Now, I could substitute other adjectives for Catholic in this equation: American, for instance, in which case I would argue that the promotion of American diversity and participation in the discourse on diversity is the search for American identity and the search for American community. It's not uncontentious. It is not without controversy. It does produce tensions and anger and resentment. But in my judgment, it is the most profound challenge we face as a nation.

This construction of diversity, this understanding of it, this conviction is the basis for the campus diversity initiative that I've had the great privilege to oversee at the Ford Foundation for the past five years. We started in 1990, and, since then, we've made grants totalling about $8.5 million to institutions and consortia of institutions around the country. We often say that the objective of the campus diversity initiative is to encourage American higher education to value diversity as an asset and to use it more creatively as an educational resource.

Now, about half of the grants that we've made have gone to individual institutions, somewhere between 35 and 40. I think three of them are represented here today—Mount St. Mary's, the University of Notre Dame,

and Boston College. And a fourth one, I don't know why Spring Hill is not here, but they also received one of our grants. And all of those grants to individual institutions were designed to produce an inventory of projects through which one could demonstrate the usefulness of diversity in educational terms.

But the other half of our grants have gone to consortia of institutions, organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and several others who have drawn even more institutions into their activity. And the institutions that are now involved in this activity are of very different types. They include community colleges, four-year institutions, liberal arts institutions, comprehensive institutions, and research universities.

The objective of campus diversity is to value diversity as an asset and use it creatively as an educational resource.

And I would say that there have been two main lines of activity in which all of these institutions have engaged. One focuses on faculty development and curricular renewal, based on our belief that faculty, acting through the curriculum, exercise the most powerful influence on institutional culture. The other activity focuses on institutional strategic planning for diversity, in the belief that the promotion of diversity has to involve all the domains of institutional activity: recruitment and retention of students, campus climate, faculty and curricular development, relations with constituencies inside and outside of the institution, trustees and alumni, and members of the public.

And for that reason, the approach to planning, we believe, has to be strategic and comprehensive. The number of institutions currently involved in our work is approaching 200, and we are now attempting to organize them into a more formal network of institutions so that their collective experience can be a resource for all of American higher education.

Let me give just one example. We are in the process of creating a computer-based catalog that will contain information not only about the institutions that are connected to the Ford Foundation, but also about some 40 institutions that have been funded for diversity work by the Lilly Endowment. And just before I sat down, I had a wonderfully rich conversation with Tom Foote of Barry University, who told me about the 196 Catholic institutions that have responded to the ACCU request for information—and we have already begun to scheme about ways of eventually including all of them in the network. So, information about the diversity activity of some 400 to 450 institutions would be available to all the other institutions in this country.

The first steps in the creation of this catalog have been taken, and we anticipate that come October you will be able to access that catalog in three formats. You'll be able to visit it on the Internet, have access to it through CD-ROM, and we also hope to make it available in print format.

There are other things that we are doing, but you're looking hungry, so I'm going to move along very quickly. I will say one other thing, and

that is about the internationalization of this endeavor. Just about two months ago, the Ford Foundation, through its New Delhi office, made grants to 24 Indian colleges and universities for their campus diversity initiatives. At the Ford Foundation conference on diversity in October, we will have delegations from India and South Africa. This will give us an opportunity for even greater cross fertilization, greater sharing of experiences and, of course, will increase our knowledge about the way diversity plays itself out in different national contexts.

Just in case I don't sound excited about that, I'm thrilled. Only recently—to bring you right up to date—about a week or two ago, a colleague at the Foundation and I made a recommendation to the senior leadership that we support a multi-year, multimillion-dollar public information project on campus diversity, one that is designed to inform wider publics that the work you and other institutions in American higher education are doing on behalf of diversity is good for individual students, good for the institutions, and good for American society.

I check my E-mail several times a day, awaiting word on that recommendation, because if it is approved, and we do expect that it will be, it will shape our efforts on behalf of diversity over the next several years. A second component of that program, by the way, will be to help institutions in this country improve their competence in discovering the good stories that they have to tell about diversity and their skills in delivering those stories to audiences that need to hear them. So, that's where we are today.

