

A RESPONSE TO KENNETH GARCIA: HEALTHY SECULARITY AND THE TASK OF A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

GREGORY A. KALSCHEUR, S.J.

John Courtney Murray hoped that the Catholic university could craft a new unity between the sacral and the secular in society, a unity fully respecting the integrity of both orders. To imagine the Catholic university as a place of enlarged dialogue characterized by healthy secularity, as a community explicitly committed to risking real conversation in pursuit of the wholeness of truth driven by the dynamism of catholicity, might be one way we today can learn from Murray's reflections on the telos of the Catholic university.

BY DRAWING ATTENTION TO John Courtney Murray's theology of higher education and his vision of the telos of the Catholic university, Kenneth Garcia has done all who are interested in the project of Catholic higher education a tremendous service. As he explains, a free and dynamic search for truth with an aspiration for intellectual and spiritual wholeness grounded in the doctrine of the Incarnation lies at the heart of Murray's vision. This vision gives the Catholic university a task.

In 1955 Murray described the major responsibility of the Catholic university as continuing to represent the idea of the unity of truth: the conviction that, while there are "many different rivulets of truth" in which all in the university community "may happily splash," they all flow into "one river of truth."¹ The university must be visibly animated by the search for "the relation of truth to truth, for the inner hidden unity that must somehow join in a

GREGORY A. KALSCHEUR, S.J., received his JD from the University of Michigan Law School and his MDiv and STL from the School of Theology and Ministry at Boston College. He is currently senior associate dean for strategic planning and faculty development in the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and associate professor of law at Boston College. His academic interests include law and religion, constitutional law, civil procedure, Catholic social thought and the law, and the contributions of Ignatian spirituality to the character of legal education. His publications include "Conscience and Citizenship: The Primacy of Conscience for Catholics in Public Life," in *Voting and Holiness: Catholic Perspectives on Political Participation*, ed. Nicholas P. Cafardi (2012); and "Conversation in Aid of a 'Conspiracy' for Truth: A Candid Discussion about Jesuit Law Schools, Justice, and Engaging the Catholic Intellectual Tradition," *Gonzaga Law Review* 43 (2007–2008).

¹ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "The Catholic University in a Pluralistic Society," *Catholic Mind* 57 (1959) 253–60, at 260.

many-splendored pattern all the fragments of truth, human and divine, that the intelligence of man can encompass.”² As Michael Buckley has more recently reminded us, the defining purpose of the Catholic university is to be the intellectual community in which *all* human culture—“everything that passes for serious discourse and human advancement”—can be related to the gospel, “just as the cosmic Christ of Colossians is to bring into unity the massive pluralism of all creation.”³ For Buckley, as for Murray, “the religious inherently entails the academic and the academic inherently entails the religious; . . . the Catholic university exists to promote this organic unity in the intrinsic completion of each. This is the university’s finality and its promise.”⁴

In the wake of the Second Vatican Council, with its affirmation of what Murray called “a healthy secularity” marked by a differentiation between the sacral and the secular in society, Murray described the task of the Catholic university in these terms: “It is to be the bearer of the new movement that will transcend the present dichotomy of the sacral and the secular, and it is to be the artisan of their new unity.”⁵ The unity of these two orders of human life, moreover, is to be “achieved under full respect for the integrity of each.”⁶ In 1966 Murray recognized that task to be “manifold, complicated and most delicate.”⁷ And so it remains today.

This complex and delicate task challenges us to remain faithful to Murray’s aspiration for a healthy secularity in society and in the life of the Catholic university. In the political context, Pope Benedict XVI has called attention to a distinction between a healthy secularity and an unhealthy ideology of secularism.⁸ An unhealthy secularism sees religion as something purely private, seeks to exclude religion from any public role in society, and presents itself as if it were the only voice of rationality. A healthy secularity, by contrast, affirms religious freedom, the legitimate autonomy and secularity of the state, and the importance of dialogue between the state and religious communities acting as partners in the integral development of

² Ibid. 259.

