Teaching That Transforms Jesuit Education Today

KEVIN P. QUINN J. JOSEPH MARR JIM MCDERMOTT PATRICK FURLONG
Matt Malone, S.J., is traveling. Eighth-graders in Catholic schools in Chicago a half-century ago had a lot on their minds. Beyond coping with being a teenager and surviving adolescence, deciding which high school to attend loomed large. Often family tradition was decisive. Other times it was where friends decided to go. That’s how I ended up at St. Ignatius. At 13, I had made a life decision.

Back then we did not hear much theory about Jesuit education. We just lived it. It got into religion courses, of course, but also into our English and Latin textbooks, some of the history, not much in chemistry or physics. Religious images were everywhere, and daily Mass was required, unless you lived south of 87th Street, about 10 miles from school.

Much of that changed during my years at St. Ignatius (1956-60), as much in the church at large was changing. Since then, the talk about what Jesuit education means—that makes it distinctive, what it demands, what results it strives for—has become more explicit.

Two weeks ago, a small group gathered at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, a national seminar called Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education. This seminar grew up after a meeting at Georgetown in 1989 when some Jesuit leaders decided to get more deliberate about the term “Jesuit education,” to study its character and plan for its future. The seminar gathers three weekends a year to discuss issues and twice a year publishes the journal Conversations. Ten of the members are drawn from among the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities. Serving as the editor of the journal, I am number 11. The meetings and membership on the board rotate among the schools, and members generally serve three-year terms.

The meetings are a privileged opportunity to know the world of Jesuit higher education. We discuss issues current in the schools and brainstorm topics for upcoming editions of the magazine. We also discuss specific articles and possible authors to open up those topics. And we discuss manuscripts authors have sent in.

A valued feature of the meetings is lunch with a faculty group and another with students. These gatherings are deeply informative, inspiring and challenging. Some concerns are common to the schools. Faculty members talk about adjuncts, workloads and the costs of education. And they talk about mission: How does the rhetoric of Jesuit education seep down into the everyday reality of courses and programs?

Students are usually optimistic and love their school, a special place for them. And they know about the Jesuit factor; they know the language and the images; they know it makes their scholastic experience different, special.

The students I sat with at lunch in Kansas City—Audrey, Matt, Morgan and Shayla—showed a high level of understanding of what their Jesuit education means, and they enjoy great rapport with their teachers. They discussed how well students are incorporated into the mission or the Jesuit ideal, but they also saw a need for better expression of the core values, Jesuit values. Still, the values are there. And some wanted more explicit reference to Jesus and the church.

Most students who enter a Jesuit school come from a family that has gotten them this far, a family that typically supports them and shares their dreams. They live their college years with hopes for a great future, with ideals and maybe some fears. While at school they receive something special beyond credits and a diploma, important as those are. Will this something special last? Will this Jesuit thing be something they keep and share? Will they use it to build a better world, to do more for that world, to find God working in it and be part of that work? That spells success in Jesuit education.

EDWARD W. SCHMIDT, S.J.
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CURRENT COMMENT

Canada’s Liberal Orthodoxy

A proposed new bill to legalize physician-assisted suicide in Canada has drawn strong opposition from an impressive coalition of religious voices. Standing together at a press conference on April 19, Catholic, Jewish, evangelical and Muslim leaders registered their grave concern about the measure proposed by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and made an admirable pledge: “Our churches, synagogues and mosques are committed to comfort and care for those who are dying and their families.”

Unfortunately, the prime minister’s Liberal Party controls the House of Commons and is expected to pass the measure sometime after the current ban on the practice expires in June. The proposal would make it legal for doctors to prescribe life-ending drugs and would allow nurses and family members to administer the dosage.

A few members of the Liberal Party have said they would not back the bill for religious reasons. On this question, at least, Prime Minister Trudeau does not appear to require strict adherence on the part of his M.P.s; in 2015 he mandated that any Liberal who sought the party’s support had to agree to vote in favor of pro-choice legislation. Like many who favor legalizing physician-assisted suicide, Prime Minister Trudeau argues from personal experience: in his case, the slow decline of his father, former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, who suffered from Parkinson’s disease. Yet as pro-life advocates have argued time and again, there are always palliative options for patients who suffer grave illness. Canada’s religious leaders are calling for increased access to palliative care and appropriate conscience protections for health care workers. If the bill passes, these protections must be included. Catholic Charities and other religious groups should be allowed to continue their life-affirming ministry to the dying without any government interference.

Corporate Tax Conversion

In early April, a $160-billion deal between the pharmaceutical giants Allergan and Pfizer fell apart when its tax advantages disappeared. Originally, Pfizer had planned the merger as a tax inversion—a maneuver that would have shifted Pfizer’s tax residency to Ireland, where Allergan is headquartered and subject to a 14 percent corporate tax rate instead of the 35 percent rate Pfizer faces in the United States. New Treasury Department rules, however, would have prevented Pfizer from escaping the higher domestic tax rates.

The failed merger is indicative of a larger problem. The current regulatory environment makes tax avoidance a primary component of global corporate strategy. Financial rewards are linked not with productive activity but with artificial constructs: tax residencies that are polite legal cover stories rather than actual investments in places where they are headquartered. But this is not surprising. After all, why should a corporation, seeking the benefit of its shareholders, volunteer to pay taxes it can legally avoid?

The answer, of course, is that those tax revenues help bolster the common good. Senator Elizabeth Warren has argued that the problem of transnational tax avoidance is not that U.S. rates are too high but that the revenues generated from corporate taxes are too low. But the fix for both these problems may be related. Lower corporate rates could be traded for reforming the tax code—both to reduce the incentives for tax avoidance and to increase overall revenue. There are moral reasons for corporations to pay their fair share of taxes. We should also reform the tax code to give them an economic incentive to do so.

Children Navigating the Web

In “The Joy of Love,” Pope Francis reminds readers that while new technologies can be a force for good, they can also place the most vulnerable at risk. “We cannot ignore the risks that these new forms of communication pose for children and adolescents,” Francis says, adding that technology “exposes them more easily to manipulation by those who would invade their private space with selfish interests” (No. 278). According to a study from the GSM Association, an organization that represents mobile operators around the world, more than 60 percent of children worldwide are using digital tools; as this number rises, so does the risk of children falling prey to online abuses, from bullying to grooming by sexual predators.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, where crimes against children are rarely investigated, new initiatives are helping children navigate the digital world. The app Project Brazil allows children to report cases of violence anonymously. It also uses location data on the child’s phone to provide information on organizations where the victim can find help. In Costa Rica the app Empodérate, or “Empower Yourself,” educates children on their rights and provides them with resources to report abuse. And in Jamaica there is Ananda alert, which is similar to the AMBER Alert System in the United States. Initiatives like these are welcome. As our reliance on technology grows, Pope Francis reminds us we should always keep in mind the safety of our world’s youngest.
The Two Israels

When Senator Bernie Sanders, during his New York debate with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, criticized Israel for its brutal waging of the war in Gaza in 2014, he called our attention to a moral issue politicians lately tend to avoid: the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

To punish Hamas for its rocket attacks, Israel launched Operation Protective Edge, consisting of aerial bombings and a ground invasion. The Israeli Defense Forces were responsible for 2,131 deaths, among them 1,400 civilians, including many children. Seventy-two Israelis, including five civilians, died. The air strikes were so devastating—damaging schools and hospitals, private homes and public buildings—a U.N. report warned that by 2020 Gaza would be “uninhabitable.”

A young American Jew, Jacob Bacharach, wrote in the Israeli daily paper Haaretz (4/16) that Israel was becoming “not the mystical homeland we appeal to in prayer, but a real, compromised place, a country whose frankly disastrous politics and shameful treatment of the Palestinians has made it increasingly unsupportable.” The rising tide of self-examination in recent years has transformed arguments over a two-state solution into a debate over the “two Israels”—between those sensitive to Palestinian rights and those so terrified by the “intifada of the knives” that they deny those rights in the name of security.

Since October, Palestinians have killed about 30 Israelis, while Israelis have shot dead 120 Palestinians who were making, or were suspected of making, attacks. Human rights groups have complained that some of the assailants did not pose an imminent threat. In March two young Palestinian men stabbed and wounded an Israeli soldier at a checkpoint in Hebron; one was killed in the attack, the other lay wounded until another soldier came by, saw the wounded man was still alive and executed him.

Israel’s defense minister has declared that this soldier’s action “completely contradicts I.D.F. values and its battle ethics.” The soldier has been charged with manslaughter. While some in the I.D.F. seem committed to protecting the army’s integrity, a notable segment of the Israeli public has celebrated the indicted soldier as a hero. Meanwhile, the corpses of Palestinian attackers killed by Israeli forces are not returned to their families but put in a freezer for months while families plead with courts for their return.

The rockets of Hamas and the knives young Palestinians used in indiscriminate attacks are instruments of immoral madness; but it is a madness rooted in a loss of hope. Uri Ariel, the conservative minister of agriculture, must have sensed this when he described Palestinian laborers waiting in line at the checkpoints for hours as a disgrace and called for giving the Palestinians a seaport with access to gas and water.

A recent U.S. State Department report on human rights practices in Israel and the occupied territories presents an exhaustive analysis of degrading conditions in prisons, restrictions on freedom of speech and the press, and troubling treatment of refugees, children and laborers. The report counts 6,826 Palestinians in jail, including 264 minors. According to the State Department, they receive harsher treatment than the general population, including increased administrative detention, restricted family visits, no temporary furloughs and more solitary confinement. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu used intolerant rhetoric against Arab citizens to win re-election. When Arabs tried to build homes, regional planning committees with no Arab members frustrated their attempts. Military courts convict a much higher percentage of Palestinians than civilian courts.

Catholics should care about this issue, since the Holy See and Palestine have committed themselves to a two-state solution. How can American Catholics work for fair treatment of Arab citizens and for peace in Israel? We should encourage our political and religious leaders to raise their voices. President Obama recently sent Vice President Joseph Biden and Secretary of State John Kerry to attend a gala sponsored by J Street, the pro-peace American Jewish lobby. The president is considering a presentation to the United Nations to lay a foundation for his successor. It should re-emphasize the importance of minimum standards for the protection of the human rights of Palestinians and of freedom of expression for dissenters among the Israeli public. It should also call for a review of the Israeli military field manual, lest any ambiguity become a license to kill.

Meanwhile 16 of Israel’s current and former security chiefs posted a full-page ad in The New York Times (3/29) endorsing the two-state solution. The alternative is a future in which Jews will be a minority in Israel; it is estimated that in 15 years they will make up 44 percent of the population. We pray that before it is too late, the United States will demonstrate its friendship by speaking honestly and encouraging Israel to be true to its better self.
Armchair Critics
Re “Presidential Powers” (Editorial, 4/18): Although I disagree with the fundamental argument about President Obama’s “overreach,” I concur that the four topics selected by the editors are important domains for discussion. I am thankful that the editorial staff of America does not have to solve the overwhelming challenges, at home and abroad, that the president has no choice but to confront. Armchair, post-hoc critiques of how the executive keeps the United States safe (i.e., the first task of the presidency) are commonplace, but collecting intelligence and stopping destructive extremists must be done either by humans or robots, which is a decision the president must ultimately make. To provide transparency about how and where this is done may satisfy journalists, but it can all too easily become informative to the perpetrators we are attempting to halt.

