

What Makes a University Catholic?

by Gregory J. Coulter
Department of Philosophy

As a participant in a summer workshop on the "Idea of the Catholic University," I have been given this opportunity to record my own thoughts on exactly what distinguishes a Catholic university from the many other kinds of universities there are. This question has received much attention lately, including from the president and the dean of the University of St. Thomas, both of whom chose, in the first week of this academic year, to address it publicly. But before going to the heart of the question, let me preface with a few remarks.

It is not my purpose to comment on, to praise or disparage, the general condition of Catholic higher education or, more particularly, of St. Thomas. Nor do I want to propose a set of practical correctives for this or any other university. These sorts of tasks can only be managed through a collective effort from every level of an institution and only after a blueprint or paradigm of a Catholic university has been articulated. I am more interested in discovering what that blueprint is and trying to determine what a Catholic university ought to look like in ideal circumstances. If an organization chooses to adopt, and to consistently describe itself by, a label, then it should be able to explain what the label means and to provide some grounds for the appropriation of it for itself. Without a clear articulation of its Catholic identity, a university cannot engage in serious self-review or long-range planning, nor can it offer anything concrete to its members and supporters as evidence of its Catholic nature. Also, it makes no sense to argue about the relative Catholicity of a given institution unless one first establishes a standard of such — even if it exists only in the abstract. After all, no one enjoys perfect health, but this ideal is, nevertheless, indispensable in determining the health of every individual. So, my purpose in this short essay is simply to engage this question in a way that might lead to some reasonably defensible claims about what makes a university Catholic.¹ As G.K. Chesterton observed, "This is the arresting and dominant fact about modern social discussion; that the quarrel is not merely about the difficulties, but about the aim. We agree about the evil; it is about the good that we should tear each other's eyes out What is wrong is that we do not ask what is right."²

This essay will not consider the question of whether a Catholic university is a worthwhile thing. Most everyone who has given it serious thought knows that there are pressing objections to the desirability of a specifically Catholic university. I have heard it alleged that, academically speaking, a Catholic university is a bad idea because it precludes or at least threatens honest intellectual work and, further, undermines academic freedom. The thinking behind these views is, if a school is really Catholic, then it is committed to a set of (supposedly divinely revealed) claims and principles that cannot be subjected to debate or dissent. But a university, by its very nature, is open to debate on any view and must allow its faculty to hold (and thus dissent from) virtually any claim whatsoever. As a colleague of mine once said, "The terms Catholic and university cannot co-exist."

Admittedly, concerns of this sort are pressing and worthy of discussion. But I do not propose to consider them in this essay. It makes little sense to try to settle whether a Catholic university is a good idea or not until one has first set out in clear terms exactly what a Catholic university is. My experience has been that arguments about the value or desirability of any project accomplish little if the status of the project is in dispute. Often passionate rhetoric and stereotypical viewpoints dominate a discussion where carefully reasoned analysis of the realities in question is absent.

As a final remark, there is a useful distinction that will advance the aim of this essay. In asking what makes a university Catholic, one can look for one of two kinds of answers. One can search for necessary features, which refer to any elements that must be present but which are not enough, or one can look for features that, when taken together, are sufficient to guarantee the presence of a Catholic university. So, for example, flour is a necessary ingredient of bread but not sufficient. Flour, water, yeast, salt and baking powder, when taken together, are sufficient. With respect to this essay, we are interested in finding both kinds of ingredients and in classifying each accordingly.

In the first part of this essay, I will examine a number of proposals, a few of which were offered by some of the workshop participants. Then I will try my own hand, relying largely on papal documents.

Part I: Some Proposed Answers

Proposal No. 1: If a university asserts in its mission statement that it is a Catholic university, then it is Catholic. I have heard it argued that the mission statement of an organization defines it, and so, the mere proclamation of its Catholic identity is sufficient to constitute a university's Catholic identity.