³ Michael J. Buckley, S.J., *The Catholic University as Promise and Project: Reflections in a Jesuit Idiom* (Washington: Georgetown University, 1998) 49. Colossians 1:19–20: “For in [Christ] all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross” (NRSV).

⁴ Buckley, *Catholic University* 47.

⁵ John Courtney Murray, S.J., “The Declaration on Religious Freedom: Its Deeper Significance,” *America* 114.17 (April 23, 1966) 592–93, at 593.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ See Benedict XVI, Address to the Participants in the 56th National Study Congress Organized by the Union of Italian Catholic Jurists (December 9, 2006), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20061209_giuristi-cattolici_en.html. (All URLs referenced herein were accessed on August 26, 2012.)

the human person. Where a healthy secularity prevails, “the state does not impose religion but rather gives space to religions with a responsibility toward civil society, and therefore it allows these religions to be a factor in building up society.”⁹ In Murray’s terms, religion and the state work together in a unified way for the common good of society, while maintaining “full respect for the integrity” of both religion and the state.

This understanding of healthy secularity finds its doctrinal basis in Vatican II’s *Gaudium et spes*, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, no. 36, which affirms the rightful autonomy of earthly affairs: “If by the autonomy of earthly affairs we mean that created things and societies themselves enjoy their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated by men, then it is entirely right to demand that autonomy.” The autonomy of earthly realities in fact “harmonizes . . . with the will of the Creator. For by the very circumstance of their having been created, all things are endowed with their own stability, truth, goodness, proper laws and order. Man must respect these as he isolates them by the appropriate methods of the individual sciences or arts.”¹⁰ A healthy secularity affirms the legitimate autonomy of earthly affairs, free from control by the ecclesiastical sphere; this autonomy, however, is misunderstood if it is taken to mean that “*material being does not depend on God*,” or that God and God’s transcendent presence are not related in a meaningful way to the world that God has created.¹¹

In the context of the Catholic university, affirmation of a healthy secularity recognizes the legitimate autonomy of the academic disciplines, while challenging them to remain open to the unity of truth—what Buckley calls the inherent unity between the religious and the academic. Jesus Christ, as the union of the divine and the human in which each of the constituents remains, is the paradigm for this sort of healthy secularity. Christ remains

⁹ Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, “Cardinal Ratzinger on Laicism and Sexual Ethics,” interview with *La Repubblica*, November 19, 2004, <http://www.zenit.org/article-11587?l=english>.

¹⁰ *Gaudium et spes* no. 36, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html. John C. Haughey, S.J., in *Where Is Knowing Going?: The Horizons of the Knowing Subject* (Washington: Georgetown University) 68, writes: “The Council fathers . . . taught the need for all of created reality to be studied according to the autonomy of each aspect of it, rightfully enjoyed by reason of its distinctiveness: “[M]ethodical research in all branches of knowledge, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific manner and does not override moral laws, can never conflict with the faith, because the things of the world and the things of faith derive from the same God” (quoting *Guadium et spes* no. 36).

¹¹ Benedict XVI, Address to Italian Catholic Jurists, December 9, 2006, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20061209_giuristi-cattolici_en.html, emphasis original.

fully human, indeed more completely human, in his unity of humanity and divinity. Similarly, in the Catholic university, “physics does not become theology and business is not piety; law remains forever itself and mathematics has its own autonomy.”¹²

This affirmation of the ultimate unity of faith and the disciplines can be understood in light of the Council of Chalcedon’s affirmation of the unity of the divine and the human in Christ: “One is not to be confused with another; one is not to be changed into the other; they are not to be divided off from one another; they are not to be separated from one another.”¹³ The unity of faith and culture, of faith and the disciplines, “constitutes the university” marked by healthy secularity. “It is their individual integrity that allows for them to be united rather than identified. And this union—not identity or confusion—is finally between faith and all forms of human culture.”¹⁴ The individual integrity and legitimate autonomy of the disciplines characterize the university as “necessarily a secular operation,”¹⁵ but the Catholic university’s aspiration toward the wholeness and unity of truth in God keeps that secularity healthy.