I agree in principle with the editors’ contention that the better method for dealing with these and many other matters would be to go through Congress. But how many times does a sane person bang his head on a huge rock before he sees blood flowing and tries to move around the rock in legal ways? The president is aware of much more, including consequences for the decisions he makes. Criticizing him is our First Amendment right; however, criticizing without knowing the entirety of what he knows is questionable.

RICHARD BOOTH

Constitutional Erosion
I salute the editors for (a) recalling their strong April 2008 reservations about George W. Bush’s abuse of constitutional power and the magnitude of its impact and (b) their choice to close the editorial with a critical paragraph on President Obama’s drone strategy. It is a shame, however, that they cannot bring themselves to see more clearly the extent of his abuses on issues on which they agree with Mr. Obama’s agenda (the environment, many aspects of health care and immigration) as well as the ways his over-reaching harms constituencies whose agenda they seem not to share (business’s rights, for example, or the rights of people holding what have become in just a few years politically incorrect views). The constitutional erosion is furthered by both.

BOB FAUTEUX

‘Authentic’ Authoritarians
Re “Facing the Frontrunners,” by Margot Patterson (4/4): The comparison of Donald J. Trump to Hitler and Mussolini may not be appropriate, but it is a sad commentary on our politics that the comparison has to be made. Mr. Trump may not be exactly like them, but he can still be a menace. His strident, ill-informed and crude language, appeals to victimization, hyper-nationalism, incitement to violence and lightweight and counterproductive policy positions (especially on national security) are not the qualities of a statesman and presidential timber. They are the qualities of an amoral demagogue who will disappoint his followers because the United States is not a kingdom.

The checks and balances in our system will defeat his preposterous proposals if he is elected president, a very unlikely prospect due to high unfavorability ratings. If Mr. Trump is “authentic” we should keep in mind that many demagogues and authoritarians in history have been “authentic,” including Hitler and Mussolini.

GABRIEL MARCELLA

Primary Advantage
Re “Fix the Primaries” (Current Comment, 4/4): One can see the sense of our current primary system in an age where travel and communication were very slow. But nowadays, with television and the Internet, it seems very antiquated.

How about this as an alternative: Let the parties nominate as many contenders as they wish by a certain date. Then have a national primary for all registered voters of that party. The votes will be made online. This should not be difficult to authenticate with modern secure communications technology. Then, any candidate who does not meet a certain threshold (say 1 percent in the first round) drops out. The remaining candidates continue to debate and advertise, and votes are held every few weeks with subsequently higher thresholds, until a candidate reaches 50 percent.

The advantages of this include that every person has a vote that counts, not just people in the earliest states, and candidates with higher support in some regions and lower in others are not at a disadvantage.

JAMES HYNES

‘Over the Pope’
“Examining Conscience” (4/4), by James F. Keenan, S.J., addresses a subject that is not spoken about very frequently in the church. I have questioned several Catholic priests about why our conscience is never preached about or discussed, and the answer by three of these priests was that most people are not knowledgeable enough to understand what it really means; basically, ordinary Catholics cannot be trusted in many situations to make their own informed decisions. This attitude toward the laity is why Father Keenan’s article is so important.

It is also important to note the former Archbishop Ratzinger’s commentary in 1968 made in the Second Vatican Council’s “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World”: “Over the pope...
there still stands one's own conscience, which must be obeyed before all else, if necessary even against the requirement of ecclesiastical authority.” The church should be giving more time and attention to the development of people's consciences so that they can make informed personal decisions.

JANE MARFIZO
Online Comment

The Right Words
Re Of Many Things, by Matt Malone, S.J. (4/4): As a priest and homilist, I struggle mightily on the great festivals of our faith, especially Easter, to find words adequate to the occasion—words that will fill the hearts and minds of my hearers with wonder and awe of the mystery we celebrate. While I regularly fall short, the ancient, anonymous homily in America’s Easter issue, with extraordinary imagery and deep religious insight, hit that elusive mark. Thank you for one of the most personally inspiring and moving experiences of this Easter season.

(REV.) GERALD FEIERFEIL
Sioux City, Iowa

Tennessee’s Search
In “His Final Act” (3/28), Michael V. Tuech, S.J., offers a great reflection on “the little-known spiritual side” of Tennessee Williams. Mr. Williams’s sexuality placed a large barrier between him and traditional Christian doctrine. Yet there is a profound tension in Mr. Williams’s plays between the brutality of human behavior and the desire for grace and companionship. It is some of the same searching that Christian theology concerns itself with.

BERT CLERE
Online Comment

Mothers at Work
I have a couple of points in response to “Revisiting Welfare Reform” (Editorial, 3/21). TANF needs to be adjusted by location—higher in cities like Boston, New York and San Francisco than, say, in the rural South. And the ceiling for “poverty level” needs to be much higher.

I wish policymakers would treat TANF and other programs the way they do grants to businesses—as an investment. Every cent of this money is going back into the local economy—for food, rent, baby items, drugstore purchases—not to mention the human investment in strengthening families.

Finally, I believe that any woman who wants to should work for her own satisfaction and career development. But women who want, or need, to stay home with their children should be enabled to do so. A number of years ago a major women’s magazine had a campaign with the slogan “Every mother is a working mother.” One of my favorite cartoons shows a husband coming home to a messy apartment—dishes in the sink, soggy diapers, vacuum in the corner. The caption has the wife saying, “Honey, you know the ‘nothing’ I do all day? Well, today I didn’t do it.” There is still a lot of work to be done to get a just and livable income for everyone.

JOAN HILL
Online Comment

Fair Play
I am a devoted reader of America; still, there are times when I find its liberal bias on certain issues annoying. I enjoy the work of Matt Malone, S.J., and his description of his dad introducing him to town hall meetings made it most understandable how Father Malone learned to love the democratic process that is so much at the heart of our nation (Of Many Things, 3/14). My dad, an Irish immigrant, loved baseball and he passed that feeling on to me. I can still see him hitting the ball a mile and running the bases with joy. A basic value he taught me was that a central part of sportsmanship was to be fair.

I am very much in agreement with Father Malone that the several of the Republican debates have been an embarrassment to watch. Still, it did bother me that he never mentioned the Democratic candidates. Senator Sanders has made promises on spending that almost everyone knows would be impossible to implement without already straining a troubled economy. I recently saw Secretary Clinton say in an interview that she cannot recall ever having told a deliberate lie. Yet a Quinnipiac University poll from 2015 found the word liar to be the word respondents most frequently associated with Hillary Clinton.

Father Malone, is it only Republican candidates who are making a poor impression on the citizens of the United States? How about a little fairness?

PATRICK WOODS, C.SS.R.
Bethpage, N.Y.
“This is a story of the high price of speaking the truth,”
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Based on the book Reimagining the Ignatian Examen by Mark Thibodeaux, S.J.
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http://ReimaginingExamen.IgnatianSpirituality.com

Welcome to a new take on a 500-year-old prayer.
Jesuit Refugee Service has a very specific answer to Pope Francis’ call to put mercy on the leading edge of a church reaching out to the peripheries. The answer is education.

With a campaign called “Mercy in Motion,” J.R.S. is trying to raise $35 million this year so that by 2020 it can educate an additional 100,000 refugees per year.

Just 36 percent of the world’s refugee children go to some form of secondary school. Fewer than 1 percent get anything beyond secondary school. In the world’s largest refugee crisis, more than 2.6 million Syrian children are out of school.

Jesuit Refugee Service has more than 150,000 students in its educational programs around the world, but that is not much in a world with 60 million people living as refugees or at risk of becoming refugees. The Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees says 51 percent of the refugees are under the age of 18.

The refugees who will shape the 21st century are everywhere, not just in the Middle East, said Thomas H. Smolich, S.J., international director of J.R.S. “People are realizing now, finally, it really is a global phenomenon,” he said. “This is not about Syria and Europe. This is a whole interconnected reality.”

“Education is the real game changer. If the average stay in a refugee camp is 17 years, what are you going to do with those 17 years?” he asked. “We’re trying to respond to needs—trying to respond as part of the church doing that. That, to me, makes sense, whether Pope Francis calls a Year of Mercy or not.”

In Syria—where the Jesuits have deep historical ties—J.R.S. finds itself doing education and more. “We’re playing, I think, a very distinctive role in Syria. We’re one of the few N.G.O.s who are actually in Syria,” he said. “Part of our goal and our way of working is that we don’t see this response [to the refugee crisis] as a sectarian response. We serve Muslims. We serve Christians. Our staffs are made up of Christians and Muslims. Our goal here is that eventually this war will end. Eventually, Christians and Muslims will be working together in Syria again. How do we start laying the seeds for that?”

Every J.R.S. education program includes a psycho-social component because every J.R.S. school is trying to teach traumatized, displaced children. In Lebanon, that requires a social worker in every school and program.

Online courses designed and delivered from the Jesuit network of universities in the United States have enabled J.R.S. to dramatically expand its offerings to post-secondary refugee students, but the critical need is with younger children where a human, interactive process of teaching and learning is more important than content delivery, Father Smolich said.

For refugees who have been treated as objects and obstacles by regimes, armies, border guards and officials, healing begins by humanizing their experience. Father Smolich said he wants refugee schools to be places of human encounter.

“Pope Francis is onto something here. You start with the encounter,”
he said. “The church is at the frontiers. We figure out what to do based on that encounter.”

“Math class in a refugee camp does not solve all the problems, but it does solve some of them.”

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**Focus Turns to Religious Orders**

In a continuing effort to protect children, much of the attention of the Catholic Church has been on how dioceses and national bishops' conferences have been responding to victims and protecting children. Religious orders and congregations are sometimes left out of that picture, even though most of the more than 300,000 Catholic schools and orphanages around the world are run by religious brothers and sisters. Now the focus is turning to those religious orders of men and women.

Pope Francis last year authorized the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to investigate and judge claims of “abuse of office” by bishops who allegedly failed to protect minors and vulnerable adults from sexual abuse. But that form of censure “wasn’t extended to superior generals, and it should be,” said Father John Fogarty, superior general of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit.

Canon Law and the complementary Vatican norms regarding this field “refer only to clergy”—bishops, priests and deacons—said Hans Zollner, S.J., president of the Center for Child Protection at Rome’s Pontifical Gregorian University.

Each religious order or congregation establishes its own policies, he said. And while some may have a set of guidelines for their whole congregation, in others each province or region is in charge of setting up guidelines.

Father Fogarty said his first priority after being elected superior of the Spiritans in 2012 was to establish comprehensive guidelines and then ask each of the order’s provinces and regions to draw up procedures that would protect children and respect local laws and customs.

Since each local superior of his order is responsible for his territory, Father Fogarty said he uses his role “to work with the superiors” and get them all “on the same wavelength.” Not everyone in every part of the world is “at the same point” in recognizing the need to protect and care for children and survivors; “our job is to get them there, put pressure on them to produce adequate policies, procedures, hold workshops” and use every “means at our disposal” to spread awareness and resources.