Reply to No. 1: Experience shows time and again that it is unwise, to say the least, to believe that organizations assert only truths about themselves. Saying something does not make it so. Imagine a mission statement cited as proof that a university has the appropriate academic credentials or that it offers equal opportunity of employment. That an institution makes certain claims cannot be seriously considered as evidence that it lives up to them or even tries to.

I suspect it matters little whether an organization asserts in its literature that it is Catholic. After all, accurate self-description is not an easy task. Members of an institution can be confused or misguided about its status. There can be obstacles of a personal, ideological, or economic sort that can make mission statements unreliable.

Proposal No. 2: What makes a university Catholic is having a significant percentage of Catholics among the faculty, staff, and students. The idea is that, because having a large percentage of Catholics in attendance at a Catholic school is unique to it, it must be a defining characteristic. I suspect that it is assumed that the personal religious convictions of its members will have institution-wide impact at a Catholic school.

Reply to No. 2: I think that looking for something unique to an organization as a way to find its defining features is correct. But, a high percentage of Catholics is not unique to Catholic organizations. Many organizations have a significant Catholic membership, often by chance, and sometimes by design. Nevertheless, this does not make an organization a Catholic one. Suppose, just for example, that a Dairy Queen in St. Cloud is staffed completely with Catholics (which I gather might very well be the case). The mere presence of Catholics doesn't make it a Catholic enterprise. It would be preposterous to say that it is a Catholic Dairy Queen. Having Catholic members is not sufficient for establishing the Catholic nature of any organization.

Now it might be suggested a significant percentage of Catholics, although not sufficient, is necessary in order for an organization to be Catholic and that it is impossible to operate a Catholic school without a significant Catholic population.

Leaving aside what a significant population might be, there are two things worth mentioning. In the first place, if having Catholics on site is indispensable to the Catholic identity of a university, it could only be so if the Catholics have the opportunity to affect the actual policies and practices of that institution. If, on the other hand, the Catholicism of its members is rendered impotent by the policies and practices of a university, then a large or small percentage of Catholics will make little difference to its identity. So, what could make Catholic membership important to the identity of a Catholic university is what presumably Catholicism can uniquely offer to its policies and practices.

Secondly, if at least part of what makes a school Catholic is the presence of Catholics, then, for any Catholic school, this should be an institutional requirement. For, to the degree that any organization, including a Catholic school, is obliged to take steps to preserve its own identity, it must secure all conditions necessary to its existence. In this case it would be necessary to populate itself with Catholics. But, if it is a requirement, then it ought to be promulgated both to actual and future members of the organization, including prospective students and their families, donors, and employees.

What we can say at this point is that a Catholic membership is not sufficient to make a university Catholic, although it may be an indispensable or necessary feature.

Proposal No. 3: When a school has a religious heritage of a Catholic sort and sees itself as within this heritage, it is Catholic. As I understand it, the idea here is that the history any organization has shapes its identity. So, a university, because it comes out of a Catholic culture, having a certain language, set of concepts and customs, because it has religious art and symbols dispersed throughout its campus, is therefore Catholic.

Reply to No. 3: There are a number of problems with the notion that religious heritage makes a university Catholic.³ A quick answer to this position is to say that, just because an institution employs language, concepts, art, or even customs which are traceable to some religion, this alone is no guarantee of a religious identity. Public buildings such as libraries and museums are decorated with Christian art and contain Christian literature; music societies perform much religiously inspired music. As far as using Christian

language and concepts, arguably Karl Marx thought in terms of Christian concepts about history, community, salvation and so on. None of these uses of religious heritages makes these organizations, or individuals, Catholic in nature.