It continues to be a daunting challenge, but also a very fulfilling one, and I want to say to you how reassuring it is to have you participating in it with us.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONVERSATIONS

Transcript of remarks by
Rev. J. Bryan Hehir

Let me begin by talking a little bit about the method of my remarks, and then their content. Essentially, the method is to use a structure of ideas based on the design and purpose of this conference, on the documentation provided by ACCU before the conference, and on the background papers that were written summarizing much of the experience of diverse Catholic colleges and universities around the country as they have taken up the theme of identity. I will relate this structure of ideas to some of what has occurred here.

I think central to the purpose and significance of the meeting is the question of timing and tone as it was defined from the outset. The function of this meeting was not so much to rehearse some of the intricate arguments that have taken our time as commentators, presidents, and faculty over the past four or five years. It was to recognize how much already has been done from the bottom up on the question of identity, to recognize what has been achieved, and to think about where one goes from here. So, the design of the meeting was purposely set in this context.

And then there's the question of holding the meeting now. In her opening remarks, Peggy Steinfels made the point that in 1988 when she addressed this question of Catholic identity, there was on the horizon a large question, and that was not whether identity was at risk or needed to be reviewed, but whether we would take up the question with the kind of honesty, vigor, and intellectual acuity that was needed. And interestingly enough, in this great gift that Peter and Peggy Steinfels are to the church in the United States, Peter in his presentation answered Peggy's question. Peter states that the meeting we are attending is nothing less than an analog to the Land O' Lakes meeting. So that definitively answers the question of whether we have addressed the issues at least as well as we can so far. The question was there in 1988. The question is under review with necessary precision and courage by 1995.

This is both an accomplishment and a possibility, an accomplishment of what has been done so far and a possibility of what lies ahead of us. What has been done is something to take pride in, and what lies ahead are the obligations that flow from shaping the question the way it has been shaped over the past ten years.

In a sense, the purpose of this conference lays emphasis on what one might call a bottom-up view of the discussion of Catholic identity. That is to say, it lays stress on what has been tried in a multiplicity of settings, and

Rev. J. Bryan Hehir is Professor of the Practice in Religion and Society at the Harvard Divinity School.

on what is already underway on college and university campuses as they try to work through identity, intellectually and operationally.

Now, my attempt to contribute to this ongoing discussion will move in three steps: the framework for the discussion of identity that has been worked through over the past seven or eight years that places emphasis on the role of the universal church and magisterial documents, so that *Ex corde Ecclesiae* fits into that framework; the fabric of debate and decision-making here in the United States, so that the level of analysis shifts from the universal and magisterial to the national and local, and the documentation is less official statements than it is the debate that has been stimulated by those official statements; and finally some personal anecdotes that I'll try to turn into an agenda for future debate and discussion.

First, the framework for discussion, the themes and the tenor of the preparatory papers that were given us. The themes and the content of the ACCU mission statement show that, however diverse Catholic higher education is in the United States, from small liberal arts colleges to large rambling universities, cutting across that diversity there has been a certain set of common themes, common ideas, and common history that have structured our debate about identity and purpose, ministry and mission.

Ex corde Ecclesiae has established a framework for the specific discussion of the church in the world, and of the university in the church and in the world.

In this meeting, Msgr. John Tracy Ellis is still invoked as a catalytic moment in this whole discussion, even though he serves now as a baseline rather than an adequate framework. The changes in the church and in the world have been too deep and too broad to make the Ellis framework the operative framework. But he is invoked and rightly so.

A second point in the journey, Vatican II, which both catalyzed the debate about the church in the world and the university in the church, and at the same time, because of the very power of the ideas of the council, made it more difficult to carry on a tidy debate about the church in the world, or the university in the church. So Ellis is one point in the journey, and Vatican II is the second.

And then *Ex corde Ecclesiae* is a third, for it has established a framework for the specific discussion of the church in the world, and of the university in the church and in the world. It has been a contested framework, but clearly not a rejected framework. It has been worked through and worked over, and clearly the tone of this meeting, including Cardinal Laghi's remarks, illustrates how far that discussion has gone, how it has been shaped so that the fabric of a consensus, as Peter Steinfels mentioned in his talk, is much more a tangible reality than it was even three or four years ago.