The need to have adequate protection policies and procedures in place for religious orders is urgent because they are present in so many countries around the globe, said Mark Vincent Healy, an advocate in Ireland for survivors of child sexual abuse. For example, of the 48 Spiritan priests noted in Ireland’s National Board for Safeguarding Children’s audit in 2012 as accused of abuse in Ireland, half of them had also served in other countries, including the United States, Canada, Sierra Leone and Kenya, Healy has said.

In Healy’s case, the Spiritan priest who had abused him at a school the order ran in Ireland was transferred to a Spiritan-run school in Sierra Leone, where he allegedly abused again before being convicted in Ireland and laicized. Healy’s case was handled in Ireland—the country where the abuse occurred—but, he said, victims of Irish missionaries in other countries, particularly Africa, lack clear channels or have none at all for reporting and redress.

The church already responds to the psychological, emotional and spiritual fallout of victims of war in many of those countries, Healy said, so why not extend that same care and concern to victims of abuse by its own members? Healy has been looking at ways the order and the church as a whole could provide services across jurisdictions, especially “in countries where there are no structures” to help survivors and communities.

One proposal, which Healy also discussed with Father Fogarty, was the creation of a global network modeled after Doctors Without Borders. Instead of addressing physical harm, the network could specialize in delivering mental health care services to people suffering from trauma caused by war, civil conflicts and abuse in un-
By offering comprehensive mental health services, Healy said, perhaps “you can alleviate the suffering and bring some function back to a dysfunctional society. Otherwise, violence will just repeat itself.”

Sisters’ Acts of Mercy

When ISIS extremists rolled across Iraq’s Nineveh Plain in 2014, tens of thousands of Christians fled to Kurdish-controlled areas of Iraq. They still wait in limbo in crowded camps. Their only certainty is that whatever happens to them, a group of Dominican nuns will be at their side. “We will not leave our people. Wherever they go, we will go with them,” said Sister Luma Khudher, a member of the Dominican Sisters of St. Catherine of Siena. The Iraqi congregation was founded in Mosul in the late 19th century, and over the decades the nuns have operated schools and clinics throughout the country. The nuns became the de facto managers of aid for much of the displaced community in Irbil. “The sisters were everywhere. When we asked about the needs of the displaced, no one could answer with any authority except the Dominican sisters,” said Michel Constantin, the regional director for the Catholic Near East Welfare Association.

Closer to Canonization

A canonical inquiry into the life of Dorothy Day, co-founder of the Catholic Worker Movement, will begin soon and extend to the end of the year, according to the Archdiocese of New York, which is sponsoring her sainthood cause. The names of 256 people had been submitted as potential eyewitnesses to Day’s life. Of those, 52 have been chosen for interviews. “Because many of the eyewitnesses still live in voluntary poverty, caring for the poor, the archdiocese will assist with airfare and lodging for those requesting assistance,” said an announcement on April 19 by the archdiocese. The archdiocese will gather the evidence and present it to the Vatican’s Congregation for Saints’ Causes and to Pope Francis. If, after examining the inquiry, the Vatican congregation and the pope recognize Day’s heroic virtues, she will be declared venerable, the next step in the canonization process. She now has the title “Servant of God.”

A Celebration of Life

One day after Planned Parenthood’s president, Cecile Richards, spoke at Georgetown University, Cardinal Donald W. Wuerl of Washington celebrated a University Mass for Life for college students at a nearby Catholic church, encouraging them to stand up for God’s gift of human life. A Georgetown student group’s invitation to Richards, the head of the nation’s largest abortion provider, to speak on April 20 at the country’s oldest Catholic university drew nationwide criticism and was countered by a week of pro-life activities at the school. The events included panel discussions on the dignity of life and the importance of outreach to women facing crisis pregnancies. In his homily at the Mass on April 21 at Epiphany Catholic Church, Cardinal Wuerl warned about a powerful movement and environment of political correctness “all around us.... It says to set aside such things as the value of human life and substitute the politically correct position that actually you should be free to choose to kill the unborn child. But the word of God says to us, ‘Don’t conform yourself to this age.’”

From America Media, CNS, RNS, AP and other sources.
Where they have burned books, they will end in burning human beings,” wrote the German essayist and poet Heinrich Heine in 1823. It is unlikely he would have thought that the same would be true of disappearing books and vanishing people, although that appears to be what is happening in Hong Kong.

The threat of censorship has hovered over Hong Kong since it was handed back to the People’s Republic of China almost 19 years ago. Media outlets and bookshops issued warnings then to customers that beyond the handover on July 1, 1997, it was uncertain what they could or could not publish or stock on their shelves. But in those first few years following the transition, the city remained for the most part a bastion of free press and free speech.

The “Basic Law,” the framework upon which the United Kingdom agreed to return Hong Kong to mainland control, appeared to guarantee a high degree of autonomy. And books, magazines and newspapers critical of China continued to be published in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (S.A.R.).

But P.R.C. pressure on Hong Kong to curtail messages unflattering to its leadership began even before 1997. The cartoonist Larry Feign, whose “The World of Lily Wong” lampooned Hong Kong life and politics, saw his strip abruptly cancelled in May 1995 when its content was deemed critical of the P.R.C. government. Owners of The South China Morning Post decided that their business interests in China could be hurt by allowing the strip to continue.

Although most tourists from the rest of China who visit Hong Kong go there to shop, some sought to pick up books that purported to expose Communist Party scandals and secrets. While some titles contained genuine investigative reporting, others were simply pulp books cobbled together from often spurious newspaper articles. Regardless, trade was brisk in these titles, placed prominently on racks at the departure gates of ferry piers, train stations and airports for passengers headed back into other parts of China.

All of that is about to change. Since the beginning of the year, 11 out of 16 of the bookstores operating in Hong Kong International Airport have closed out of fear of reprisals or reduced business prospects for selling books deemed offensive to the P.R.C. government.

Protests in Hong Kong in 2014 saw some of the S.A.R.’s most prominent thoroughfares and business districts occupied as students, journalists, academics and other concerned citizens spoke out against what they perceived as the P.R.C.’s growing, negative influence on Hong Kong society. But demonstrators ultimately failed to propel reforms meant to maintain the independence of Hong Kong’s institutions.

An alarming incident occurred in late 2015, when five men associated with the Mighty Current publishing house, which produced inflammatory books about P.R.C. leaders, their personal lives and family business dealings, went missing—four from Hong Kong and one from Thailand. All five eventually re-emerged in police custody in China. So far, only one, Lee Bo, has returned to Hong Kong; the other four are still being held.

Other publishers are feeling the heat. Pete Spurrier, founder of Blacksmith Books, a boutique Hong Kong publisher that recently released *Umbrellas in Bloom*, an account of the “Umbrella Revolution,” as the 2014 protests are called by some, told The South China Morning Post that two companies turned down the printing of the book, and a third consented to the work only if it could remain anonymous.

The Post itself has now become a bellwether of freedom of expression in Hong Kong. Formerly owned by Rupert Murdoch, The Post is now the property of another billionaire—the online retail magnate Jack Ma. His Alibaba Group spent over a $250 million on the acquisition, which many suspected was concluded with Chinese government backing despite Ma’s assurances that he would fight to keep the paper independent.

So far so good. State-run media were ordered to avoid reporting on the Panama Papers and the involvement of family members of Chinese leaders. They were also told to seek out and scrub references to the scandal online. But The Post reported the news as normal. How and whether that coverage will continue remains to be seen.

Sounds like a story that would make a good book.

STEVEN SCHWANKERT, author of *Poseidon: China’s Secret Salvage of Britain’s Lost Submarine* (Hong Kong University Press), is America’s Beijing correspondent. Twitter: @greatwriteshark.
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Among the signature moments of Reggie Jackson’s baseball career is one he would rather forget: a ninth-inning showdown in the 1978 World Series against the Dodgers’ reliever Bob Welch. The Yankee slugger had earned the nickname Mr. October for his World Series heroics against the Dodgers the year before, including one game where he hit three home runs on three consecutive pitches, and Welch was just a 21-year-old rookie who couldn’t throw much beyond fastballs. So he threw Jackson nine straight, the last a heater down the middle that Jackson swung at so hard he almost fell down. (He missed.)

The Dodger Stadium crowd went crazy: Reggie Jackson was the player everyone loved to hate. He didn’t have the kindest words for them, either, later dismissing them as “a baseball crowd that usually sits on its hands and waits for Vin Scully to tell them what they’re seeing. The usual Dodger Stadium crowd is about 50,000 people and 40,000 transistor radios.”

But the impossible is happening. After 67 years of play-by-play for the Dodgers, Vin Scully, Southern California’s soundtrack to summertime, is retiring. Unless the Dodgers make the playoffs (THEY WILL), Oct. 2, 2016, will be his final broadcast, a few weeks before his 89th birthday.

That’s a lot of birthdays. But Vin has always been philosophical about length of years; three decades ago, he announced during a broadcast that Cubs slugger Andre Dawson had bruised his knee and was “listed as day-to-day.... Aren’t we all?”

Vin called Reggie’s strikeout on the radio, the medium for which he is famous, but he has also done television play-by-play for an astounding number of historic moments in sports. Remember Don Larsen’s perfect game to win the 1955 World Series? Vin called the game. Or the ball squirt- ing between poor Bill Buckner’s legs in the 1986 World Series? Vin called that. Sandy Koufax’s perfect game in 1965? Vin. Joe Montana’s desperation touchdown pass to Dwight Clark to put the 49ers in their first Super Bowl? That was Vin, too. His call of Kirk Gibson’s game-winn- ing home run in the 1988 World Series is legendary. He has narrated plenty of classic golf and tennis tournaments, too. Vin Scully even called the perfect game Kevin Costner tossed in that awful movie.

The city of Los Angeles just gave Dodger Stadium a new address: it’s now located at 1000 Vin Scully Avenue. X-Files fans hear his name every time they watch the show, because agent Mulder’s partner is named in his honor. For one short year, he was even given his own weekday variety program. And he has a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame.

Why so much Sturm und Drang over an announcer? It’s that voice, first of all, that velvety tenor described by Chris Erskine of The Los Angeles Times as “full of swing, moxie and sonic opulence.” But the level of erudition is part of it, too. Vin can quote Shakespeare, compare an athlete’s muscles to the Belvedere Torso, explain why the number 13 isn’t really unlucky and bowdlerize a manager’s profanity-laced tirade on the spot. All in one evening.

Equally important has been the comfort of continuity. My father, as a teenager, as a Brooklyn Dodgers fan in the Washington Heights neighborhood of Manhattan, listened to Vin Scully. Think about that. In a sport that claims to be about tradition, the players and coaches come and go all the time; sometimes even the teams and stadiums do. But not Vin Scully.

Finally, there is the wisdom that comes through with every broadcast, some of it the result of a life well-lived, some of it earned the hard way. Though a private man, Scully has given a few interviews about his Catholic faith, including one with The National Catholic Register in 2013 in which he reflected on the death of his first wife and the loss of a son. “When my wife, Joan, died in 1972 at the age of 35, I was devastated, as were our children. We didn’t stop praying, though. The worst thing you can do in times of trial is to stop praying. The tough moments are when you need God the most. He’s always there and more than happy to give us His help; we need only ask for it,” Scully said.

“There are so many good things about the Church, but that might be the most essential thing I’ve learned from it: the importance of continu- al communication with God. That’s what all the kneelers, candles, incense, stained-glass windows, holy water and other things are about: directing our minds and hearts to God.”