Religious heritage is an ambiguous term and can mean practically anything. Thus it is not of much use in characterizing an organization. Considered in a weaker sense, religious heritage can mean nothing more than an interesting historical fact whose practical significance can be ignored or rejected by the organization to which it belongs. It is reminiscent of the Gilbert and Sullivan joke about having enough good sense to be born an Englishman — as if the chance occurrence of one's birth is a reason for self-congratulation. Since it lacks definitive identification, other than reference to historical fact, this sense of religious heritage could not be used to define or constitute a university as Catholic. Consider, for instance, a person born and raised in a devoutly Catholic household but who has none of the religious commitments of the parents. The person still has a religious heritage and may find the religious art and music soothing, or is drawn to attend holiday liturgies out of sentimental feelings. But if it does not imply anything about the commitments or guiding principles of that person, then this heritage comes to very little. Moreover, it is possible for people who claim the same religious heritage to have contradictory views about virtually every aspect of that religion, including God, goodness, salvation, and so on. Why would one think, therefore, that a claim to a certain past would commit a Catholic university to any view or any practice whatsoever?

There is, though, a stronger sense, of religious heritage. If an organization characterizes, in precise and unambiguous terms, how its heritage is embraced consciously and in a way that it affects the operational life of the organization, then it could help identify that institution. So, a Catholic university would have to deliberately promulgate policies and guidelines based on Catholic principles — guidelines that it defended by reference to authentic Catholic teachings and which pertained to all elements of university operation, ranging from the curriculum and constitution of faculty to student residence life. This is especially problematic for Catholic universities, which are notorious for their free and creative interpretations of what authentic Catholic principles are. To use religious heritage, in this strong sense, as a defining feature of a Catholic university, therefore, must refer to a heritage that can be defended in terms of an authentic Catholicism — a topic of some dispute. We might therefore conclude on this point that only the strong sense of religious heritage could be used as one defining, perhaps necessary, features of a university providing that it referred to a set of guiding principles which were authentically Catholic in origin and inspiration.

Proposal No. 4: What makes a school Catholic is its values. I suspect that what attracts people to this position are a number of things. In the first place, values are often taken to refer to private, non-institutional beliefs about the quality of choices and actions. Values, then, does not pertain to the public or academic dimension of a university. And so, a university that is Catholic, according to this view, does not do anything unique in the classroom or in the research conducted by faculty. It refers to what goes on in the purely private lives of the members of the university. This is attractive to a number of groups at a university. For faculty, both non-Catholic and Catholic, who feel burdened or

threatened by the prospect of having to research and teach with a view of the Catholic intellectual tradition, the plea of values is an easy way to avoid such demands. For administrators, it frees them from worrying about how to incorporate Catholic principles into their institutional policies. For students, it allows them to attend a Catholic school but remain unaffected by its religious character.

Reply to No. 4: For an institution to allege that it is Catholic because of its values, but not show that these values are indeed Catholic, that they are contained in the institutional policies and guidelines, and that they must be embraced by all members of the university, leaves the university vulnerable to questions of honesty and authenticity. If it turns out to be that what values comes to is that the institution forbids illegal acts, then these values no more make a university Catholic than they make a law firm Catholic. If values means that some members of the university are Catholic and are trying to live that way, this too fails to distinguish a so-called Catholic university from any other kind. Surely sincere Catholic faculty and staff are not unique to Catholic universities. If values could be a defining feature of a Catholic university, then they would have to be professed and required by the university and they would have to be uniquely Catholic.

Although I think it would probably make for a more stable moral environment if the members of a Catholic university were encouraged to live according to Catholic moral teachings, I don't think this is what proponents of the values view have in mind. Nor do I think they want, as a condition of employment, that all members live up to a certain standard of Catholic holiness or goodness.

I do not think a Catholic university should base its identity primarily in the moral rules it adopts or prescribes for its members. After all, a university is an academic community whose main task is intellectual, not moral, instruction. This is not to say that values have nothing to do with a Catholic university. The promotion of authentic moral truths is the business of every authentic community to some degree or another. But a university is uniquely dedicated to intellectual work. It is here that the Catholic identity should be primarily grounded.

