

The Importance of a Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Student Group at a Catholic University

by Robert J. Riley
Economics Department

Through wisdom is a house built; and by understanding it is established. And by knowledge shall all the chambers be filled with precious and pleasant riches.

--Proverbs 24:3-4

I. Introduction

One of the more contentious issues on Catholic campuses in the U.S. over the past decade is the presence—or lack thereof—of groups that are considered controversial in that they are perceived to advocate positions that, at least in part, contradict official church teachings. In particular, student groups formed to address issues faced by gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) students on the university campus and in broader society have generated controversy and opposition at Georgetown, Notre Dame, as well as the University of St. Thomas.¹ Opponents of GLBT groups on the Catholic campus tend to cite the *Letter to Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*, among other church documents, which states that permission to use the facilities of Catholic schools "may seem only just and charitable; but in reality it is contradictory to the purpose for which these organizations were founded, [and] is misleading and often scandalous."²

The general argument offered by opponents of GLBT groups seems to be that any group that appears to advocate a position contradictory to a church teaching, even if all other positions supported by the group are in accord with church teachings, should not be allowed to meet on a Catholic campus, let alone receive official recognition through funding from the university or through other means. The further line of reasoning is that GLBT groups explicitly or implicitly "advocate" a position contrary to church teaching—namely, that a non-celibate gay life is neither evil nor morally wrong—and should thus be barred from campus.³ This would be the conclusion offered by opponents of a GLBT group regardless of other positions advocated by the group which actually further the work of the Catholic church.

It should be noted that *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, Pope John Paul II's apostolic constitution on Catholic universities, seems to be less clear on the possible role for a GLBT group at a Catholic college or university. For example, article 2.4 of that document's general norms states that "Catholic teaching and discipline are to influence all university activities, while the freedom of conscience of each person is to be fully respected. Any official action or commitment of the university is to be in accord with its Catholic identity."⁴ This

statement does not clarify what it means to "be in accord with" a university's Catholic identity, nor what is meant by freedom of conscience. Does the latter entail, for example, some degree of freedom of speech or does it merely state the truism that neither the university nor the church can dictate what individuals think? Further, it is not at all clear what is meant by the phrase "influence all university activities." Does this mean "simply inform" them or does it demand the censure of all positions or claims thought to be in conflict with official church teaching?

The point of this essay is to reconsider the claim that a GLBT group that possibly advocates a position contrary to official church teaching ought not be granted permission to use Catholic university facilities, awarded funding through student or university conduits, nor in any way encouraged to be active on the Catholic campus. The thesis advanced here is that the discussion that this type of group engenders and *the establishment itself of this group* constitutes a kind of academic freedom broadly defined, and that such freedom must be generously secured by the university. This claim will not be based on the legal or political dimensions of academic freedom and free speech but rather only by reference to academic freedom's importance to a university's mission. The basic argument is discussed more fully in the next section, while the third section offers some comments on the perceived tradeoff between academic freedom and Catholic identity and some related remarks; the fourth and final section of the essay offers a few conclusions. At the outset it is perhaps useful to point out that this essay—and others in the volume—is at least some evidence that academic freedom is not as moribund at the University of St. Thomas as some have imagined.

II. The Basic Argument

Defining academic freedom itself is not an easy task. Thinking about the possible conflict between academic freedom and the Catholic identity of an institution such as St. Thomas is even more difficult as the thorny issue of university autonomy vis-à-vis the church hierarchy is examined. The range of opinions on the appropriate degree of that autonomy is remarkable, though the majority of campus members' opinion is likely closer to the average opinion that might be supposed. In a statement now thirty years old, an influential group of American Catholic college presidents stated that "to perform its teaching and research functions effectively the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community."⁵ The Vatican, on the other hand, has stated in *Ex Corde* that the Catholic university is "linked with the church either by a formal, constitutive and statutory bond or by reason of an institutional commitment made by those responsible for it."⁶ The document also states that "each bishop has a responsibility to promote the welfare of the Catholic universities in his diocese and has the right and duty to watch over the preservation and strengthening of their Catholic character."⁷ These statements appear to call for a greater degree of influence by the church in university affairs than is called for in the Land O'Lakes statement.