Did Vin make the wrong choice 67 years ago? Maybe the guy should have been a spiritual director.

JAMES T. KEANE is an editor at Orbis Books in Ossining, N.Y., and a former associate editor of America. Twitter: @jameskeane.
What is different about Jesuit higher education? Two questions will help focus this consideration. How does the idea that reality is suffused with the presence of God, or the idea that the way to become more like God is to be as fully human as we can, find expression in Jesuit higher education? And does Jesuit higher education aspire to provide for its students something more than superior academic training?

Well-done education at a Jesuit university transforms a student and prepares him or her for work that promotes the common good, while allowing that student to discern his or her vocation in life and, in the long run, to flourish as a human being. This is the transforming power of education on a Jesuit campus rightly understood: personal transformation that

BY KEVIN P. QUINN

HUMAN FLOURISHING.
Stephanie Lovina, a graduate of St. Joseph’s University, working at Homeboy Industries in Los Angeles.

KEVIN P. QUINN, S.J., is the president of the University of Scranton and a professor of philosophy there. This article is a version of an address he gave at the First Joint Symposium of Universities With Jesuit Tradition, hosted by Trnava University in Trnava, Slovakia, in October 2014.
leads to societal transformation through the ongoing dialectic of personal freedom and social responsibility.

Contemporary Jesuit leadership remains vigilant regarding what is an appropriate starting point for this discussion. The 34th General Congregation stated: “As we look to the future, we need consciously to be on guard that both the noun ‘university’ and the adjective ‘Jesuit’ always remain fully honored” (Decree 17, No. 5). And the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities says further: “Catholic and Jesuit, descriptors that define us as an institution, are not simply two characteristics among many. Rather, they signify our defining character, what makes us uniquely who we are.” This is a risky undertaking for us as Catholic and Jesuit educators. While the values and “way of proceeding” of secular education sometimes overlap with ours, many times they do not. That is why it is so important for us to understand and celebrate the principles and convictions that motivate our work, precisely as the work of a university that is Catholic and Jesuit.

The contemporary university qua university is characterized, the A.J.C.U. adds, by “peer reviewed research, research-grounded teaching and teaching as mentoring, and service, all within a climate of academic freedom.” What universities claim to be teaching their students—specifically, to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems and communicate clearly—is necessary but not sufficient for Jesuit universities. For a Jesuit university should ask more of its students by educating and forming them to become men and women of faith and of service to their communities. This is the “value added” of Jesuit higher education.

This self-defining claim poses a significant challenge for us because it does not matter to our external accreditors or to our secular colleagues. By definition, Jesuit institutions of higher learning exist to educate young people in a way that prepares them to be valuable contributors to the common good through the work they will do in the course of their careers. But that, for Jesuit educators, is not enough. We seek to form—and that powerful transitive verb cannot be overemphasized in our context—men and women of a particular kind: individuals of faith who understand that their faith compels them to work for justice and in the service of others, regardless of their chosen profession. Even more pointedly, our tradition recognizes that the work our alumni undertake and the careers that will unfold for them take on their proper importance and meaning only in the context of the deeper, primary commitments of their lives: the commitments they owe to their families and their communities.

In 1989, reflecting on 200 years of Jesuit and Catholic education at Georgetown, Timothy Healy, S.J., then the university’s president, spoke eloquently of the work of all Jesuit universities when he reminded all involved with the life of Georgetown:

Undergraduate teaching, with its dream of making citizens for the City of Man and the City of God, has always been first in Georgetown’s time and heart. For two centuries on this good ground the faculty has labored to help young men, and for the last 30 years young women, to achieve themselves as citizens, husbands and wives, parents and as friends. “Liberal education” has always had those aims and only those.... [W]e have never bowed to either of two heresies—that the bachelor’s degree is for making a living rather than for life itself, or that one can debase the arts and sciences to make them “value free.” Neither fallacy has ever clouded the renaissance Jesuit vision that everything human, as well as the nature in which mankind sits, is filled with the laboring presence of God and thus worth the struggle to enjoy, understand and celebrate.

Such convictions flow from the spiritual vision passed on in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, the touchstone of all Jesuit spirituality and the work of any Jesuit school. The underpinnings of education in Jesuit schools can be found in the worldview transmitted by three meditations found in the exercises. Although written almost 500 years ago, they evoke powerful, foundational convictions that can—and, I would submit, must—animate any academic program at a Jesuit university. These meditations are those on the Incarnation, on the Call of the King and on the Two Standards.

**The Meditations**

In the meditation on the Incarnation, Ignatius asks the retreatant to use the powers of imagination to envision the Trinity—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—involved in a conversation as they look down upon the entire “expanse and circuit of the Earth.” They behold it all at once, the good, the bad and the ugly, and they agree that the project of creation, as embodied in the human race, is not going well. Something is wrong and needs fixing. The fruit of their discussion is a divine decision and resolution: “Let us work the redemption of the human race.” And the angel Gabriel is sent to Mary in the backwater village of Nazareth.

This meditation and the understanding of the nature of God it conveys are at the very heart of Jesuit spirituality and Jesuit education. The foundational understanding is this: God has chosen to “roll up his sleeves” and “go to work” in creation. God labors in creation. Our laboring, therefore, is one profound manifestation of how we are made in the image and likeness of God. This insight has—or should have—profound implications for the work of education in Jesuit schools.

Ignatius does not stop there. After inviting us to consider the truth that God labors in creation, he then summons all men and women to join in that divine labor. In the medita-
tion on the Call of the King, Ignatius asks the retreatant first to consider a good and upright earthly king who issues a call to his subjects, asking them to “join with him” in a noble task “conquering all enemies of mankind, which include disease, ignorance, poverty and oppression.” Ignatius asks the retreatant to consider that any reasonable person of good will would join in such an endeavor. He then takes a step further, asking the retreatant to reflect on the call of the Eternal King, Jesus Christ, to join with him in the aforementioned work of redeeming the human race. This call is issued to every human being.

The Ignatian imagination sees God as actively involved in the ongoing work of creation and sees human beings as recipients of an unending divine invitation to join in that work here and now. Fittingly, academic programs at Jesuit institutions are natural and potentially very powerful tools for bringing about human flourishing both for the individuals who are educated and formed in them and for the broader community in which they will work. Ignatius reminds us, however, that Jesuit schools—precisely because of the good they can bring about for so many—will be opposed by what Ignatius repeatedly called “the enemy of human nature.”

In the meditation on the Two Standards, Ignatius places both the activity of God in the world and the call to action God issues to all human beings within the broader context of a cosmic struggle between good and evil in the world. For Ignatius, evil was very real and very active in the world, especially in the realm of human decision-making; moreover, it was crafty and relentless in its desire to frustrate the hopes and the laboring of God among human beings. In this powerful meditation, Ignatius asks the retreatant to imagine a scene in which both Christ and Satan invite all human beings to “choose sides” in the great cosmic struggle between good and evil. Ignatius insists that “Christ calls and wants all beneath his standard, and Lucifer, on the other hand, wants all under his.” Human beings must choose.

These three meditations, quaint as they may appear to contemporary readers and foreign as they surely are to secular academics, can be for us today powerful reminders of why Jesuit schools exist and how Jesuit educators should understand the work we do. In particular, these meditations can inform how we structure our academic programs.

Jesuit Education Today

But what is distinctive about Jesuit higher education today? The Society of Jesus is 475 years old and continues to educate young men and women by applying insights born of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius and by reflecting on experiences of countless Jesuits and Jesuit schools across the globe and through the centuries. Contemporary commentary on Ignatian spirituality identifies several important themes, as articulated by the Jesuits at Georgetown in 2010:
the experience of a divine and forgiving love that in turn enables us to recognize our complicity with sin; a personal calling that frees us to embrace our truest passions in following Christ and in service of others; the redemptive possibility of self-giving love that invites us to attend to the cries of those who suffer; [and] the experience of enduring goodness that gives hope for a world in which the Spirit always labors.

These themes in turn shape the Ignatian worldview and inform as organizing principles much of Jesuit education, as the A.J.C.U. states, by “encouraging students to see the hand of God in all things, to discern the ‘magis,’ or the better course of action, [and] to engage the world through a careful analysis of context, in dialogue with experience evaluated through reflection, for the sake of action, and with openness, always, to evaluation’ (GC 35).”

Jesuit education has engaged mind, heart and hands since the first Jesuit school opened in 1548. In 2000, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., then superior general of the Jesuit order, called for a new Jesuit educational standard. “Tomorrow’s ‘whole person,’” he said, “cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world.” For that reason, he explained, students “must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn to feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering, and engage in it constructively.” They should learn, he said, to “perceive, think, judge, choose, and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed.”

This is the contemporary standard for engaged learning in a Jesuit university. This standard applies to all students. To apply these Jesuit “marching orders,” students are encouraged to enter worlds beyond campus, to gain an education that no classroom alone can offer, to learn with and from people in marginalized communities and so to become global citizens for a new century.

This educational strategy calls for personal transformation that would lead to transforming society. The ideal of a personal transformation requires a rigorous education to prepare students to become ethical and compassionate leaders who will infuse society with faith and justice, informed by knowledge. For personal transformation to be effective, academic, moral and spiritual, experience must be integrated with and enhanced by learning outside the classroom. But it must be experiential learning in which immersion and reflection on experience are intertwined and focused on the needs and concerns that many in our world face. It must also be learning that is framed in the context of asking the “bigger questions” of human experience, such as, “What does this experience say to me about God, about the purpose and meaning of human life and about how the hopes and labors of God in the world can be frustrated?”

Learning With
There is a catch here, a shift in educational philosophy. The aim is not just serving others and learning about people but learning with and from people who are often excluded from participation in economic, social and political life. And further, there is a call to integrate academic inquiry, creative imagination and reflection on experience in order to inspire the fashioning of a more just and humane society. Or as Mark Ravizza, S.J., put it so well during a conference on the University of Scranton campus: integrating accompaniment, spirituality, academic excellence and community will lead university students to a depth of thought and imagination that is a distinguishing mark of the Ignatian tradition. Through these experiences faculty members, students, community partners and indigenous peoples become dynamic partners in an ambitious and often difficult educational process.

To deliver a transformative education in the Jesuit tradition requires the integration of academic, moral and spiritual learning—the union of mind, heart and soul. We also know that any university that claims—as Jesuit institutions surely do—to educate and form the whole person cannot pretend
that the religious life of that person is somehow an optional or accidental dimension that can be relegated to the sidelines or attended to as an afterthought. Rather, the experience of a Jesuit education can and should provide all students with the tools and opportunities to develop the habits of mind and heart that will enable them to encounter the living God. Only in this most important of all encounters will students discover the truth about themselves as well as the meaning and implications of the call that comes with being a person.

In the words of the Georgetown Jesuits reflecting on undergraduate education there: “The journey of selfhood should also ideally include the cultivation of a freedom to choose our truest selves.” Promoting this project of self-discovery and discerning one’s deepest vocation is consistent with, for example, the University of Scranton’s statement to “provide a superior, transformational learning experience, preparing students who...will set the world on fire.” The task of providing these tools and opportunities is not the job of any single office or division of the university. Nor is the target audience only students studying philosophy and theology. Rather, this task is the focus of the entire university community and is arguably the raison d’être for any Jesuit university.