Proposal No. 5: A commitment to a curriculum that studies issues pertaining to globalization, multiculturalism, and diversity makes a university Catholic. Although this may seem an odd candidate, it has some plausibility. It offers an academic or intellectual component as typifying a Catholic university, versus the other proposals we have examined that focus on some moral, cultural, or physical feature. Further, it tries to defend the idea that Catholicism is genuinely intellectual because it is open to different, and sometimes conflicting, ideas from non-Catholic sources. This is attractive to those who want to assure themselves and others that Catholicism is not anti-intellectual and that it can exist in a world of scholarship and teaching where difference and disagreement are commonplace.

Reply to No. 5: Although a school's commitment to such studies is reasonable and desirable when situated in accord with its overall aims and resources, it cannot possibly be a defining characteristic of a Catholic university. If it were, then virtually every

university in the country that has these emphases would be Catholic. It would come as a surprise to faculty at the University of California at Berkeley or Harvard that they were members of a Catholic university.

If a Catholic university does something unique and different from what a secular university does when it engages in studies pertaining to globalization, multiculturalism, and diversity, then perhaps such an enterprise could be included as an ingredient, although not a necessary nor sufficient one.

Proposal No. 6: A commitment to some theology courses as part of a required curriculum makes a university Catholic. Of all the proposals, in my experience, this one by far receives the most mention and approval. Its defense seems to run, if a Catholic school is going to affect the intellectual life of its students, i.e., what students learn, then it will do so in the way it examines questions about God, revelation, etc. But this is what theology does, and so, it is essential to the Catholic identity of a university by way of its intellectual influence on its students.

Reply to No. 6: It is not unreasonable to allege that a university should have a place reserved for the branch of learning that goes by the heading of theology. But, aside from the fact that the reasoning in this proposal is flawed, the presence of theology courses is not sufficient for making a university Catholic, since it is not unique to a Catholic university. It is possible that a non-Catholic or secular institution offers and may even require some theology courses.

If the presence of theology courses is essential to a Catholic university, it could only be so if the particular way or kind of theology taught was distinguishable from that which is available at a secular or non-Catholic university. Otherwise, it could not function as a defining feature of a Catholic university. A Lutheran or Jewish theology course could examine questions about God's nature, freedom of the will, and they could examine Scripture or magisterial documents (e.g., encyclicals). Yet, in so doing, these theology courses would not automatically become Catholic in nature. A Jewish colleague of mine would be both surprised and dismayed if I were to tell him that whenever he offered a course that consisted, at least in part, in the studying of Scripture and examining questions about God's nature, he was offering Catholic theology. I suspect he would wonder about my own grasp of what makes a theology course a Catholic one.

So, assuming only for the moment that theology courses are what make a university Catholic, then they must have something about them that distinguishes them from theology or religious studies courses offered at non-Catholic or secular institutions. This is the only way they could function as causative of the Catholic nature of an institution. In other words, if they are distinct in such a way that they make a university Catholic, then these courses must contain something particularly Catholic. But this "something particularly Catholic" cannot be merely the examination of Scriptures, other religious-based texts, or questions about God's nature and the like. Nor can it consist in the academic quality of the faculty. All of this can be found at non-Catholic universities or in non-Catholic theology courses.

Further, if one were to argue that such courses are necessary to a Catholic university, then they would have to be required of students. It would make little or no impact on the identity of a school to have courses that rarely were taught or rarely attended. How could courses that no one is required to take be necessary to the Catholic identity of a university?

Part II: What makes a university Catholic?

The answer to this question lies in what is essential to a Catholic university, namely, its intellectual or educative character. For, what distinguishes a Catholic family or a Catholic social agency from a Catholic university has to do with the particular way Catholic principles or teachings are applied to the ideals and operational capacities of each. And so, although necessary to every Catholic community are certain common elements such as prayer and eucharistic liturgy, a significant percentage of Catholics, and a commitment to live in accord with the Gospel, a number of key features are necessary to a Catholic university and which, when taken together are, I believe, sufficient. They are

- 1) Catholic Intellectualism, 2) Catholic University Life,
- 3) Administrative Catholicism and finally 4) Catholic Leadership.