Before examining the issue of university autonomy in more detail it is appropriate to make an attempt to define academic freedom. Some define it quite narrowly: it is the

liberty to pursue unrestricted teaching and research activities of non-theology faculty members alone; it does not extend to student activities generally nor to faculty activities outside the research facility or classroom. I believe that most of us would, however, agree that academic freedom applies to certain—though not all—activities of faculty members that take place outside the classroom or research facility proper. I would add that I believe that it applies to certain activities pursued not only by faculty *but also by students within as well as outside of the classroom*. For example, it would apply to the production of a student-written and -produced play, but not to the celebration of the Catholic mass: a student is free to make an unsolicited statement about church teachings in the former context, but not the latter.

In order to clarify matters, it might be helpful to more specifically define academic freedom as the opportunity to investigate and discuss any topic in an appropriate university setting without the possibility of censure in that endeavor by other members of the university community or by individuals external to the university itself. Defined in this way, limits on academic freedom are not the same as limits on personal *conduct* which are dictated by civil law, process requirements, or by professional codes for faculty. This would limit the scope of activities that is allowed on campus but only in very limited ways to be considered momentarily.

Even if an activity is found to be permissible on campus, limits may be placed on the appropriate venue within the university in which academic freedom may be exercised. For example, it might be appropriate to have a heated discussion about abortion or gay rights in certain, though not all, settings on campus. The important rule here is that the university must provide an equitable opportunity across the campus for the discussion of a range of issues as long as doing that does not itself threaten the effective functioning of the process. Given the *raison d' être* of a university, the institution must afford equal access to the discussion of issues.

Further, academic freedom is not the same thing as an analogous freedom of action: a faculty member's university-protected *discussion* of same-sex marriage or housing is not the same thing as using the university chapel for a same-sex marriage ceremony or campus housing for same-sex cohabitation. As another example, a distinction needs to be made between a faculty person's discussion of abortion rights on campus and the action of performing an abortion in university facilities. In this essay, I will strictly focus on the legitimacy of a GLBT group on a Catholic campus as it is related to academic freedom as a means of facilitating the inquiry or discussion into issues important to the dignity and well-being of GLBT students, such as the decision by the university regarding same-sex benefits, housing, and so on.

Specifically, I propose that the funding (particularly if it is initiated by students themselves through the usual channels) and the convening of a GLBT student group on a Catholic campus ought to be allowed and encouraged as a protected form of academic freedom.⁸ That student group activities fall under the rubric of academic freedom is by no means accepted by everyone. For example, a draft paper on controversial student groups on Catholic campuses states that "a Catholic university's recognition of a controversial

student group cannot be justified in the name of academic freedom."⁹ The authors, however, make this argument by taking as a given the definition of academic freedom from *Ex Corde* and applying it in a way that doesn't really address the issue of academic freedom vis-à-vis the church. I propose that the functioning of student groups *is*, in fact, protected under conditions of academic freedom albeit with the same community (e.g., legal, process or public safety) restrictions as are placed on faculty in their teaching and research activities. These restrictions will in fact bar some groups from campus: those, such as KKK chapters, which advocate violence against community members or seek to exclude African-Americans or other individuals from democratic participation in the education process, can be barred from campus on the basis of security and community requirements designed to ensure the effective functioning of the university's essential process, of democratic dialogue and participatory investigation.¹⁰ Of course, the burden of proof in such cases would be on the university, which must show that the group barred from campus represents a serious risk to the basic operation of the university's essential function because the group seeks to undermine that function, and not simply because others find that group's position disagreeable. To simply compare a GLBT group to a KKK group, as the authors of the previously cited draft paper do, is specious at best: the two groups differ not only with respect to their position on the use of violence but also on equal access to campus facilities and process. GLBT and KKK groups are multidimensionally different and cannot be lumped together part and parcel as groups antithetical to the mission of a Catholic university. At bottom, the GLBT group seeks to restore and nurture the intrinsic dignity of its members while the KKK, behind its masks and burning crosses, attacks the dignity of those it perceives to be different.¹¹