How should one interpret this rather complicated framework that runs from Ellis through Vatican II through *Ex corde Ecclesiae?* Let me offer a hermeneutical principle. I suggest the hermeneutical principle is to read *Ex corde Ecclesiae* through the lens of *Gaudium et Spes.* And I submit that is not a difficult thing to do, because in many ways, *Gaudium et Spes* is the inspiration for the themes of service and dialogue with culture that one finds in *Ex corde Ecclesiae.*

I submit there are three good reasons for keeping the hermeneutic of the discussion that *Gaudium et Spes* is the lens through which one then examines *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. First of all, there is the experience of Vatican II itself. I think we need *Gaudium et Spes* in the same way the council's document *Lumen Gentium* needed *Gaudium et Spes*. Of course, what was very interesting about the council was that it was from the beginning an ecclesiological event. The council fulfilled Henri de Lubac's prediction that the 20th century would be the century of the church, and the council fathers always knew there would be a *Lumen Gentium*. They did not know there would be a *Gaudium et Spes*. It was not on the preliminary agenda of Vatican II. *Gaudium et Spes* arose out of the experience of the council. It arose at the end of the first session when a series of bishops, among them Archbishop Montini of Milan, said we need to go beyond the content of what we have said so far in the document on the liturgy and the document on the church.

Gaudium et Spes is the lens through which one examines *Ex corde Ecclesiae*.

And so *Gaudium et Spes* arose from a reflection on the church, and it pushed the church's own understanding out to new horizons. In fact, I don't think it is too much to say that it would have been a very different council and a very different conception of the church if Vatican II had come and gone without *Gaudium et Spes*. It, in a sense, pulled the church into a different arena of discourse without letting go of the polarity of the internal life of the church that is the focus of *Lumen Gentium*.

I submit that *Gaudium et Spes* has to have the same kind of role in tandem with *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. *Ex corde Ecclesiae* has a very strong internal agenda, as one might understand, if one tries to talk about the university in the life of the church. But it would be possible to get ourselves encapsulated in that internal agenda, to exhaust our intellectual energies and our sense of what we are about as colleges and universities, if we did not have the pull of *Gaudium et Spes*.

So, I submit that the first lesson of the hermeneutical principle is to draw the lesson of Vatican II, watch what *Gaudium et Spes* did to *Lumen Gentium*, keep *Gaudium et Spes* as the pull in light of which you interpret *Ex corde Ecclesiae*.

The second contribution of *Gaudium et Spes* is that it places the whole discussion of the role of the college and university in the church within the context of what I will call the conciliar project. *Gaudium et Spes*, as you know, talking about timing, is exactly 30 years old this year. And this year is the 30th anniversary of the close of the council. Those 30 years obviously have affected not just the church and higher education institutions in the church, but the role of the church in the world. Now, there are many ways of trying to interpret that complicated history of 30 years, but I think it is possible every now and then to step back and at least take a theme and say, this is a theme that we ought to use to understand the project of the council.

I submit one way to think about the project of Vatican II, and it is best embodied in but goes beyond *Gaudium et Spes*, is the way in which we move from what Yves Congar used to call a controversialist theology to a

theology in dialogue. That is to say, Congar made the point that Catholic ecclesiology from the time of Trent up through the middle of the 20th century was a kind of point-counter-point theology. We found out what the Protestants said, and we emphasized the other point, and there was about this character of controversialist theology both a truth and a limitation. The truth was to affirm what we thought was being forgotten in other ecclesial communities, the limitation was not to stress the fullness of the vision of the church. Now, if one thinks about this point-counter-point style of discourse, it really is larger than just theology or ecclesiology.

Let me be more specific. Take three areas: religion, politics, and intellectual life, and I submit the great change of Vatican II was that in all three areas we moved from controversialist logic to dialogical logic. We moved from an argument about starting every discussion with the Protestants on how we were different from them, to trying to find common ground, and then elaborating the differences. We moved in the declaration of religious liberties from a view of democracy which saw it as a threat, to a view of democracy which saw it as an invitation. And then one enters into dialogue on what the invitation is about.