The complex and delicate task to which Murray’s vision of healthy secularity calls us also challenges us to stand with Murray in recognizing the difference between a sectarian understanding of the Catholic university and one whose orientation is “Catholic in the adequate sense.”¹⁶ This is an important distinction to keep in mind in our efforts to build an intellectual culture that embodies the aspiration for wholeness that animates Murray’s vision of the telos of the Catholic university.

In talking about that telos in the necessarily and properly pluralistic contemporary university environment, and in implementing policies that hope to shape the intellectual culture toward the realization of that telos, the vision that animates the university must be grounded in an adequate understanding of catholicity. The engaged presence of faculty with expertise in both the Catholic tradition and the various disciplines is critically important. At the same time, fostering the intellectual and spiritual wholeness that

¹² Buckley, *Catholic University* 18. ¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Along these lines Haughey writes: “That Jesus’ humanity is at one and the same time other than God, and also united with his divine nature, is the key to understanding Christianity, and in turn Catholicism, and in turn Catholic schools. This is why Catholicism cannot accept a faith without reasoning or reasoning without faith. There is a direct link between the unique union of the two natures in Christ’s person, and the Christian faith’s insistence on reason. That is why the Church rejects any kind of integralism that would confuse or conflate divinity with humanity” (*Where Is Knowing Going?* 72).

¹⁵ Haughey, *Where is Knowing Going?* 34–35.

¹⁶ John Courtney Murray, S.J., “Reversing the Secularist Drift,” *Thought* 24 (1949) 36–46, at 40.

is at the heart of Murray's understanding of the task of the Catholic university cannot be understood as something to which only those faculty who have mastered the texts of the Catholic tradition or become dual experts in theology and another discipline can contribute.

Murray himself suggested, for example, that the Incarnation grounds the conviction that

he who entered the stream of history as its Redeemer is the Logos, Eternal Reason. Through His Spirit He is still immanent in history, there to do a work of reason—that work of reason which is justice. . . . Hence *all efforts, by whomsoever put forth*, toward the rationalization of human society, its 'justification' and its pacification, *are put forth in the line of action of the Logos Himself. He is in mysterious alliance with them.*

This "humanizing action is participative in the action of Christ, as Logos."¹⁷ In a similar way, John Haughey has argued for an expansive understanding of what it might mean to participate in the development of the Catholic intellectual tradition in the life of the university. Because God conducts himself as "one who is laboring"¹⁸ in human intentionality, all "those who pursue truth and value, as they disclose themselves in innumerable and always particular ways, are participants in this tradition, albeit usually anonymous ones. This makes membership in the Catholic intellectual tradition very large."¹⁹ Indeed, for Haughey, the Catholic intellectual tradition "is formed by all those who have been prompted to seek an intelligible whole and have succeeded in doing so."²⁰

Haughey argues that a clear rationale for the distinctiveness of a Catholic university might be found by seeking to better understand the notion of "catholicity"²¹ and the connection between catholicity, properly understood, and the Catholic intellectual tradition.²² The term "catholic" has its roots

¹⁷ John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Is It Basket Weaving?: The Question of Christianity and Human Values," in *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 1960, 1988) 175–96, at 191, emphasis added.

¹⁸ Ignatius Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius: A Translation and Commentary*, trans. and comm. George E. Ganss, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola University, 1992) no. 236.

¹⁹ Haughey, *Where Is Knowing Going?* 74.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 75.

²¹ Haughey, drawing on Lonergan, distinguishes a "notion" from a "concept." "Notions," such as "being" and "value," "are the triggers in intentionality that produce concepts." The "notion" of catholicity is that thirst in us for meaning, a dynamism that moves our thinking toward an anticipated wholeness. We humans "are scripted to pursue some kind of a *pleroma*—a completion, a fullness—just as surely as we are scripted to know what is so and what is good. Catholicity as a notion keeps beckoning us on to a more, to something yawning out before us, leading us on to something that is in the genre of the 'is' [being] and 'is good' [value], but also is meaningful [catholicity]" (*ibid.* 45).