Nearly any college mission or vision statement claims that a college education takes place not only in classrooms and research labs but also in the broader campus environment: in office hours, cafeterias, social events, service projects, and a host of other arenas. This is reflected in documents of the University of St. Thomas, such as our latest version of policies and procedures for rank and promotion, which states that "recognizing that much learning goes on outside of the classroom, faculty should also be effective and skillful formal and informal advisors to students."¹² If the learning process extends beyond the classroom it seems reasonable that faculty activities that are part and parcel of inquiry into a range of issues but that take place outside of lecture time or the research lab on campus ought to be afforded the same protections as teaching and research activities per se. This would imply that a faculty or staff member who has been selected as the advisor to a GLBT group, for example, ought to be entitled to the same academic freedom in the discussions and inquiry engendered by the group as are extended to the pure teaching and research activities of that advisor. This, of course, doesn't address the question as to whether such a group ought to exist in the first place. This will be taken up momentarily. The main point here is that once such a group is established it ought to be afforded the same protections in its inquiry into a range of issues that might also be addressed in a classroom. In the case of a GLBT group these issues might include the types and sources of discrimination or harassment against gay people, the possible policy prescriptions for these social problems, and the difference in opinion across religions regarding homosexuality.

As controversial perhaps is the notion that academic freedom applies only to certain activities pursued by faculty members, but not to student activities. It is sometimes claimed that students are not afforded the same rights as are enjoyed by faculty members. I dispute this. We know that traditionally, at least, students have often been thought to enjoy these privileges. In the original 1915 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) declaration it is stated that "the term 'academic freedom' has traditionally had two applications—to the freedom of the teacher and to that of the student—*lehrfreiheit* and *lernfreiheit*."¹³ Under this tradition, students themselves enjoyed many of the same privileges as faculty members. While the emphasis on student academic freedom in the U.S. has been historically weaker than in Europe, it still has retained currency in American higher education. In 1964 the AAUP issued its own statement on student academic freedom stating, among other things, that students ought to enjoy freedom of association to discuss issues they deemed important free of censorship.¹⁴ This notion was strengthened, we might suppose, by the experience of the 1960s and 1970s as student civil protests helped define the issue further and, it might be added, as universities sought to maintain the orderly process of the university.

Beyond claims to tradition, the nature of learning and teaching itself mandates that both teacher and student are able to freely explore, discuss, and report on important issues. If not, the process is reduced to a simple unilateral catechism in which students are unable to question critically and argue ideas presented by faculty. While students who are not granted academic freedom of the same type extended to faculty members might derive some second-hand benefit from the academic freedom given to faculty alone, it seems that true intellectual development requires something much more dynamic and involves the free—i.e., the unrestricted—dialogue between student and professor. Students who refrain from critically examining what is presented to them without fear of censure are, I would argue, less likely to develop to their full intellectual potential. Further, if students in the free marketplace of ideas seek to form a group that addresses a particular set of issues, even if one or more of the positions advocated by the group is distasteful to some, it is incumbent upon the university to provide an equal opportunity for that group unless it seeks to disenfranchise others on campus from the same process. Again, learning is not limited to lecture or lab time alone.