Dialogue is not a sort of surrender . . . it is to enter into a pattern of discussion marked by confident modesty.

And we moved in the intellectual life, best understood in *Gaudium et Spes* from a view of the enlightenment that was purely negative critique, to a willingness to engage the enlightenment themes and dialogue.

Now, dialogue here is *sic et non*. It is not a sort of surrender. It is not to swallow whole cloth any of these themes, but it is to enter into what I have called in the past a pattern of discussion marked by confident modesty. That is to say, a conviction that the church has something to teach the world, and a conviction that the church has something to learn from the world.

That is, it seems to me, the great tone of *Gaudium et Spes*. But notice that when you enter into dialogue, when you move from a controversialist position to a dialogical position, the dynamic of the debate changes significantly. The controversialist position gives you great solidity and surety. You know what you're against.

The dialogical position opens up a dynamic where you need to know both who you are and how you need to move beyond where you are to someplace else. It is a much more complex process, and where else but in universities and colleges would this dialogue take place? Where more fulsomely and with more intensity would it take place?

So, that's why I say that Vatican II, in a sense, was catalytic. It also was somewhat confusing, for it opened up a discussion about our identity, about our purpose, about our place in the world that was very broad and goes on to this day. The project, if you will, of the church in the world is the framework of the project of the university in the church.

Finally, *Gaudium et Spes* not only will in a sense pull us as we study *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, it will not only locate us within the wider conciliar project, it will help us, I think, to appropriately define the full scope of what the identity discussion in the Catholic university and college ought to be.

Oftentimes, there is a strong focus on service as the distinguishing mark of Catholic colleges and universities—what we hope to produce. I submit that the service theme is essential, but it must be understood as partial. The service theme leads to a discussion of social justice. I submit social justice is, as the Synod of '71 said, constitutive for the life of the church, but it is not comprehensive for the whole work of the church in the world.

And therefore, as we think about service and social justice, let me put it in a somewhat provocative way. The service/social justice discussion in the university must not be exclusively the discussion of the social encyclicals. It must be the *Gaudium et Spes* framework, for the *Gaudium et Spes* framework is broader than any of the encyclicals.

In a sense, the encyclicals are conclusion documents. *Gaudium et Spes* is a source document. As we stress service, as we stress social justice, we will locate service and social justice appropriately in a Catholic university context, precisely because *Gaudium et Spes* will drive us beyond conclusion debates about specific principles and specific policies. The *Gaudium et Spes* breakthrough, what it added substantially to the encyclical tradition, was that it drew upon the wider, intellectual heritage of Catholicism, the broader theological framework within which the social fits.

And so *Gaudium et Spes* provides for our discussion of service and social justice, for our discussion of church in the world, a broader fabric of discussion. For it drew not only upon the conclusions of the encyclicals, but upon that rich body of theological reflection that preceded Vatican II, and the work of Congar and Chenu and de Lubac.

Gaudium et Spes takes you into a discussion of the world as a theological object of reflection, not simply a political and social arena where certain tasks must be achieved. *Gaudium et Spes* is about how we read history as Christian Catholics. *Gaudium et Spes* is about issues of vocation, intellectual and civil, as well as ecclesial. *Gaudium et Spes* is about how we understand the logic of the disciplines, secular and sacral, and their relationship.

So, *Gaudium et Spes* takes us to what Peggy Steinfels was talking about in her opening address, that is to say, the fabric of the Catholic intellectual tradition. And that Catholic intellectual tradition is marked by a characteristic that Father Charles Curran always talks about, the Catholic "and." That in the Catholic context, it is always faith *and* reason, nature *and* grace, church *and* world. And if that is a distinguishing mark of how we approach questions of the political, the social, the legal, and the cultural, my submission is that *Gaudium et Spes* is necessary as the lens through which we read *Ex corde Ecclesiae* so that the college and university discussion of service and social justice will be cast in this broader framework of the Catholic intellectual heritage. Not simply because that's more truthfully the full fabric of what we have to offer the world, but also because it is precisely in that wider intellectual framework, which then supports the conclusion documents of the encyclicals, that I think we will best be able to make a contribution to some very urgent themes in American society.