Criterion No. 1: Catholic Intellectualism. The first, and in my view, the most important element necessary to a Catholic university is a commitment to the study and promotion of truth as contained both within the Catholic intellectual tradition as well as the secular and non-Catholic areas of scholarship. Let me offer some brief remarks by Pope John Paul II in which he notes that a Catholic university's mission is academic:

It is the honor and responsibility of a Catholic university to consecrate itself without reserve to the cause of truth ... a Catholic university is distinguished by its free search for the whole truth about nature, man and God ... (it) is completely dedicated to the research of all aspects of truth in their essential connection with the supreme Truth, who is God.⁴

Notice the language of consecration, free search, and all aspects of truth. The enterprise is sort of a sacred or holy work whose significance affects its faculty, administration, students, and curriculum. The idea of free search, although regarded skeptically by some, is affirmed as not only possible but obligatory in all academic areas, and this because it also happens to be a search for God. In the abstract, at least, a Catholic university should first and foremost be concerned with enabling itself to conduct a free and careful search for truth in every discipline.

As far as its faculty is concerned, it ought to have professors engaged in disinterested study in every branch of learning unencumbered by ideological or political pressures from the culture at large, the institution, or its officers. And so, as part of its intellectual charter, a Catholic university must not only choose a faculty whose members are unswerving in their dedication to truth regardless of peer and professional pressures, but also whose members are committed to the promotion of Catholic intellectual life. They

must be willing to try to integrate their teaching and research into the existing body of Catholic scholarship. This would also include the ongoing enterprise of examining new knowledge in light of the Catholic faith wherever appropriate.⁵ Faculty must also try to show how faith and reason can coexist and be of mutual aid.⁶ This task is especially pressing in intellectual circles where faith is regarded as opposed to the intellectual life. Also implied here is the duty to provide a moral evaluation of one's discipline for students whenever it is appropriate.⁷ How this would be implemented would be sorted out by the faculty in accord with the institution. These research and teaching directives apply to faculty in all disciplines, not just in theology and possibly philosophy. An intellectual culture can only succeed when students are presented with an integrated vision affirmed by all faculty, albeit in a manner befitting each discipline. This vision involves a fundamental acknowledgement of "the dignity of the human person and, ultimately, the person and message of Christ."⁸

When it comes to theology, there are additional standards that constitute the unique enterprise of a Catholic university. The theologian has the special duty to examine and also to teach theology, "in a manner faithful to Scripture, Tradition, and the Church's Magisterium."⁹ This is necessary to distinguish a Catholic theology program from a nonsectarian or merely Christian one. This is the only plausible rationale for asserting that theology is necessary to a Catholic university.

The administration also bears a direct responsibility to promote Catholic intellectualism in a number of ways. It must encourage and reward faculty for advancing the work of integrating faith and reason, for doing research in areas where Catholic teaching affects or is affected by their unique disciplines, for dedicating themselves to advancing their own understanding of the Catholic intellectual tradition as a way to prepare themselves better to teach. It is inconsistent to have an administration insisting on its Catholic identity while rewarding its faculty only for work having meaning or value to secular institutions and secular professional associations.