So today’s Jesuit universities in the United States are about student formation, regardless of the student’s college or discipline. Jesuit schools have long had, as the Georgetown Jesuits stated, “a keen interest in formative concerns and in the ways in which such concerns intersect academic work.” Robust collaboration between academic and student affairs and the continued vitality of general education on Jesuit campuses highlight this concern for formation among undergraduates. Jesuit educators aim to invite all students into a broader formational experience that will enable them to grow into persons of a certain kind, blessed with gifts of heart, mind and soul. It is this human formation that provides the context within which Jesuit higher education takes on its proper perspective, its deeper purpose and its true meaning.

Much of what I have discussed here is, to be frank, aspirational and liable to be interpreted as the stuff of promotional materials. To an extent, that is true. However, the aspirational, the articulation of the goal toward which we are working, giving voice to the very reasons why our schools exist—all of this does matter. It can give shape to what we do and the way we do it. If we do not provide a theoretical framework—or a worldview born of intellect and imagination—for what we do in our academic programs, others will provide them for us. If we do not know who we are as Jesuit universities, others will happily tell us who to be.

I am thinking here not of coercive governmental intrusion but of controlling narrative and value systems that accreditation agencies, professional associations and even our secular colleagues offer as substitutes for the thicker, deeper narrative that is our inheritance as Jesuit schools. We must maintain strong and professionally savvy relationships with all these outside entities, but we must likewise always be careful to safeguard, promote and deepen the distinctive reasons for and faith-fueled convictions behind why we do what we do. We must, in other words, continually articulate aloud and in public, for ourselves and our many constituencies, the spiritual vision that animates everything we do, including our professional education programs.

Jesuit universities are in a privileged position to provide an education that speaks to the deepest desires of our students and at the same time aims to address the most profound needs of our world. Inherited from generations of Jesuit educators and two millennia of Christianity, this is our legacy to preserve and enhance. It is hard for me to imagine more important or rewarding work. In sum, the 21st-century Jesuit university attempts to educate its students by joining excellent academic training with personal and moral formation rooted in the Catholic tradition. When this is done well, those students, now alumni of Jesuit universities, will work hard transforming society, thereby contributing to the labor of God in attempting, as David Fleming, S.J., said, “work the redemption of the human race.”
Legislation and litigation regarding L.G.B.T.I. discrimination and the use of gender-specific public toilets reveals a deep societal divide and illustrates the need for reasoned use of political power. The most recent controversy arose after some localities passed antidiscrimination ordinances that allow people to use facilities based on gender self-identification. In response, states passed laws prohibiting L.G.B.T.I. discrimination claims and limiting the use of gender-specific facilities in public buildings.

The equal protection clause requires laws to be, at minimum, rationally based. In Romer v. Evans (1996), the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Colorado constitutional amendment that prohibited all government action designed to protect homosexuals. In rejecting Colorado’s argument that the amendment protected religious rights, Justice Kennedy wrote, “it is divorced from any...legitimate state interests; it is a classification of persons undertaken for its own sake, something the Equal Protection Clause does not permit.”

North Carolina’s recently enacted law is more carefully worded than the invalid Colorado amendment, but North Carolina’s own attorney general considers the law unconstitutional, and the governor is trying to minimize its impact. Federal civil rights laws prohibit sex-based discrimination in education, employment and housing. The federal circuit court that covers North Carolina has approved the extension of those protections to transgender claimants. Nevertheless, federal law does not prevent sex-based public accommodation discrimination and the equal protection clause does not apply to commercial relationships. Thus, businesses throughout North Carolina may impose toilet use restrictions on transgender customers.

Mississippi also recently enacted a law that limits public facility usage. Mississippi passed a very different type of law that protects defined religious beliefs, including that the terms “male (man) or female (woman) refer to an individual’s immutable biological sex as objectively determined by anatomy and genetics at time of birth.” The law does not take into consideration the conundrum faced by intersex people who are born with undefined or hermaphroditic sex organs.

The Mississippi law clearly violates the establishment clause of the First Amendment, as the constitution requires neutrality among religious beliefs. Any law, like this one, that blatantly supports a specific set of beliefs is an unconstitutional endorsement of religion. Enacting legislation that is patently unlawful and doomed to be invalidated by the judiciary serves no legitimate purpose and erodes confidence in the democratic process.

Religious rights already are protected by the federal and state constitutions and numerous federal, state and local laws. These rights may become clearer if the eight-justice U.S. Supreme Court is able to issue a majority opinion in Zubik v. Burwell, the contraceptive mandate case. Regardless, politicians and advocacy groups serve their constituents best by avoiding unnecessary controversy and looking instead for mutually beneficial solutions. As Gov. Dennis Daugaard of South Dakota, a Republican, stated when he vetoed a bill that would have prohibited transgender accommodation in public school facilities: “Best government is the government closest to the people. Instead of encouraging local solutions, this bill broadly regulates in a manner that invites conflict and litigation, diverting energy and resources from the education of the children of this state.”

Political and religious differences aside, many people, including women (who often endure long waits for female-only facilities), parents with small children and adults who need physical assistance, benefit from non-gender-specific facilities. Single-use toilets can become gender-neutral unisex facilities with the simple change of a sign, and money that otherwise would be spent on litigation could be used to retrofit multiperson facilities to provide more privacy for everyone.

Focusing on outcomes that are universally beneficial will not end all disputes regarding the appropriate balance between civil rights and religious rights, but it would be better government.

ELLEN K. BOEGEL

Politicians serve their constituents best by avoiding unnecessary controversy.

ELLEN K. BOEGEL
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College Encounter
Dialogue and witness in Catholic education
BY JOHN C. CAVADINI

Modern campus politics make strange bedfellows. In recent years, both the Cardinal Newman Society and students at Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts have sought to cancel—for very different reasons—a production of “The Vagina Monologues,” a play regularly performed at colleges across the country.

The controversy over this explicit play is just one example among many of schools grappling with the competing desires to, on the one hand, support free speech and, on the other, create “safe spaces” for students in which certain values are upheld. Watching these events unfold in 2015, it struck me that 25 years after the publication of “Ex Corde Ecclesiae,” St. John Paul II’s apostolic constitution on the Catholic university is not only relevant to contemporary debates but perhaps even avant-garde. One of the enduring legacies of “Ex Corde” has been to provide a framework for thinking about the goods of education and the identity of universities.

In the various debates spawned by the document, two ways of arguing about the identity of a university (especially, but not only, of a Catholic university) arose. The first is to think of the university as a place of witness; the second is to think of it as a neutral place intended to facilitate dialogue.

The first way of thinking regards the university’s fundamental role in bearing witness to higher values, truths and beliefs, for which the university itself, and not just individuals at the university, stand. The second way of thinking regards the university as a place that, far from bearing witness to any particular value or truth, is a neutral arena where learned discussion and debate occur, with clarification of thought arising from such dialogue. People are then free to choose and uphold their own values and beliefs as a result, but the university as a whole is simply the impartial impresario of such dialogue and does not stand for any of the values discussed.

Even before recent events on secular college campuses, it was clear that no university can consistently hold to only one of these modes absolutely. A university that is only a place of witness, without also having room for dialogue, will lose its credibility as a university and, as a result, its credibility as a witness. People will feel that the deck is stacked, that their views are not heard, that there is only a party line.

On the other hand, can any university really be a fully neutral place for dialogue, where the only value is dialogue itself? Is there really a university, even the most secular, that would say it stands for no values at all, not even “truth” or “justice”? The more absolutely neutrality is claimed, the more likely it is an illusion or even a delusion, and the more likely it is that one will compromise some fundamental truth or value.

After all, then, it seems that in practice a university must be a place of both witness and dialogue, however minimal the witness claimed, on the one hand, or however much the dialogue may be restricted, on the other. A serious university, and especially a Catholic university, is faced with both theoretical and prudential considerations regarding a balance of the two. A Catholic university can be thought of as an attempt to balance the two in a unique way, and, from the perspective offered by 25 years of implementation and debate, it seems evident that “Ex Corde Ecclesiae” presents the project of a Catholic university in just this way.

Community of Inquiry
It is fair to say that “Ex Corde Ecclesiae” features the idea of dialogue quite prominently. “Dialogue” was one of St. John Paul II’s signature words and is present in full vigor throughout the text of the document, including the introduction:

Through the encounter which it establishes between the unfathomable richness of the salvific message of the Gospel and the variety and immensity of the fields of knowledge in which that richness is incarnated by it, a Catholic University enables the Church to institute an incomparably fertile dialogue with people of every culture (No. 6).

Here the dialogue a Catholic university can foster flows from an idea of the university as establishing an “encounter” between revelation—so rich that it is never able to be fully grasped—and the various disciplines of academic inquiry in which the university, to a greater or lesser extent, is able to incarnate this richness in some appropriate way. The Catholic university is a kind of living incarnation of this encounter that takes place specifically in and as a community
of inquiry, we could say, in the mode of inquiry.

What could this mean? Does it mean, for example, that there are a Catholic biology and a Catholic organic chemistry? No, of course not; but it means that the study of biology at a Catholic university should in some way present the opportunity to experience the fundamental encounter with the richness of the Gospel incarnated in the mode of inquiry. At a minimum, this will happen because these studies, without departing from their own scientific methodology, are conducted in an intellectual community where, in another department, the doctrine of creation is taught and explained in a way that resists reductionism and gives permission for the wonders that science discovers to be the occasion for genuine praise of the creator.

Or, maximally, because scientific research is carried out by believers, students are made aware that faith and scientific study can in fact be combined. Nor should we neglect the incarnation of the riches of the Gospel that occurs when scientific inquiry is carried out in a way that refuses to violate the dignity of the human person and in fact seeks to advance human dignity.

The incarnational feature of the Catholic university is thus, in “Ex Corde,” already, in implicit form, both dialogue and witness. This is because the “incarnation” of the richness of revelation in the mode of inquiry, when it becomes explicitly thematized, is nothing other than the dialogue between faith and reason, and indeed, “Ex Corde” notes that “a specific part of a Catholic University’s task is to promote dialogue between faith and reason” (No. 17, emphasis original).

**Evangelizing Truth**

Reading farther, we find that the point of this dialogue is to show “more profoundly how faith and reason bear harmonious witness to the unity of all truth.” Encountering the “incarnation” of the richness of revelation in the mode of inquiry means encountering both dialogue and witness, because the dialogue itself bears witness, in this case, to the unity of truth:

While each academic discipline retains its own integrity and has its own methods, this dialogue demonstrates that “methodical research within every branch of learning, when carried out in a truly scientific manner and in accord with moral norms, can never truly conflict with faith” (“Ex Corde,” No. 17, citing “Gaudium et Spes,” No. 36).

St. John Paul II clearly believed in dialogue. And yet this dialogue is not carried out in a neutral space or to a neutral end. The Catholic university is not a “neutral place” but a primary and privileged place for a fruitful dialogue between the Gospel and culture” (No. 43, emphasis original). The point
of the dialogue is to clarify the meaning of the human person in light of revelation so that people will be enabled “to come to the full measure of their humanity, created in the image and likeness of God, renewed even more marvelously, after sin, in Christ, and called to shine forth in the light of the Spirit” (No. 5). Out of a dialogue arises a witness to the church’s liberating message.