So, let me turn now to that kind of discussion, where I'm trying to go from the framework of discussion—Ellis, Vatican II, *Ex corde Ecclesiae*—to a different level of discussion. I call it the fabric meaning. It is the discussion of what has gone on in the church in the United States about these broader themes of the universal church. When you move from the framework to the fabric, you move from the universal focus to the national focus. You move from an emphasis on magisterial documents, whether they be *Gaudium et Spes* or *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, to more what you might call commentary, commentary by theologians and social scientists.

Two preliminary comments, as we make this move. Part of what I've done in getting ready for this talk is to take myself back through the discussion that has gone on at the national level. And I think one of the things that you're probably all aware of, but at least for me it struck me anew, was the richness of the fabric of this discussion. To listen to David O'Brien engage Michael Buckley, and Michael Buckley engage David O'Brien. To listen to Ann Ida Gannon and Ted Hesburg, Sydney Callahan and Avery Dulles, Peggy Steinfels and Brian Daly. There is nothing to be ashamed of here in that fabric of discussion. It stands up well in almost any context where people would seriously want to think about the life of the mind, the life of the church, and the life of the world.

Moreover, while my purpose is not to rehearse this discussion, but simply to locate it, this ACCU meeting is significant because, I think, of the interaction that has gone on between the universal level of the discussion, as I've called it, the framework, and the national fabric of discussion.

David O'Brien is right. We don't need to get stuck rehearsing the same debates. We need to recognize that in many ways we're already beyond some of the questions that have been intensely debated. The Ellis legacy is a legacy rather than a defining agenda, and the project of the council is already well advanced, but still not over.

But all of this, and the debates specifically around *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, I submit, has yielded very valuable intellectual resources. It has yielded an approach to a consensus that Peter talked about in his eight points.

Now the task is, it seems to me, to look at how that framework, fabric, discussion prepares us to enter a discussion not only about our place in the church, but once again, using *Gaudium et Spes*, to pull us directly into the discussion of the church and the world.

For what we've done is, it seems to me, in emphasizing the national situation in dialogue with *Ex corde Ecclesiae*—what's gone on over the past four or five years—in an interesting kind of way is comparable to what John Courtney Murray did in his discussion about democracy with Rome. Murray kept saying to the universal church, you can't make a judgment on democracy until you can feel the fabric of what it means to live in a democratic context. You can't equate democracy with 19th century European versions of church/state relations.

That's one piece of the picture, but it's not enough of it. It was when Murray made the case that there was a specific fabric to a kind of democratic governance that allowed the church not to be fearful, but to flour-

The service/social justice discussion in the university must not be exclusively the discussion of the social encyclicals.

ish, that he finally opened up the possibility for a different kind of theological discourse on church and state.

I submit that the product of the past four or five years in the discussion of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* has been to try to make clear what Cardinal Laghi called the complexity of the situation of higher education in this land. And therefore, not to say that we should be normative for the universal church, but simply to say that there is a specific context here that must be taken into consideration as we hammer out universal principles for the life of the whole church.

Now, what is it that we face? David O'Brien has made the point in his book that the changes within our colleges and universities have been due largely to what has happened inside them in terms of professionalization of the faculty and in terms of lay boards of trustees.

We are now a church that is both at the center and the edge.

There also have been other changes. There has been change in the composition of the Catholic constituency. We are now a church that is in a very different position than John Tracy Ellis saw before him in the 1950s.

We are now a church that, I have tried to argue in other situations, is in a very interesting social location in the United States, for we are both at the center and at the edge. Precisely because of Catholic education, in many instances, the Catholic community has moved into the center of American life politically, legally, professionally, in every way. Perhaps not yet intellectually are we where we want to be, but a long way from where we were when Ellis made his point.

And now we're a church at the edge again, an immigrant church again, a church that works in the urban areas and that is helping to bring immigrants into the United States. And that social location is a much more interesting location, I think, than in the Ellis time. So there are changes inside the colleges, there are changes inside the Catholic composition, there are changes in American academic life as a whole that we must contend with as others do. And finally, there are the changes in American society, or the challenges to the American society of the '90s, where I think the fabric of the Catholic intellectual tradition has a moment of opportunity.