If we grant that academic freedom ought to be granted to students and to faculty and that this freedom extends beyond the classroom to broader campus activities, it is appropriate to specifically discuss the role of a GLBT group on a Catholic campus. What is the purpose of such a group? How do protections of academic freedom apply to what it does? In general, a GLBT group by its very existence promotes increased discussion of gay and lesbian issues, including the position of the Catholic church itself. This last point is worth emphasizing: the existence of such a group affords concerned individuals within the university to clearly and frequently discuss what Catholic teaching on homosexuality is. In the absence of such a group, there will likely be little practical reason or incentive for the Church position to be widely discussed on campus: absence generates silence, which is antithetical to the process of inquiry and learning. If the Catholic university and its constituents are to address a range of social issues effectively—which certainly includes the treatment of gay people within society—it must foster a pluralistic discussion on its

own campus. This is perhaps more essential at a university that seeks to synthesize and integrate knowledge across disciplines as a unified whole, since any practical effort at this will, to a significant degree, occur outside of the individual classroom and the narrow focus of traditional disciplines. If a meaningful discussion is to take place on, say, the nature of homosexuality from the Catholic and integrated perspective, it is vital that biologists, psychologists, sociologists, theologians and gay people themselves engage one another in meaningful dialogue and not isolate themselves from one another.

Such discussion is crucial in inculcating in our students the ability to critically examine issues that they will inevitably encounter off campus. Peter Gomes, the preacher to Harvard University and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals, writes in a widely read and discussed book that much of the nastiest views on homosexuality "can be summarized in the hate slogan of the notoriously homophobic Baptist preacher Fred Phelps who pickets the funerals of gay men dead with AIDS with the sign GOD HATES FAGS."¹⁵ How do our students respond to what Peter Gomes writes or to what Fred Phelps does and says when they are confronted by their words and deeds if they have had no opportunity to discuss those ideas and to think about both sides of the issue? As another example, what are our students to *think* about their Catholic parish banning the GLBT group Dignity from meeting on its premises, and how can they even effectively defend the church's position if they have never been afforded the opportunity to discuss and examine the issue?

It is true that a pluralistic discussion protected by the rights of academic freedom would be open to all sorts of groups that advocate controversial positions as long as they do not seek to block access to the same discussion or process by other groups on campus. These groups *might* include Freemasons, John Birch Society chapters, or others that many of us would rather not have to deal with. They might even include a group that invites the aforementioned Fred Phelps to speak on campus, who has a right to express his opinion and the responsibility to then defend it in an intelligent fashion in the appropriate venue (in the school auditorium but not at the funeral of an AIDS victim in the campus chapel). I suspect, however, that the clash of ideas and the uncensored discussion of issues in a truly free marketplace of ideas would quickly take the steam out of groups who advocate positions that are objectionable to the broader campus community.

III. -A More Nuanced Understanding of Catholic Identity and Academic Freedom

A related question that has not yet been addressed is to what extent a conflict truly exists between the Catholic identity of a university and its educational mission and under what conditions the local bishop can or should be allowed to intervene in campus affairs. Even if we grant that a GLBT or other controversial student group is eligible in theory to the same general kind of academic freedom as is extended to faculty or students in other discussions, the related issue of when a university might intervene by removing a GLBT group from campus or barring the formation of one in the first place needs to be considered.

It is quite possible that the notion of a trade-off or conflict between academic freedom and Catholic identity has been exaggerated because of the very strict definitions sometimes applied to the two terms. A more fluid—or nuanced—understanding of Catholic identity and academic freedom can help ameliorate some of the apparent tension between the two. Carefully defining these two nuanced terms is, of course, quite tricky. Most would, for example, likely agree that church teachings ought to inform all activities that take place on a Catholic campus. If we take "inform" to mean "forbid" any questionable activity at all we will of course sacrifice a greater degree of academic freedom than if a less strict notion is applied. Likewise, those who adopt a very strict notion of academic freedom are likely to also adopt a less strict notion of Catholic identity, such as one that requires a strong but not necessarily singular Catholic presence on campus, as a means of avoiding the tension. Whether a genuine compromise between these two—one which minimizes the discomfort felt by the purists on either side—can be effectively reached at St. Thomas and other Catholic universities remains to be seen. I believe, however, that such a compromise is feasible. If we take the view that academic freedom applies only to speech and not to action and that Catholic identity means only that in all official university proclamations official church teaching is maintained and that internally the Catholic position is clearly—though not exclusively—stated, we are perhaps able to satisfy all except the most adamant individuals on either side.