The text later states that a specific priority of the Catholic university in its modern context is “to communicate to society those ethical and religious principles which give full meaning to human life” (No. 33, emphasis original). Thus:

By its very nature, each Catholic University makes an important contribution to the Church’s work of evangelization. It is a living institutional witness to Christ and his message, so vitally important in cultures marked by secularism (No. 49, emphasis original).

In sum, there is no question of a university that is merely a neutral place for dialogue, but rather of a university with commitments in faith to the dignity and transcendence of the human person, ready to clarify and bear witness to those commitments and to come to understand them better through dialogue. If a Catholic university becomes so uncomfortable with thinking of itself as a part of the church’s mission of evangelization that it ceases to understand itself as a place of “dialogue,” at least in the way St. John Paul II intends.

### Balancing Act
Claiming a trajectory that goes back as far as the Second Vatican Council’s “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World,” “Ex Corde Ecclesiae” certainly affected the way both Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis came to articulate the Catholic university precisely as a place of balancing witness and dialogue. Pope Benedict’s address to Catholic educators during his visit to the Catholic University of America in 2008 offers a good example: “To all of you I say: bear witness to hope. Nourish your witness with prayer.” Here is a clarion call for the university to be a place of witness, also sounded in other places in the address. For example: “A university or school’s Catholic identity is not simply a question of the number of Catholic students. It is a question of conviction—do we really believe that only in the mystery of the Word made flesh does the mystery of the human being truly become clear?”

And yet there is also an awareness that the university will not be able to form anyone into these values unless there is an appeal, as Pope Benedict says, to their “will.” “Perhaps we have neglected the will,” he notes, adding that it is the responsibility of teachers to...

-evoke among the young the desire for the act of faith, encouraging them to commit themselves to the ecclesial life that follows from this belief. It is here that freedom reaches the certainty of truth. In choosing to live by that truth, we embrace the fullness of the life of faith.

The emphasis here on freedom, on persuasion, on choosing and on inspiration implies also the emphasis on dialogue, conversation and exchange that is so evident in other writings of Pope Benedict. No one is persuaded, the will is not moved and free decisions are not made unless there is opportunity for discussion, debate, exchange and conversation. The word dialogue itself is not used here, but it is implied. One can recognize in these remarks the balance between witness and dialogue that St. John Paul II attempted to articulate in “Ex Corde,” though perhaps one can see a certain emphasis on witness.

### Power of Appeal
Pope Francis, in turn, in his remarks on Catholic education so far, certainly explodes the idea that for a university to embrace a paradigm of dialogue implies that it must become a neutral space whose sole purpose is to foster dialogue, without any explicit witness to core values. Commenting on the university specifically as a place of dialogue, he says that Catholic schools and universities—even, and perhaps
especially, when attended by many non-Christians or non-believers—still are called upon...

to offer, with full respect for the freedom of each person and using the methods appropriate to the scholastic environment, the Christian belief, that is, to present Jesus Christ as the meaning of life, the cosmos and history.

This, Pope Francis is saying, is to enter belief into dialogue, not as one position among many but as a belief to which the university is itself committed, convinced that it can speak to the souls of people across racial, cultural and even religious boundaries. Jesus, Pope Francis reminds us, proclaimed the good news in the “Galilee of the people, a crossroads of people, diverse in terms of race, culture and religion.”

Of course, Jesus was not preaching at a university, and Pope Francis speaks of “methods appropriate to the scholastic environment.” A university culture of “courageous and innovative fidelity that enables Catholic identity to encounter the various ‘souls’ of multicultural society” is not meant to turn the university culture into one of proselytism, of pressure to convert to Catholicism. That would hardly have “full respect for the freedom of persons,” nor would it be an authentic witness to the Gospel, which has an intrinsic power of appeal, if we can only trust it is so and enter it into dialogue with that trust in mind. And yet, though it is not proselytism, what Catholics bring to the dialogue must indeed be the conviction that Jesus Christ is the meaning of the cosmos and not simply a message of justice and peace that would be at home at any good university (though that message is obviously also important).

One can see here a renewed iteration of St. John Paul II’s idea in “Ex Corde” that the Catholic university is, as such, the incarnation of an encounter between faith and reason, between the richness of the Gospel and the various modes of inquiry. Its witness, therefore, is dependent upon and executed in dialogue. Although contrasts between Pope Benedict and Pope Francis are often overdone, perhaps we can see here an emphasis on the pole of dialogue.

But in continuing and interpreting the legacy of St. John Paul II, Pope Francis is asking us to go beyond inherited dichotomies between dialogue and witness. He is wagering that if we do so, we will find an energy that animates an academic culture, filling it with an appeal to the imagination that is the stuff of leadership, of innovation, of interest, urgency and life, an “expression of the living presence of the Gospel in the fields of education, science and culture” that exposes the myth of the conflict of science and religion, or of religion and culture, as just that, a myth. That, it seems to me, is worth buying into, a powerful form of witness generative of all kinds of new forms of dialogue ex corde ecclesiae, from the heart of the church.
An Educator’s Influence

Learning to think in biology class
BY J. JOSEPH MARR

We first met when I was applying to Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. The dean of admissions, after praising my high-school record and my plans for medical school a bit too generously, sent us over to see the chairman of the biology department. In a small office in one corner of the third floor of Albers Hall, we met a gray-haired, quiet man wearing a lab coat. This was Joseph J. Peters, S.J. He had an understated gravitas, and it quickly was clear that he was not as easily impressed as the dean of admissions. I do not remember our conversation, but I do remember the serene quietness of the laboratory, the lack of ornamentation of the office and the aura of science. Do not discard this as hyperbole; to me it was tangible.

We talked; he gave some advice regarding admissions procedures and coursework but was otherwise noncommittal. I returned home absolutely committed to the Xavier program. It had nothing to do with the campus, pleasant as it was; I had seen none of the dorms or other facilities, of which there were many fewer than there are today. I knew nothing of the composition of the student population and did not care. I had met someone who was beyond teachers I had met thus far: clearly dedicated to some arcane concept called knowledge and intent to pass on this sense of dedication. Some people have life-changing moments at rock concerts or from mind-altering drugs; I had mine in a laboratory interview. The following autumn I matriculated.

I had studied no biology and was part of the crowd in the introductory biology class. Father Peters taught that introductory course and began with a history of the subject, though it was not presented as such. He told a story of the astounding creatures that had come to be over time. Some remained with us; others had their day and were no more; still others had characteristics of their ancestors but had added new features that were useful.

In his lectures, we learned to apply and distinguish between deductive and inductive reasoning and how to focus on a scientific question. We learned that an experiment always gives the right answer: this is why it must be designed and conducted carefully. If not, the answer you get—the right answer—will be to some question you did not know you where asking.

After some weeks, we were asked to write a paper that proved or disproved the process of evolution. This was an exercise in dialectics as much as biology. I slowly came to realize that this was how Father Peters taught. He was not simply conveying information to young minds but developing critical thinking. His course was as much about why the scientists and philosophers of the Middle Ages, Renaissance and the Enlightenment were important to us now as it was about the origin of species. We were being given a course in the philosophy of science alongside introductory biology.

By junior year I had begun to study the deeper mysteries, at the same time memorizing biological information and being seduced by it. Comparative anatomy gradually came into focus as the beautiful mosaic of the commonality of structure and function throughout the animal kingdom. In embryology, ontology really did recapitulate phylogeny as the movement of cells from one part of the body to another during embryogenesis unfolded: a window into our history. Father Peters saw this as an almost theological exercise. He saw the magnificence and mystery of developing life and instilled it into his lectures. Since then, the scientific underpinnings of embryogenesis have become much clearer. None of that has taken the magic from embryogenesis as Father Peters presented it, but rather may have enhanced it.

As seniors, we moved beyond simple coursework. We were asked to create a research project worthy of the name and then find a way to investigate it. We had guidance but no direct help. This was not unique to biology, being implemented in various ways across the university. This was university education at its best, I thought, challenging us to pursue, present and defend new knowledge. It changed my life.

I worked on the physiological mapping of a part of the salamander brain. The department provided the salamanders, but when the research moved beyond the standard available instruments, I had to fend for myself. In order to stimulate and record brain functions in salamanders, I wound up devising a procedure for producing glass microelectrodes from glass tubes heated with a Bunsen burner. Of course, the value of this lesson was not in glass manufacturing, but in developing the individual ingenuity necessary to solve problems and the willingness to go figure them out.
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I still have a copy of the thesis I presented, proving my conclusions about certain brain functions in the salamander. It is a forgettable piece of work but has an honored place on my bookshelves, reminding me not about what I contributed to science but what I learned in the process. I went on to a career of 20 years in medical research and teaching that began by overheating glass rods in the biology lab.

Finally, there was Father Peters’s final exam in physiology. It is a complex topic, and we who sat for the exam had studied accordingly. When the day arrived, the 12 of us remaining of the 120 who began in biology as freshmen were seated with paper and pen awaiting the exam.

The door opened. Father Peters walked in and said, “Pick up your pens and write your names on the top of the page.” We wrote; he waited.

“Set your pens down.” We did that.

“Now tell me everything that happened from my first sentence until the second. Please leave your papers on the desk in the front of the room when you complete the exam.”

Then he left. We were stunned.

It was an excellent exam. He assumed that we had studied the material; he wanted to know how well we had assimilated it. Stated differently: “I trust you have mastered the notes, but can you make a symphony?” The exam itself was a learning experience. Before we could begin we had to review a great deal of physiology, decide how to organize our presentation of this synthesis and then, finally, begin to write. At the end of the exam we understood the dynamics of physiology far better than we did before. Beyond that, I suspect that how we answered did not matter much.

Father Peters was a scholar in a community of scholars and, for many of us, a model to be emulated. He coaxed from us our best efforts—by example. He was a quiet, self-effacing person and yet had a towering reputation. What combination of factors brought this about? His biography is instructive. Father Peters was born in 1907 and died 91 years later in 1998. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1927 and pronounced his final vows in 1940. His 31-year academic career at Xavier University stretched from 1946 to his retirement in 1977. He chaired the department of biology for 21 years.

During his Jesuit formation, he studied philosophy at St. Louis University and philosophy and biology at the University of Detroit. He earned a licentiate in theology (again at St. Louis) and a doctorate in zoology at Fordham. This blend of backgrounds was evident in his teaching and makes clear why he did not simply teach biology. He taught about life, the beauty of knowledge and the history and philosophy of science. He challenged us to consider who we were relative to the rest of the planet’s biology.

He did not offer simplistic answers but instead encouragement and guidance about how to seek a solution and en-
His approach to embryology, in particular, bordered on the mystical. If you think about one cell beginning the journey of division into almost 37 trillion, genes turning on and off, creating various tissues that then move into their final organization, getting all of this right just about every time, you begin to understand why he felt that way. Philosophy, theology and natural science all played their roles in forming his style and methods of education.

As an educator, Father Peters passed all of this along to those who wanted to listen, encouraged independent judgment and offered guidance when asked.

In all my years of schooling, I have encountered several very good teachers, role models and counselors. But I have not met anyone who matched Father Peters in devotion to knowledge, breadth of perspective or inspired teaching.