As far as the curriculum is concerned, a Catholic university must choose a curriculum not because of its similarity to secular programs, but because of its ability to impart truth and "the meaning of truth" to its students.¹⁰

Aided by the specific contributions of philosophy and theology, university scholars will be engaged in a constant effort to determine the relative place and meaning of the various disciplines within the context of a vision of the human person and the world that is enlightened by the Gospel, and therefore by a faith in Christ"¹¹

At the very least, Catholic intellectualism relates both to what is taught and how it is taught. What is taught are all the academic disciplines in which each has a significant component of Catholic vision wherever appropriate. How it should be taught is in such a way that the faculty exhibits respect for the Catholic intellectual tradition by giving it the best and fairest reading, without sacrificing intellectual honesty.¹²

With respect to studies in multiculturalism, globalization, and diversity, which so often seem to be vehicles for the promotion of competing ideological movements, a Catholic university has a unique opportunity to research and educate. Authentic multicultural studies, even in a secular university, should leave a place for the Catholic intellectual tradition since this has been a culture for almost 2,000 years. In a Catholic university, these studies should be conducted in a way where there is not only an eagerness for the study and appreciation of other cultures, but where students and faculty "discern their positive and negative aspects, to receive their authentically human contributions"13 After all, how can one argue that multicultural studies are good for a university, and yet prohibit others from using and applying these same moral evaluations when engaging in such studies?14

Criterion No. 2: Catholic University Life. This refers to the principles or ideals that a Catholic university embraces, professes, and calls its members to live by. It does little good for any university to espouse views about human dignity, the importance of truth, authentic Christian principles and yet not encourage its members to translate these ideals into their daily lives. This is especially true for the members of a Catholic university. They must be encouraged to live by those truths taught in the classroom and affirmed by the administration. Faculty should not only be competent in their respective areas, but should strive "to be witnesses and educators of authentic Christian life."15 All other levels of personnel are similarly obliged to try to embody this goal as well.

Students also should be taught and encouraged to live a life befitting their dignity as humans and heirs to the Kingdom of God. They should be encouraged to develop mature, non-exploitive relationships with one another. The rules of behavior for students, as well as dormitory policies, should be illuminated by a Catholic vision of authentic friendship and goodness. This pertains not only to standards of intellectual industriousness, honesty, and integrity, but also to standards of moral conduct as indicated by Catholic teachings.

Criterion No. 3: Administrative Catholicism. Administrators of a Catholic university have a duty to formulate policies and goals and to make practical decisions that reflect Catholic social and economic principles. This would cover virtually all aspects of the organization, including hiring, wages, health care, promotion, investment, growth strategies, and so forth. For example, in accord with Church teaching, wages should not be calculated by what employees can be persuaded to accept, or what the marketplace allows, but by what a person, and any of that person's dependents, require in order to live a decent life and to plan for the future. Without such a commitment to a lived Catholicism, a university and its administration will rightly suffer from the charge of hypocrisy and empty intellectualism.

Criterion No. 4: Catholic Leadership. This final element refers to the role a Catholic university has with respect to the world outside its borders. Briefly stated, a university has an impact outside its campus. A Catholic university must try to exercise an influence based on its uniquely Catholic vision and not allow itself to be led or intimidated by secular culture or its institutions:

If need be, a Catholic university must have the courage to speak uncomfortable truths which do not please public opinion, but which are necessary to safeguard the authentic good of society. A specific priority is the need to examine and evaluate the predominant values and norms of modern society and culture in a Christian perspective, and the responsibility to try to communicate to society those ethical and religious principles which give full meaning to human life.¹⁷

A Catholic university should aim not to conform to the culture in which it happens to exist but to be society's intellectual and moral guide. The message it proclaims should be derived from its continual reflection on Scripture, tradition, and magisterial teachings. So, for example, the denial of property rights for women, killing of the infirm or unborn, all of which are now or have been endorsed by at least some cultures, would rightly be condemned by a Catholic university as inconsistent with human dignity and authentic Catholic principles. Regardless of the unpopularity of some of these stands, a Catholic university has a duty to perform such a leadership role based on its privileged status as a Catholic place of scholarship and research.