As an alternative we could have a more extreme arrangement. At one end we might seek to establish the "completely Catholic" university that requires all students, faculty, and staff to identify themselves as practicing Catholics and require that they all sign a statement affirming that they will abide strictly by all Church teachings. This, of course, will raise a host of other issues—the means by which individuals are to be monitored, how legal issues will be resolved, and so on—but it is certainly a possibility on the spectrum of institutional arrangements. Pinpointing the other end of the spectrum is more difficult, though we might imagine an institution that is shorn of all real Catholic identity except that it claims to be one in its mission statement: it has no campus ministry, no functioning chapel, but simply claims that it is a Catholic university.

The appropriate arrangement is, as stated above, likely to lie somewhere between these two extremes. As such, the Catholic university will not be completely Catholic and will thus be comprised of individuals with a wide range of religious and political affiliations and beliefs. While the university identified as a Catholic institution will presumably ensure that there is a strong Catholic presence on campus, it will not under this more moderate arrangement censor discussion engendered by the presence of people of other religions or belief systems simply because in good and free conscience they take positions contrary to the Catholic church. It is in this spirit that the University of Saint Thomas has established its Center for Jewish-Christian Learning and has invited Jewish people to participate fully in campus discussions without fear of censorship. This despite the fact that the Jewish religion advocates theological positions which are at times quite contrary to teachings of the Catholic church, not least of which is that Jesus is not the messiah. It is in the same spirit that students form College Democrat groups at most Catholic universities, despite the fact that the U.S. Democratic Party has for years had an abortion rights plank in its platform. As another example, are we certain that the College

Republican's position on the death penalty or on economic issues is in accord with church teaching? Even though it is possible to identify a position "advocated" by some commonly accepted groups that is contrary to certain Church positions, very few (if any) campus members have asked that these groups be barred from campus on that basis. This is in recognition of the fact that allowing these groups to freely meet on campus does not reduce the university to a Tower of Babel nor dilute the voice of the Catholic church on campus.

Some might argue that more mainstream groups such as the College Democrats or Republicans ought to be allowed on campus even if they hold a position contrary to church teaching because these groups do not hold that position at the core of their belief system, and the issue of impinging on academic freedom is simply a matter of the degree (measured by the placement of the position in the overall belief system) to which the group violates the Catholic identity of the institution. Under the notion of academic freedom discussed above, however, restrictions on free speech ought not to be imposed *only* because a position—no matter how central it is to a group's belief system—is not endorsed by the Catholic church.

Beyond that, it is still helpful to clarify what a GLBT group's mission is about. Its belief system will typically include the claim that the active living out of a gay orientation is morally acceptable, at least according to some religions such as Reform Judaism. It will, however, also typically include the claim that discrimination against gay people—whether celibate or not—in employment and housing is wrong, and that such discrimination is a public policy issue. The belief system of a GLBT group will also likely include the notion that an unusually high suicide rate for gay teenagers is unacceptable and that solutions ought to be advanced to save lives; that persons with AIDS face serious difficulties, and funds ought to be raised to assist them in the fight against the disease; that physical violence against gay people—celibate or not—is unwarranted and ought to be stopped.

None of these positions, except the first, which typically constitute part of a typical GLBT group's belief system contradict church teaching, at least in general terms. Arguments regarding particulars remain, though this is true for many church teachings. On the issue of social discrimination, for example, the previously cited letter to bishops on the pastoral care of gay people states that 'it is deplorable that homosexual persons have been and are the object of violent malice in speech or action. Such treatment deserves condemnation from the Church's pastors wherever it occurs. It reveals a kind of disregard for others which endangers the most fundamental principles of a healthy society. The intrinsic dignity of each person must always be respect in word, action, and in law."¹⁶

Even though the next paragraph of the document cheapens this wonderful statement (and might be construed as justifying the actions of the Reverend Phelps of the world) by stating that it should be no surprise that irrational and violent acts against gay people occur when claims are made that the gay orientation is not "disordered," to use the church's phrase, we can take the church at its word that work aimed at reducing violence

against and harassment of gay people on a Catholic campus is in accord with church teaching. There might be some disagreement about the exact fashion in which this is to be done but that would best be addressed in the context of free, uncensored dialogue.