²² *Ibid.* xi.

in the Greek word *katholicos*, which Haughey suggests is best rendered in English as “catholicity.” *Katholicos* connotes movement toward wholeness.²³ Accordingly, “a sectarian catholicity is a contradiction in terms.”²⁴ Haughey argues that catholicity understood as an orientation toward wholeness is the characteristic dynamism that drives human knowing, the drive in us for a sense of the whole. In the face of a universe of meanings that otherwise lacks order or a sense of the whole, our desire to know pushes for a fuller whole, a more comprehensive view of reality, a connectedness between “knowns” that are also known to be partial.²⁵

Murray himself recognized that a central aim of humanistic education “is to put the student in the way of building a view of reality. The essential humanist refusal is to diminish the range of man’s intelligence and thus contract the dimensions of reality.”²⁶ For Murray, “the subject matter of a humanistic education is *the whole of reality*, or, if you will, all truth, in its unity and in all the inner differentiations within its unity.”²⁷ A humanistic education, therefore, will help students build a view of reality that is shaped by catholicity—by the dynamism in us for a sense of the whole. As Murray explained:

The effort to build a view begins with the profound sense that intelligence is, as Aristotle said it was, *capax fieri omnia*, a universally responsive capacity for spiritual identification with, and therefore knowledge of, all that is real. To put it more simply, the quest for a view begins with the awakening of the spirit of wonder that is the root of the desire for understanding.²⁸

Murray’s understanding of the task of higher education is thus focused on the question of who our students are becoming: Has their educational experience helped them to view reality with minds and hearts awakened by wonder and open to the whole of reality, including its spiritual dimensions? By the mid-1960s, Murray saw that the key issue was that of reciprocal openness: “Is the scientific story and picture of man open to, or closed against, the story and picture which, in different ways, philosophy and theology have to tell or draw, and does this openness also reveal itself from the standpoint of philosophy and theology?” How are these different stories and pictures related? “Does one cancel the other or complete the other? . . . [Can we] account for the difference of views, render intelligible

²³ Ibid. 40. While “catholic” is sometimes said to mean “universal,” Walter Ong notes that *katholikos* is more properly understood as “through-the-whole” or “throughout-the-whole.” See Walter Ong, S.J., “Yeast: A Parable for Catholic Higher Education,” *America* 162.13 (April 7, 1990) 347–49, 362–63, at 347.

²⁴ Haughey, *Where Is Knowing Going?* 41.

²⁵ Ibid. 57–59.

²⁶ John Courtney Murray, S.J., “On the Future of Humanistic Education,” in *Bridging the Sacred and the Secular: Selected Writings of John Courtney Murray, S.J.*, ed. J. Leon Hooper, S.J. (Washington: Georgetown University, 1994) 157–72, at 162.

²⁷ Ibid., emphasis added.

²⁸ Ibid.

the diversity of perspectives, and compose the views into one, under respect for the respective character of the explanatory value of each?"²⁹

Nearly 50 years later, we might articulate our hopes for who we, our students, and our colleagues are becoming through our shared experience of Catholic higher education in these terms: Does the life of the university community witness to the truth that it is possible for one to be both seriously engaged with questions of faith and seriously committed to a rigorous intellectual life, such that the life of faith and the life of the mind are not two radically separate realms? Do we challenge one another to pursue in depth the largest possible questions that can be asked about human life and the world in which we live?³⁰ Questions about the meaning of life in the face of life's fragility, about where we have come from and where we are going, questions about what it means to live a good life, to foster life-giving relationships, and to build good communities, questions about what sorts of people we are becoming as we engage in our teaching, research, and study. And as we freely pursue all these questions wherever they may lead, are we open to all possible sources of truth, including the wisdom to be found in the intellectual life and tradition of the church? Perhaps most fundamentally, does the life of the university community help open all its members to a view of reality in which, as Garcia has elsewhere suggested, "every living being is a theophany, . . . [because] it is God who appears to us through the world 'to solicit our attention.' We need only be attentive to discern God's presence everywhere."³¹

This view of reality takes seriously what Buckley calls the "religious density" of all things.³² Because God dwells in all things and labors in all things,³³ the life of the university must make explicit the conviction that "there is no reality that is only profane for those who know how to look."³⁴ Grounded in this Ignatian affirmation of God at work in all things, Murray's understanding of the telos of higher education can be understood as part of the Jesuit

²⁹ Ibid. 171.