When I got to medical school, I realized quickly that the biology and chemistry I had learned were already out of date. This is the nature of scientific knowledge. However, the abilities Father Peters had helped me develop to think about how to do science, and what scientific knowledge was and how it could be achieved, were still entirely valid.

Education has two components: information transfer and perspective. The former is easily accomplished; the latter is acquired only with difficulty. He gave us both but emphasized the second.

It has been said that education is what you retain after everything you learned has been forgotten. That was one of the gifts that Father Peters gave to any of his students who would listen. He taught us to think critically and to direct that thought to action and achievement. Is there a better definition of the purpose of a university? He taught the love of learning, the benefits of the intellectual life and a holistic view of life and its issues. He showed us a spiritual approach to understanding, looking objectively and critically at oneself. Is there a better definition of the liberal arts?

He pushed his students forward without prodding and stayed in the background as we went ahead. He left a mark and an influence that remains many decades later.
Deep in the waist of Mexico, on gentle plains at the foot of the forested Sierra Juárez, lies a small indigenous community known as Jaltepec de Candayoc. Warm and rainy year round, Jaltepec is a town built around coffee beans, corn and livestock. It is in a location about as remote as can be found today—six hours drive from the nearest big city and without consistent access to the Internet or even phone service.

And in this most isolated and unexpected of places, there is a university. More surprising still, though it has been in existence for 10 years, its mission sounds like a passage from “Laudato Si.”

Universidad Ayuuk, otherwise known as the Ayuuk Indigenous Intercultural University, was founded in 2006 out of conversation between local people, regional organizations and the Mexican Province of the Society of Jesus. Based on what they learned from a regional study, the Society offered to start a school in Jaltepec.

The local people agreed. “But they wanted a school with certain characteristics,” remembers César Palacios, S.J., the president. Specifically, they wanted a university that would teach their children care for the environment, economic solidarity (through community organizing) and an appreciation for and promotion of indigenous cultures. As of 2010, 34 percent of people in the state of Oaxaca speak an indigenous language; 16 different indigenous cultures can be found just in this area and 62 throughout the country. Indigenous peoples make up over 21 percent of Mexico’s population.
The Wisdom of Community

So the Jesuits, in conjunction with regional organizations and the local community, began Ayuuk as a school specifically for indigenous people. Today they have 150 students, who come from all over the country and more than a dozen different cultures. Spanish is the shared language, but 13 different indigenous languages are spoken at Ayuuk. And the pedagogy for its three fields of study—sustainable administration and development, communications for social development, and intercultural education—taps deeply into indigenous practice and insight.

“There’s knowledge in the community—the wisdom of the elders, the wisdom of the communities,” says Father Palacios. Areas like “our relationship to the earth, the knowledge of the human person, how you organize things—the university wants to bring that knowledge to the academy...to make it more accessible.”

But even more intriguing than its pedagogy is Ayuuk’s administration. Unlike the typical customer-service model of Western education, in which students’ main responsibility to their school is prompt payment of fees and respect for the school environment, Ayuuk is built on the indigenous practice of tequio, or “collective work.” As part of their life at Ayuuk, every student has a job related to the upkeep and development of the school. Cleaning the classrooms, tending the gardens—every student shares in the responsibility for the school. “Our students work for the institution and the institution works for them. That’s the idea of tequio,” says Father Palacios.

This co-op style practice extends to extraordinary degrees. When someone offered Father Palacios money for a new gymnasium, he put the question to the students. “I told them, ‘If you want the gym, you have to build the gym, because we don’t have money for workers.’ ”

“And they told me, ‘Okay. And now we have a gym. They cut the wood, they cleared the space.’ ”

Three times a semester the administration also meets with the student body both to hear their concerns and ideas and to seek their counsel. Father Palacios makes clear, this is not a pro-forma exercise: “Our decisions are made in these assemblies.” Participation is the custom of indigenous communities.

Preparing for a Global Culture

Each year Ayuuk has to raise between three million and five million pesos, roughly $300,000. That might not sound like much; one small grant from the U.S. federal government could keep it running for a decade. But “in Mexico it is not possible for the government to give money to private institutions,” Father Palacios points out. And the isolation of the school means it is not readily on people’s radars, either. In the end some funds are raised within the country, including from the other Jesuit universities of Mexico, and some come from donors abroad.

For Father Palacios, himself a member of the Wixarika indigenous community, the ultimate goal of the school is to prepare students for a “global culture.” This means development of practical skills but also that fundamental concern for others expressed both by indigenous culture and Pope Francis. “We need to have the tools, so the focus of our administration program is business, but it’s also care for the environment. For our communication program, it’s communication [skills], but also the social organization of local communities. For education, it’s teaching, but also learning indigenous languages and cultures.”

That global concern molds the religious identity of the school as well. “Our students come from various Christian denominations,” he says. “Because of our intercultural focus, we don’t have religious activities in our university but in the town.

“Everyone knows we are Catholic. But if we were to project ourselves as a private university just for Catholics, people would shy away,” he says. “We keep it open it to all and promote dialogue that is intercultural as well as interreligious.”

In “Laudato Si’,” Pope Francis calls for a “dialogue with all people about our common home.” The future of our planet is not the purview of any one group, but a reality to be formed by all of us, no matter what our nationality, religion or bank statement. “The Spirit of God has filled the universe with possibilities,” Pope Francis writes. “From the very heart of things, something new can always emerge” (No. 80).

In the little town of Jaltépec de Candayoc, Universidad Ayuuk offers an inspiring glimpse of that hoped-for future.
A Call to Prophetic Action

Pope Francis visited a refugee camp on the Greek island of Lesbos with two Orthodox Church leaders on April 16, not only to express solidarity with the 2,500 refugees there and 60,000 others in 40 camps across Greece but also to encourage the governments, the churches and the peoples of the European Union’s 28 member states to respond with greater solidarity to the biggest humanitarian crisis on the continent since World War II.

The pope’s dramatic gesture came at a time when the influx of refugees from Syria and other countries was putting serious strains on the European Union’s fundamental principles, causing some states, under pressure from nationalist and xenophobic political forces, to block the free movement of people. These political tensions, and the fear of terrorism, had pushed the union on March 18 to negotiate an agreement with Turkey to end the irregular migration from that country, an accord criticized by human rights organizations and the office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

Francis decided to visit Lesbos, through which 500,000 refugees transited to E.U. countries in the past year, as the union began deporting the first groups back to Turkey. Together with the Orthodox leaders, he met 300 refugees amid highly emotional scenes and cries for help and freedom from the terrified refugees in the camp, now a detention center, who fear deportation.

He told them he was aware of their suffering after being forced “to flee situations of conflict and persecution for the sake, above all, of your children” and “to leave behind everything that is dear to you and—what is perhaps most difficult—not knowing what the future will bring.”

Then, before having lunch in a shipping container with eight refugees, the Christian leaders signed a joint statement appealing to “world opinion” not to ignore this “colossal humanitarian crisis,” which, they declared, is “fundamentally a crisis of humanity” that calls “for a response of solidarity, compassion, generosity and an immediate practical commitment of resources.”

They appealed to the international community “to respond with courage” to the crisis “and its underlying causes” by working to end the wars and violence in the Middle East. They called for “a broader international consensus and an assistance program” to “defend fundamental human rights, protect minorities, combat human trafficking and smuggling, and eliminate unsafe routes.” They asked all countries to give asylum to the refugees and expand their relief efforts. They praised the Greek people for their generosity to the refugees, despite their own economic difficulties.

The pope, patriarch and archbishop are aware of the problems E.U. governments face from political and xenophobic forces that stir anti-immigrant backlash. They know that many Christians too, even some bishops, view this influx of refugees as a Muslim invasion of Europe that poses a serious threat to the continent’s Christian values.

Francis sought to allay such fears during a memorial service at the port of Mytilene for the refugees who drowned at sea. “The worries expressed by institutions and people, both in Greece and in other European countries, are understandable and legitimate,” he said. But, he added, “we must never forget that migrants, rather than simply being a statistic, are first of all persons who have faces, names and individual stories.”

Significantly, he reminded everyone that “Europe is the homeland of human rights, and whoever sets foot on European soil ought to sense this, and thus become more aware of the duty to respect and defend those rights.”

He and the Orthodox leaders asked religious communities “to increase their efforts to receive, assist and protect refugees of all faiths” and promised their churches would defend the fundamental human rights of refugees, asylum-seekers and migrants.

On Sept. 6, 2015, Francis asked every Catholic parish and religious community in Europe to give shelter to a refugee family and instructed the Vatican’s two parishes to accept two such families.

He concluded his visit to Lesbos with a prophetic gesture: He brought three Syrian Muslim families back to the Vatican with him on the plane. By this act, Francis is calling on European states, peoples and churches alike to respond in a truly human way, with solidarity, to this grave crisis.
In high school, I did not even know what a Jesuit was. One thing I did know: a fancy and expensive Jesuit school like Loyola Marymount University in California surely could not be for students like me. With its manicured lawns and breathtaking ocean views, I just knew students like me were not destined for life on the L.M.U. bluff. How could we ever afford it? As it turns out, I was wrong. Fortuitously, a mix of academic and need-based scholarships transformed L.M.U. from a “dream school” to “my school,” and the Jesuit education I would receive has transformed my life.

I spent my first day at Loyola Marymount away from the beautiful manicured lawns and breathtaking ocean views. Instead, I joined a small group of students in a program sponsored by the university’s Center for Service and Action. The Center immersed me in downtown Los Angeles, where I learned about social injustice and met some of the people fighting to make the world a better place. I sat in a tiny conference room in Boyle Heights, in what was then the headquarters for Homeboy Industries, an organization that helps formerly incarcerated young men and women reintegrate into society. I met a charismatic Jesuit priest named Greg Boyle, the founder of Homeboy. He encouraged me and the other freshmen in the group to imagine compassion as the answer to every question.

In that moment, I realized L.M.U. was absolutely for students like me. The L.M.U. I know is most distinctly found off campus, throughout Los Angeles in organizations like Homeboy Industries; or in Tijuana with programs like De Colores, a weekend immersion trip sponsored by L.M.U.; and in sacred places across the world where ordinary people do extraordinary work in the face of injustice and adversity.

In times of struggle, it is hard to follow the advice of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., to “trust in the slow work of God.” I am overwhelmed with emotion by the flood of migrants and refugees around the world who feel that their potential in their homelands has reached a ceiling—a ceiling they hope will transform into a floor their children can use as a foundation for a new life. Racial inequality eats away at the fabric of our society, a not-so-subtle reminder that there is work still to be done, despite what many want to believe.

When I was a student at L.M.U., a Jewish friend shared the story of a rabbi, Abraham Joshua Heschel, who described marching with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. as a moment when he “learned to pray with his feet.” Perhaps the pursuit of the magis is just that:
never ceasing to pray with our feet, while continually seeking to trust in the slow work of God.

Father Boyle said something else when I first met him that has guided the way I approach life to this day. Quoting the Book of Ecclesiastes (2:13), he reminded us that the light is always better than the darkness. There are seemingly countless problems in the world, but I am lucky to be surrounded by some of the brightest and most passionate students and communities, fighting on the margins to make the world a little more just, a little more humane.