Conclusion

Let me use what remaining space I have in this essay not to review what has been argued, but to mention something about the feasibility of a Catholic university as described above — assuming for the moment that a Catholic university like this is desirable. I have heard for a long time now that current circumstances affecting the quality of faculty and students, affecting hiring and promotion practices, affecting donors and funding resources, affecting academic standards, and so forth make the ideal of a Catholic university, in the above-mentioned sense, an impossibility. It is argued that a heteronomous faculty with a jealous hold on academic freedom makes it impossible to implement any curricular changes involving the introduction of Catholic content in existing courses or in new ones. But surely institutions implement curricular changes such as the current move toward multicultural and diversity studies at the request of the institution without threatening the academic welfare of the faculty. If diversity studies can be implemented at a Catholic university, why not Catholic studies?

It is also argued that the current configuration of a faculty, staff, and administration, because it is often a result of hiring and promotion practices that do not make any concrete requirements regarding Catholicity, cannot be made to adopt Catholic principles in its teaching, governance of student life or its administration. But surely a university is allowed to modify its expectations of its personnel as a result of a deeper understanding of its own mission. Consider, for example, the recent adoption of sexual harassment and hazing policies, which made new demands on the language, behavior, and attitudes of all of the university's personnel while they are on campus. The implementation of these rules can hardly be called unjust to members hired prior to the adoption of these policies. Existing members are rightly required to comply with these rules while on campus because these policies are warranted in light of the institution's recognition of new standards of integrity and justice. Why cannot the institutions also make policies

affecting campus behavior and language based on its understanding of its Catholic identity?

What is needed, in order for a university to adopt the sorts of changes warranted by the general criteria outlined above, is the institutional will to reflect on ways to become ever more Catholic. If an institution cannot manage these kinds of radical changes all at once, it would do well to consider founding a program within the institution in which these guidelines can be implemented so that anyone who has a desire to participate in a Catholic university, in as complete a way as possible, may do so. It demands of a university a kind of courage rarely found in current education and culture, but which offers a remarkable gift to all of its present and future members.

References

1. A note on terminology. For purposes of convenience, I will adopt both the language of *non-Catholic* and *secular* when referring to universities that are not Catholic. *Secular* refers to institutions that have no formal religious commitment or charter. *Non-Catholic* refers to institutions that do have a religious character other than Catholic, e.g., Jewish, Lutheran, fundamentalist, etc.
2. G.K. Chesterton, "The Medical Mistake," in *The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton*. Volume 4, San Francisco, California: Ignatius Press, 1987, 41.
3. For an interesting and compelling treatment of the trend of Christian universities to use the language of *religious heritage*, and the problems with its usage, see James T. Burtchaell, "The Decline and Fall of the Christian College," *First Things*, 13, (1991) 30-38.
4. John Paul II, *On Catholic Universities (Ex Corde Ecclesiae)*, Washington, D.C., United States Catholic Conference, 1990, #4.
5. *Ex Corde*, #10.
6. *Ex Corde*, #5.
7. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #20. He writes: "Furthermore, the moral implications that are present in each discipline are examined as an integral part of the teaching of that discipline so that the entire educative process can be directed to the whole development of the person."
8. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #21.
9. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #20.
10. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #4.
11. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #16.
12. As John Paul II writes in *Ex Corde*: "In ways appropriate to the different academic disciplines, all Catholic teachers are to be faithful to, and all other teachers are to respect, Catholic doctrine and morals in their research and teaching."
13. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #44.
14. It came as a surprise to me that an interesting and rich model of the uniquely Catholic approach to multiculturalism can be found in a document about Catholic liturgical practices: "Inculturation signifies 'an intimate transformation of the authentic cultural values by their integration into Christianity' and the

implantation of Christianity into different human cultures...the Church assembles these values when they are compatible with the Gospel... ." From, "Instruction: Inculturation and the Roman Liturgy," Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 14. What is attractive about this directive is the double movement inculturation implies. Both the Church and culture affect one another in a way that the Gospel elevates culture and culture enriches the Church community and heritage.

15. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #22.

16. See for example, John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens*, #19.

17. John Paul II, *Ex Corde*, #32-33.