Where do we stand in this culture? How do we explain the fabric of the political, cultural, social situation we face?

I submit that we as a church in this country face a secular state, a religiously pluralist society, a post-industrial economy, and a post cold war world. Now, there's a semester course, if you simply played that out. But notice what you do when you line that up, you're listening to *Gaudium et Spes*. Those are the signs of the times. That's the fabric of the challenge that this church must speak to and must act within. And the Catholic possibility in each of these discussions is what I would concentrate on.

Gaudium et Spes invites us to examine the fabric of the empirical challenge the world poses and then to think about what we have to offer, confident modesty. David O'Brien has said that the consensus that has emerged is that the two-fold task for us is retrieval of the tradition and projection of the tradition into the events of the time. I submit it is this

kind of empirical challenge which then will drive us to retrieve the best of our tradition, so that we can speak to a society that is not at all clear on many of these issues.

Let me indicate three different issues, without arguing the case, that illustrate what I mean by the potential of the Catholic moment. There is in the United States a major debate on religion in public life, and I think one of the things to keep in mind is that the way religion often is treated in the academy is a very narrow slice of American life. It may be suspect, and it often may be despised in the academy, but in the wider fabric of American life, that just illustrates how at times the academy can get itself lost in itself. Religion in American life is part of the fabric of the history and of the existential presence of this moment, of this country.

At the same time, we are not at all clear about what we think about the role of religion in public life. If you try and paint the debate, it runs from John Rawls to Pat Robertson, and believe me, that's a long walk. It is interesting with Rawls that his focus today is not on the theory of justice, but on the liberal idea and precisely the question of the relationship of religious discourse in public reason. Steven Holmes' long review in the *New Republic* of Rawls' most recent book notices how Rawls has changed his focus. Holmes is not happy about it. Rawls is very focused on the question of the different ways you can try and make a public case. He is obviously very suspicious of introducing religious discourse into the public arena, but that's a pole of the debate.

The Robertson pole is the immediate, direct, I would say sloppy translation of biblical imperatives into the political arena. I submit the Catholic option is comfortable neither with Rawls nor with Robertson, but we have our own story to work out. Now, immediately all of us will say, well, tell them to read John Courtney Murray. And indeed, there's a good deal of wisdom in that. But I think what's also necessary is to see that just as we're beyond the Ellis project, to some degree, we're beyond the Murray project. And there needs to be not only a retrieval of Murray but a use that goes beyond him.

That is to say, when Murray said to the council the church must not speak to the state in a language the state does not understand, that was a very ascetical view of the role of religion in public life. For it says that you virtually can't use religion in any public discourse. It sounds like Rawls, but it is not identical with Rawls. But David Hollenbeck and others have both wanted to maintain Murray's gift and to recognize that there's perhaps a wider role for religion in public discourse. That is a large question, but it is not an internal Catholic question. It is a question the country needs guidance on. And when you have a Murray, and when you have a tradition that runs back through the Roman empire as your history, we ought to have something to contribute.

Secondly, there is the question of the relationship of social ethics and bioethics. It seems to me this is best embodied, at least the fault line in the relationship, in the most recent encyclical, *Evangelium Vitae*. If you take *Evangelium Vitae* into the United States context, it seems to me it is a

very interesting possibility—not our conclusions, but our perspectives. Bioethics has been consistently an individualistic perspective on very complicated problems. Bioethics today is social in its content and its fabric, whether one thinks of genetics or one thinks of euthanasia. If you put a social framework around those debates, you change the logic of the ethical argument. I think the interesting case study here is somebody like Dan Callahan. He argues a pro-choice position on abortion and doesn't argue a pro-choice position on euthanasia, and I see the enormous difference precisely in the way he incorporates the social consequences of what he sees euthanasia to be in his discussion of euthanasia.

Again, a topic too large to argue out here, but I think identifying the topic highlights precisely the kind of possibility that's there. This is not an internal issue for us, but we've got something to say.