³⁰ See Stephen Schloesser, S.J., "The Unbearable Lightness of Being: Resourcing Catholic Intellectual Traditions," *Cross Currents* 58 (2008) 65–94, at 72.

³¹ Kenneth N. Garcia, "Academic Freedom and the Service Theologians Must Render the Academy," *Horizons* 38 (2011) 75–103, at 85, quoting Henri de Lubac, *The Discovery of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996) 88.

³² See Buckley, *Catholic University* 82–84; see also Gregory A. Kalscheur, S.J., "Ignatian Spirituality and the Life of the Lawyer: Finding God in All Things—Even in the Ordinary Practice of the Law," *Journal of Catholic Legal Studies* 46 (2007) 7–28, at 18–21.

³³ Ignatius Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises* nos. 235, 236.

³⁴ General Congregation 35 of the Society of Jesus, Decree 2, "A Fire That Kindles Other Fires" no. 10, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st–35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, S.J. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009) 737; see also Buckley, *Catholic University* 84 ("Nothing is finally profane").

mission to help people see the world as a place in which God is always and everywhere at work, laboring to bring all people and all of creation to experience freedom, wholeness, and fullness of life. When we are open to intimate knowledge of God companionship in our work of attaining knowledge and striving to realize the good through our lives in the university, our growth in knowledge can generate in us a response of gratitude. This gratitude, Haughey suggests, might allow us to see and experience our intellectual labors as a response of loving service to “the God who ‘makes a temple’ of us for this lifelong enterprise of coming to knowledge and acting on it.”³⁵

As we pursue the truth in whatever areas of study engage us; as we seek to answer questions about what it means to live a good human life and what it might take to build a world characterized by justice and reconciliation; as we open our minds and hearts in wonder and gratitude to the complexity and beauty of the world around us; in all these endeavors we are encountering the God who labors in all things to bring all people and all creation to experience the freedom and wholeness and fullness of life that God passionately desires for all that God has lovingly brought into being. Thus, as Karl Rahner imagined St. Ignatius telling a Jesuit biologist, “once he has grasped the insight that God can be found in all things he should feel free to investigate any avenue of study, even the spiritual life of the cockroach.”³⁶ There is no reality that, for those who know how to look, is only profane.

Garcia recognizes that implementing the practical structural changes needed to give flesh to Murray’s vision in the contemporary Catholic university will be difficult; it will require gradual changes in departmental and institutional cultures, changes that are likely to come only through a process of inculturation that allows theology to be a leaven in the various disciplines.³⁷ Such inculturation is a manifestation of healthy secularity in the life of the university. As Garcia has explained it: “The movement from academic disciplines toward theological must come about . . . from within each discipline. . . . The dynamism must move naturally outward from a particular sphere of knowledge toward the all-encompassing whole, *even while disciplines*

³⁵ Haughey, *Where Is Knowing Going?* 152, quoting the *Spiritual Exercises* no. 235.

³⁶ William B. Neenan, S.J., “A Catholic/Jesuit University?,” in *Finding God in All Things: Essays in Honor of Michael J. Buckley, S.J.*, ed. Michael J. Himes and Stephen J. Pope (New York: Crossroad, 1996) 312, citing Karl Rahner, S.J., “Ignatius of Loyola Speaks to a Modern Jesuit,” in *Ignatius of Loyola*, trans. Rosaleen Ockenden, photos by Helmuth Nils Loose (London: Collins, 1979) 11–38, at 16.