Apparently opponents of GLBT groups on Catholic campuses believe that work to reduce violence toward gay individuals—or any of the other type of work that GLBT groups might do—is not worth the *apparent* advocacy of the active gay life implicit in the presence of a GLBT group on a Catholic campus. Are we convinced that is the case? Is it true that a possible life saved or a gay bashing prevented is less valuable than ensuring that only a single voice on gay celibacy is allowed to speak? Are we certain that, as Martha Nussbaum points out in a recent book, stifled discussion is *not* a factor in violence against gay people?¹⁷ Further, it is not at all apparent that permitting the free discussion of any and all GLBT issues is in the same category as the provision of, say, same-sex housing or permitting same-sex commitment ceremonies to take place in the university chapel. It is true that in the unfettered marketplace of ideas—an essential component of a university—the permission to discuss a position on any issue may be misconstrued to imply endorsement by the "system." Faculty know this all too well from everyday experience. That is a possibility that cannot be completely avoided. It is, of course, the Catholic university's right and responsibility to use every forum to convey church teaching on a range of issues. Further, if a group of students or faculty seeks to form a Catholic advocacy group on campus that holds that under no conditions may a gay person express love sexually, and engage other groups on campus in debate or dialogue on that position, they ought to be actively encouraged. But that is again under the guarantee of equal access to all campus facilities by legitimate groups.

Beyond this it is important to ask why advocacy becomes the central issue with GLBT groups but not others that might at least in part hold positions contrary to Church teaching. Does the Catholic university endorse Jewish theology by encouraging a Jewish presence on campus or allowing a Jewish person to teach on the faculty and freely express his or her religious views, or does the university advocate the pro-choice position by permitting students to form a College Democrat chapter when that party broadly supports abortion rights? It is tenuous at best to claim that the University is providing implicit or explicit endorsement to a position merely by permitting a group that does hold that position to freely state it as part of the dynamic of the college environment.

It might be added here that the argument in favor of allowing a GLBT group to meet in a Catholic parish would have to proceed along different lines than those here given the significant difference between a parish and a University. The establishment of GLBT groups in Catholic parishes is of a different nature than that of a GLBT group at a Catholic university and thus must be defended on different grounds.¹⁸ While I support the formation of GLBT groups at the church level as well, I will not pretend that I have furthered an argument in favor of that here.

Finally, if a tradeoff does exist between the Catholic identity and academic freedom of the University given the particular institutional arrangement in place, in which direction does the institution choose? As a university, St. Thomas has arguably more essentially in

common with St. Olaf College than with a local Catholic parish. The university function at St. Thomas could continue if all catholicity were somehow lost, but what would remain of St. Thomas if all of its university functions were lost? The institution must zealously protect its essential university function, which in the end need not be antithetical to its Catholic identity. If the local church authority (even if that is the administration itself) is to bar a group from campus it must justify that impingement on the educational process by clearly demonstrating that the loss in academic and religious freedom that results from that action, as well as the silencing of all other positions held by that group which are in accord with church teaching, are less valuable than the expression of only one voice on one controversial issue.