Finally, if you look at the debates about foreign policy in the post-cold war world and the place the United States has in this world, there is not only a possibility, there is an imperative in terms of what the Catholic voice will say about this.

Think of this week. We bring together the remembrance of Hiroshima, the anniversary of the gulf war, and the awful state of Bosnia. How does one think, morally and politically, about the nature and meaning and use of force, the meaning of solidarity and responsibility in what we have inherited in the post-cold war world?

How does one avoid a discussion of intervention, whether the case is Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, or Bosnia, that is paralyzed, as I think it is today, in the American context between a fear of quagmire on the one hand and the likelihood that we'll adopt a policy of quarantine on the other. Or that we just take a number of situations in the world and treat them the way we used to treat typhoid fever. You close the door, put a sign on it, wait until it's over, and go in and pick up the pieces.

It is not an easy question. But once again, a tradition that has struggled with universal solidarity, with fear of the use of force in its modern forms, but with a recognition that sometimes force needs to be used, at least ought to be able to say something to this discussion.

Those, I think, are the possibilities. Those are the stakes, I think, of what our internal discussion is about. Let me close with a final word, simply using anecdotes to highlight possibilities. They're all personal, and therefore, they won't be long.

The first one is a conversation I had with John Courtney Murray when I was a seminarian. I had 15 minutes with him. He set the agenda for my graduate work, and I guess for my professional life. And the one thing he said to me—when I asked him where you would go if you wanted to study ethics and foreign policy—was to get the foreign policy first and the theology second. Because if you get the theology first, your categories will be too rigid. And don't go to a place that will teach you more and more about less and less in foreign policy, because it is the broad architectural vision you need.

We've talked about the fragmentation of knowledge here and at least

the idea in the Catholic tradition that there is an architecture to knowledge, that things relate to one another. That is a very large question in the 1990s, but it is an interesting possibility for our future agenda.

The second is the relationship of institutions and Catholic identity. Cardinal Laghi yesterday talked about universities as institutions, but the focus was on the institution within the church. I submit we need to think long and hard about the value of institutions as a social presence in the world, for Catholicism has been institutional, not just in its internal life, but in its sense that the church always needed institutions to lay hands on life.

Today, in the United States, the institutional presence of the church in education, social service, and health care gives us the largest single nonprofit institutional presence in this country. The identity debate is going on in all three institutions, all three phases of our institutions. But it's a different debate in each place. There is need for some cross-fertilization of this discussion, and there is a badly needed intellectual architecture which runs from both principles of identity to strategy and tactics about what this opportunity is—to be the largest private health care institution in the country, the largest private educational system, and the largest social service agency.

The idea in the Catholic tradition that there is an architecture to knowledge . . . is a very large question in the 1990s.

What threatens identity differs in each case, but I submit that colleges and universities have some obligation to try to set some architecture within which our different parts of the Catholic institutional community can dialogue and set its future.

And finally, there is the question of discipleship and citizenship. We had a quote yesterday in one of the workshops from Msgr. George Higgins, who said the final impact of a Catholic college and university is not what its scholars produce, but the community that gets produced.

Once again, a kind of anecdote: When we were writing the statement on third world debt for the bishops, we went to New York to have a meeting with six of the leading executives from the banking community. Essentially, they held the Latin American debt right in their hands, and we went to talk to them about what we thought might be done. There were several Catholics around the table. They did not dismiss the bishops. They did not raise questions like why are you here, or why do you get involved in this? But when we got into the fabric of the discussion, and we were trying to frame the third world debt problem in terms of what we were calling the international common good, it was a tough walk from the appetizer through the entree—because they weren't resistant, it was just unintelligible discourse to them.

The frame of reference was not why are they interested in this question, but why do they talk about it this way?

And I think the anecdote illustrates the possibility of framing a way of looking at the world that produces a certain kind of citizenry and a certain kind of influence in society. Those are the kinds of things that I think are possible. The stakes of the debate are cast not just in terms of where we stand in the church, but where the church stands in the world and what kind of contribution we make to the society of which we're a part.

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
(A Department of NCEA)
Suite 650 One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Washington,
D.C.
Permit No. 9366