³⁷ See Garcia, “Reversing the Secularist Drift” 903 n. 47 and text at 907 n. 56; see also Garcia, “Academic Freedom” 92. Garcia here adopts the yeast metaphor that Ong drew from Matthew 13:33 to “illustrate how Catholic thought should be inculturated into other forms of knowledge in the Catholic university” (*ibid.*; see Ong, “Yeast” 348)

maintain their own identities and methods."³⁸ Theology leavens the other disciplines "as yeast does dough: by serving as a catalyst to their own potencies and elements, helping them to rise and become more fulsome. It does not impose on or suppress the natural qualities of the dough; rather it leavens them."³⁹

This sort of leavening may thus be less a matter of helping faculty "more fully integrate Catholic themes in their course work"⁴⁰ than of helping faculty be more attentive to the dynamism inherent in their own questioning. To be human is to be born with a "ceaseless drive toward meaning and truth."⁴¹ There is a "dynamic thrust" to "the human intellect that constantly presses toward the fullness of meaning and truth in the Absolute."⁴² It is our questioning itself that "reveals our orientation to the divine."⁴³ Because we are creatures *capax infiniti*, whose questioning strives to become and know everything, all our knowing "is always reaching out to be in communion with the Being whose being it is to be."⁴⁴ As Buckley explains:

Any inquiry moves to the satisfaction of questions. Any satisfaction of questions sets in motion further questions, which in their turn open up further inquiry. Questioning keeps "going on" because the drive to know is not satisfied. It is looking for something else. The drive of the human mind is towards an ultimacy, i.e., towards a completion or a whole, in which it can obtain comprehensive sense. The human intellect moves asymptotically towards the satisfaction of inquiry in this completion. One keeps asking questions—unless this natural drive is repressed—until they lead to questions about ultimate explanation or intelligibility, about the truth of the finite itself, "which all human beings call God." This relentless inquiry constitutes the natural career of the academic mind unless the culture arrests its progress by dictating the despair of its fulfillment.⁴⁵

Sustainable success in implementing the sorts of structural changes that Garcia suggests will therefore depend on our ability to develop and maintain

³⁸ Garcia, "Academic Freedom" 93, emphasis added.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ See Garcia, "Reversing the Secularist Drift" 903 n. 46.

⁴¹ Gerald O'Collins, S.J., *Rethinking Fundamental Theology: Toward a New Fundamental Theology* (New York: Oxford University, 2011) 38.

⁴² Ibid.; see also Karl Rahner, S.J., *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity* (New York: Seabury, 1978) 31–34; Garcia, "Academic Freedom" 84–87, 89–91.

⁴³ Haughey, *Where Is Knowing Going?* 83.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 80. See also text accompanying n. 29 above, pp. 929–30.

⁴⁵ Buckley, *Catholic University* 15; see also 186 n. 20, noting that the quoted passage draws on the "nominal" definition of God developed by Thomas Aquinas in *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 2, a. 3. Elsewhere Buckley writes: "In the commitment to truth in any of its realizations, no matter how minor, there is an implicit, mediated commitment to truth as such, in its highest and primordial form. There is a surrender to what is alone absolute, to its unconditional lordship, to a summons of obedience and a love that takes priority over any conflicting claim. . . . [T]he experience of the mediated, but absolute claim of truth is the experience of the claim of God.

a university-wide intellectual culture that will help faculty experience the telos of the Catholic university as something that is an audacious, exciting, and dynamic idea—in Murray’s words, something that flows out of “the excitement inherent in the free search of the mind” for truth and order, giving rise to a project that responds to “an inner need of the human spirit” itself.⁴⁶

For this to happen, we will need to find ways to foster conversation with faculty that will allow them to connect the university’s aspiration for wholeness with their own innate drive for catholicity as it manifests itself in their intellectual lives.⁴⁷ Haughey suggests that this sort of engagement with the telos of the university “from below” might begin by inviting faculty to reflect on the questions and desires that drive their own particular work in the university: Describe the good you are attempting to achieve through your teaching, research, and service. Does your faith play a role in your work, and if so, how concretely is your faith connected to your work? Do you have a dream, a hope, or a long-term project that you are seeking to implement in and through your discipline? Do you see your work as being of a piece with a larger whole?⁴⁸ Questioning that is open to moving beyond narrow disciplinary isolation in a drive to make connections leading to a deeper understanding of the human person and a more comprehensive realization of the common good can be understood as questioning that is open to the in-breaking wholeness and fullness of life that the Christian tradition calls “the reign of God.”⁴⁹ We need, therefore, to try to engage faculty in conversations that invite reflection on the ways their search for meaning or coherence or truth, in *whatever* their discipline might be is, as Buckley puts it, “inchoatively religious. . . . The intellectual dynamism inherent in all