IV. Concluding Remarks

The Catholic university is not an anomaly nor is it anachronistic. As any enduring institution it has had to adapt not in order to adopt broader cultural changes but to effectively accomplish its traditional mission in a changing environment. I believe that, if anything, Catholic universities have a stronger Catholic presence in the world than they did fifty years ago. While some might claim that the catholicity of St. Thomas is much less intense than even twenty years ago—a lower percent of Catholics on campus, a GLBT group established, and co-ed housing in the works—it is certainly plausible that the reach of St. Thomas and therefore its presence in the broader community is much greater today than twenty years ago. The net effect might well be a wider Catholic influence than ever by the University, and not one that is simply watered down. Discussions with individuals in the local community make it apparent that St. Thomas is increasingly known as an important Catholic institution in the Twin Cities and the region. The presence of a GLBT group at St. Thomas surprises many people, though it would seem that very few, if any, regard this as a signal of change in church teaching on gay issues. They rather express respect for a university that better than most tolerates a free discussion and investigation of those and other issues without a need to censor those positions with which the church does not agree. They recognize, as we on campus do, that a silenced conscience is by no means a free one but merely an imprisoned one, and that the best interests of both the university and the church can be served by a generous attitude toward academic freedom.

Endnotes

1. -The Summer 1997 issue of *Notre Dame Magazine* discusses the recent decision by Notre Dame President for Student Affairs Patricia O'Hara to deny official recognition to the GLBT group at the university because "the group's mission was inconsistent with the mission of the university and the moral teaching of the Catholic Church." (p. 9). As a co-advisor to the GLBT group at St. Thomas I am well aware of the opposition to its existence on the part of some individuals.

2. -From *And the Truth Will Make You Free: Letter to Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987, p. 14.

3. -Some individuals have argued that the only appropriate role for a GLBT group is to help gay people "recover" from their sexuality much as Alcoholics Anonymous helps alcoholics begin recovery from alcoholism. The flaw in this argument is that untreated alcoholism will typically end in premature death and has adverse consequences for the alcoholic's professional, social, and emotional well being. The same cannot be said for an active gay life, whose sexual expression does not typically affect one's broader life adversely. Non-celibate gay people are able to lead happy, complete lives (even spiritually, I would claim) despite the prejudices and social pressures that have been heaped upon them historically.

4. -As reported in "The Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities," *Origins*, CNN Documentary Service, October 4, 1990, p. 274.

5. -From the "Land O'Lakes Statement: Catholic Nature of Contemporary Catholic Education' in *American Catholic Higher Education, Essential Document: 1967-90*, ed . Alice Gallin, Notre Dame Press, 1991 p. 7.

6. -From "The Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities," *Origins*, CNN Documentary Service, 4 October 1990, p. 274.

7. *Op. cit.*, pp. 274-75.

8. -I also believe that it ought to be allowed and encouraged under the protection of freedom of religion, a point I make later on.

9. -From "Controversial Student Organizations: Why they Should Not Be Recognized by a Catholic University," Robert Sassen and William A. Frank, University of Dallas, 8 January 1993, p. 3.

10. -A fine discussion of KKK ideology may be found in *Behind the Mask of Chivalry*, Nancy MacLean, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.

11. -I would like to thank Michael Mikolajczak for bringing this point to my attention.

12. -*Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty, Rank, and Evaluation*, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of St. Thomas, May 1997, p. 19.

13. -Cited by James Heft, "Academic Freedom and the Catholic University," in *Theology and the University, Annual Publication of the College of Theology Society*: 33, ed. John Apczynski, 1987, p. 213.

14. -The main points regarding student academic freedom are discussed more fully by James John Annarelli, *Academic Freedom and Catholic Higher Education*, Greenwood Press, New York, 1987, pp. 103-07.

15. -From *The Good Book: Reading the Bible with Mind and Heart*, Peter J. Gomes, William Morrow and Company, New York, 1996, p. 147.

16. *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

17. -She writes in *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997, p. 255) that "it appears that anti-gay violence on campuses is correlated with the absence of open discussion, and that institutions like Brown and Chicago, which do a lot to educate students in this area, are less plagued by violence. At Notre Dame, which combines a long tradition of drunken partying with virtual silence about sexuality, abuse of gay and lesbian students has become so severe that in 1994 a group of 276 faculty members signed a public petition protesting the administration's lack of support for these students' situation."

18. -A general discussion of GLBT issues and Catholic doctrine can be found in *Freedom, Glorious Freedom*, John J. McNeill, Beacon Press, Boston, 1995.