There is no claim that is more absolute; there is no claim that is more pervasive. And the surrender to this claim—long before it has reached adequate categorical embodiment—is *de facto* a surrender to God, the only absolute” (*Denying and Disclosing God: The Ambiguous Progress of Modern Atheism* [New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2004] 133); and in *Catholic University* 37, Buckley writes: “Only this commitment to truth can make authentic faith possible. . . . To evoke authentic faith, the church must foster in every way possible an uncompromising commitment to truth, in whatever way it discloses itself. . . . The church itself must be understood or come to be more vitally the place where truth is revered and demanded and spoken. For this openness to the real . . . this acceptance of what is, simply because it is, constitutes a fundamental condition of the possibility of Christian faith.”

⁴⁶ Murray, “The Catholic University in a Pluralistic Society” 253, 256.

⁴⁷ To this point Haughey writes: “The mind always seeks to integrate the disparate, to make meaning, to achieve a sense of the whole. It is the notion of catholicity that drives this dynamism in human consciousness” (*Where Is Knowing Going?* 81).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 2, 4, 10, 15.

⁴⁹ See *ibid.* 22–24. Later Haughey observes: “There are wholes being birthed by academics that can be interpreted as parts of the larger whole that Jesus seemed to allude to and named the reign of God” (29). See also his chapter entitled “Catholicity: Its Scope and Contents” *ibid.* 40–60, esp. 47–49.

inquiry initiates processes or habits of questioning that—if not inhibited—inevitably bear upon the ultimate questions that engage religion.”⁵⁰

Rather than understanding the Catholic intellectual tradition as a body of doctrine that faculty must master in order to participate fully in the telos of the university, we might better describe the tradition itself as a conversation in which the participants are open to the sort of uninhibited process of questioning that leads across disciplinary boundaries with an openness to questions of ultimacy, a conversation in which all are invited to participate as a leaven for their scholarly lives.⁵¹

One model for this sort of conversation might be found in the “Junior Scholars in Conversation” seminar sponsored by the Jesuit Institute at Boston College. Since 2004, this seminar has provided a forum for junior faculty to come together to discuss works in progress in an effort to foster cross-disciplinary discussion and collaboration and to give faculty an opportunity to talk about the interconnections between their lives, their teaching, and their research.⁵² The program aspires to “construct ‘from the ground up’ a university climate in which faith, ideas, [and] values can flourish—particularly when the newest members of the faculty are brought into the conversation from the start.”⁵³

It has been said that John Courtney Murray hoped “to limit the warfare of conflicting philosophies and to enlarge the dialogue.”⁵⁴ For him, the manner in which a community engages in conversation—its whole manner of living, working, and talking together—is central to the identity of the community.⁵⁵ To imagine the Catholic university as a place of enlarged dialogue characterized by healthy secularity, as a community of teachers, scholars, students, and administrators explicitly committed to sharing an intellectual journey and risking real conversation in pursuit of the wholeness of truth driven by the dynamism of catholicity, might be one way we today can learn from Murray’s reflections on the telos of the Catholic university.

⁵⁰ Buckley, *Catholic University* 15. See also n. 46 above and accompanying text; and Garcia, “Academic Freedom” 90.

⁵¹ For further development of this idea, see “The Catholic Intellectual Tradition: A Conversation at Boston College,” Church in the 21st Century Center, Boston College, 2010, <http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/top/church21/pdf/Catholic%20Intellectual%20Tradition%20cropped%20pages.pdf>.

⁵² See <http://www.bc.edu/centers/jesinst/jsic.html>.

⁵³ Letter of August 1, 2004, from Francis X. Clooney, S.J., inviting participation in the program (on file with the author).

⁵⁴ Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., preface to John Courtney Murray, S.J., *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 1960, 1988) iii–vi, at vi.

⁵⁵ See Murray, *We Hold These Truths* 117, discussing the importance of what Aquinas called *civilis conversatio*.