Pope Francis’ leadership is an incredible inspiration in times like these. But I often wake up thanking God that I need not look only to Rome for such daring servant leadership. I am surrounded by it everyday because of so many ordinary people who have the audacity to fight for the dignity of every human being because they believe in something that is as radical as it is simple: The answer to the world’s most pressing questions starts with compassion.

FAITH IN FOCUS

Worth a Fig

Harvesting my children’s faith

BY BETH MELESKI

These days, when my family arrives at 9:30 a.m. Sunday Mass (usually fast-walking in just as our celebrant starts up the aisle), my husband and I can be relatively secure in the knowledge that we will make it through the service without incident. This was not always the case, and one Sunday morning, not long ago, those more capricious days were brought back to me.

The woman in front of my family was heavily pregnant with her second child. Her oldest was a lively and curious 2-year-old. The toddler colored quietly through the readings and snacked on impossibly tiny and uniformly cut pieces of fruit through the parable of the barren fig tree. During the collection she found her lovey—an item often given to provide a child with comfort—deep in the recesses of her mother’s purse and settled in for a cuddle. By the time of the consecration, however, she wanted only to tap dance on the pew as we knelted.

I watched as the mother made a face at her husband. I heard her exasperated whisper, “She’s being so bad today.” I stifled a smile as the little girl scooted out of their reach with a giggle. By the end of the Mass, the 2-year-old was frantic and her mother exhausted. I could relate. Once upon a time, I had two toddlers, just a year apart in age, so the look on that mother’s face and the slump in her shoulders were muscle memory to me.

I stopped the mother after Mass as she shrugged into her coat and collected the crayons scattered around her pew. The father already had led the little girl out, anxious for damage control.

She looked at me guardedly, probably steeling herself to be berated or criticized for her daughter’s behavior. “It’s worth it,” I said to her, “Bringing her to church each week. It’s worth it.”
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She apologized anyway, “She’s usually so much better. I don’t know what got into her today.” To start with, I thought, she’s 2. She has a 10-minute attention span, but has been asked to remain still and quiet for over an hour. Instead I responded, “She did great.”

As I told the mother to have a good week and turned to find my own brood, my youngest child raced past me on her way to play tag in the grass outside the church with her friends. I made a halfhearted effort to slow her down to a more dignified pace. But in truth, I was delighted that she felt comfortable enough in this place to let her hair down. She is not disrespectful, only joyful.

I watched as my other two, now teenagers, followed more slowly. They caught up with some friends and began talking and laughing just a bit too loudly to be appropriate. Again, I let it go, preferring their casual comfort to a caution that will make them less easy here. These are the children who dropped Goldfish crackers and Cheerios on the floor, who were carted out of the church screaming more times than I could count for reasons too numerous to name. The same children who, as potty-training preschoolers, were hurriedly rushed up the aisle when, invariably, they loudly insisted they had to use the bathroom just as the church plunged into silence.

I have been in the shoes of this mother many Sundays before. My husband and I have pacified with toys and rolled our eyes over their heads and hissed warnings and smiled encouragingly as responses and prayers grew from tentative and unfamiliar to confident and certain.

Over the years, and still today, we choose, time and again, to brace the wrath of children awakened too early on a weekend morning, in order that we might continue to attend Mass as a family. We prioritize religious education over sports, dance rehearsals and social events. We find ways, in our increasingly secular world, to work our faith into our lives; sharing parables and the stories of the saints as bedtime stories and stopping for evening prayers each night, a practice that reconnects us after a long day of going our separate ways. We rely on our “village” to help us set examples in words and deeds.

As I walked out of the church that morning, my phone vibrated. I squinted in the sunlight as I read the text message from a friend: “I just have to tell you how much I enjoyed watching your daughter belting out the responses in Mass today! So sweet!”

That was the payoff. I realized that after so many years and tears—theris and mine—my husband and I nurtured our children’s faith, helped to make our church feel like home and conveyed that the Mass had meaning. We persevered and powered through, using all the diversions and tactics at our disposal—toys, books, coloring, snacks, threats and bribes.

And when that failed, we acknowledged our blessed mess and apologized with a rueful laugh to the people worshiping behind us. I have offered doughnuts to these poor souls as compensation and said a prayer that our barren trees would someday flower.

I motioned to my husband on that morning and called the kids. As we headed to the car, my son sauntered up humming the Mass’ closing hymn. Close behind, his sister joined in, softly singing the refrain.

I breathed in the moment as the littlest one grabbed my hand. She said, “Hey Mom, know what? I wasn’t bored in church today.”

“Oh good, honey. Why do you think that is?”

“Well, Mass doesn’t seem so long when you know how to join in.”

Not all Sundays are like this. There are still Masses in which arms remain crossed and frowns never budge. There are Sundays when my husband and I must insert ourselves between feuding children. During these mornings I, like the owner of the fig tree, wonder if the fragile buds we are nurturing will continue to bear fruit.

But on that Sunday morning, I wiped away a tear and silently repeated the words I said to that mother: “It’s worth it.”
If sports fans draft fantasy teams of players, comic book fans likewise draft fantasy teams of creators. Favored characters may be paired with dream writers, or amazing writers might be paired with peerless illustrators.

And so it came to pass that Marvel Comics, in a fit of cultural awareness perhaps unequaled in contemporary comic book publishing, invited Ta-Nehisi Coates to write the newest series of Black Panther. Mr. Coates is an award-winning author of numerous books and articles on the intersection of race, culture and politics in contemporary America. T’Challa, the Black Panther, is the king of Wakanda, a fictional African nation that is simultaneously technologically advanced and wed to traditional cultural norms. This new project was announced last year, in the midst of an America struggling anew with questions related to race, society, violence and inequality. The announcement was greeted with great enthusiasm—and for good reason.

T’Challa has long been a fascinating character in the Marvel pantheon. He was created by Stan Lee and Jack Kirby in an issue of the Fantastic Four in 1966 (only a few months before the founding of the Black Panther Party). At the time, he was the only black comic book hero in a mainstream publication. Since his first appearance in print, he has headlined several standalone titles, with mixed commercial success, and has always remained a major player within the Marvel universe as a member of a group of characters known as the Illuminati.

Any story involving the Black Panther has to face the serious tensions inherent in the character. He is not a freelance superhero, nor is he responsible simply to a team, like the Avengers or the X-Men. Instead, he is the monarch of Wakanda, a sovereign country, and has to deal with domestic and international politics. That country, too, is riddled with tensions. Wakanda is recovering from invasion and war and is riven with various social, political and religious factions, within the royal family, between the elites and the working classes, and between the cults aligned with traditional national beliefs. It is portrayed as highly advanced technologically, dependent upon trade in the desirable mineral vibranium, a useful plot device in the Marvel universe. Coexisting with this technologically advanced utopia is a traditional culture built upon mystic and mythic notions of the nation and its people. Indeed, the Black Panther himself is a sort of manifestation of the nation; think Captain America but with a quasi-mystical overlay.

Through a Different Lens

Much of T’Challa’s story has been developed through the lens of white American creators. In his first few stories, T’Challa was essentially a plot device to allow white heroes and characters to question their own paradigms and privileges. In the early 1970s, his first turn as a starring character was in the unfortunately titled Jungle Action. Yet over time the character evolved from a mere caricature. In the late 1990s, Christopher James Priest (often credited simply as “Priest”) wrote a series starring T’Challa. Priest introduced or reinvigorated many aspects of the Black Panther mythos. He did not invent the Black Panther but gave him an identity independent of white heroes and teams; Priest developed the idea, for example, that T’Challa joined the Avengers only in...
order to evaluate them as a threat to Wakanda.

In the early 2000s, Reginald Hudlin likewise took the character in new directions, exploring what it would mean to be both king and superhero. This was the point at which T’Challa married the X-Man Storm, herself from Africa and long portrayed as a regal and even quasi-divine figure. Since then, although the Black Panther has not had his own series, he has remained at the forefront of the Marvel universe, holding leading roles in recent company-wide stories like *Avengers vs. X-Men* (2012), *Infinity* (2013) and last summer’s *Secret Wars*. And he has taken the lead of a team solving cosmic-level problems in the recently launched series *The Ultimates*.

What is fascinating about Mr. Coates taking on the character is only partially the novelty of having a mainstream black comic book character written by an African-American (or the novelty of having an African-American comic book creator at all), though that is important. Rather, it is because, in hiring Mr. Coates, Marvel has reached outside the box to bring in a creator who is invested in and engaged with the questions and tensions of race and society; Mr. Coates is arguably the most well-known voice within this conversation in the United States today. The decision to hire him shows that Marvel is truly interested in telling a meaningful and engaging story about the intersection of race, culture and politics.

In his own reflections on writing *Black Panther*, Mr. Coates states that the comic is, in some ways, an extension of some of the broader themes he has traditionally worked with: “In my work for *The Atlantic* I have, for some time, been asking a particular question: Can a society part with, and triumph over, the very plunder that made it possible. In *Black Panther*, there is a simpler question: Can a good man be a king, and would an advanced society tolerate a monarch?” Mr. Coates offers a different way to explore the deep questions of how we live in *Black Panther*. While a comic book is not a seminar on race relations or critical theory, the narrative becomes a lens through which readers can engage these questions. Readers can see how characters in Wakanda live out their daily struggles and try to engage these tensions in the real world.

To see a writer of Mr. Coates’s caliber involved with a superhero comic released by a flagship publisher is an amazing sight—but one that is becoming less so. Like many media, comic books in recent years have been criticized for their lack of diversity and for even pandering to the supposed “ideal” comic book reader—the straight, white, middle-class boy aged 15- to 25. Marvel, though, has pushed back in recent years, bringing minority and women characters and creators to the fore. Legacy characters like Spider-Man, Captain America and Thor have all seen minority and women characters take on greater roles in their stories. Female creators have successfully written for popular series like *Captain Marvel* or have created new ones like the very popular Kamala Khan, a Pakistani-American teenager who has become the new Ms. Marvel.

The story of Ta-Nehisi Coates and T’Challa of Wakanda becomes perhaps the most high-profile example of a publisher seeking not to take advantage of minority communities but rather to celebrate and truly represent them. Though the early reviews have been positive, it is too early to know if Mr. Coates’s run will be successful. Still, as part of developments that see popular media open to all voices and experiences of our society, and media unafraid to invite serious intellectuals to bridge the gap between theory and culture, we can already count the newest volume of *The Black Panther* a welcome and important contribution.

NATHANIEL ROMANO, S.J., is currently studying theology at the Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University in Berkeley, Calif.
LIKE so many of Pope Francis’ writings, homilies and interviews, there are many passages in the apostolic exhortation “The Joy of Love” that are well worth returning to frequently and considering for an extended period of time. The pope himself writes in the introduction, “I do not recommend a rushed reading of the text,” suggesting instead that the greatest benefit comes “if each part is read patiently and carefully” (No. 7). With the document weighing in at 325 paragraphs (79 more than “Laudato Si’”), I’m not sure there is any other way to approach this teaching than to take it slowly, contemplatively and prayerfully.

Though I feel as if I have only just begun to unpack for myself the multiple theological, spiritual and pastoral threads that are woven together to form this impressive text, I have been struck by one recurring theme that first appears early in the exhortation and undergirds the whole text. That is the emphasis on the importance of context in the lives of Christians.

To many modern people, the notion that one’s context, social location, circumstances in life and the like should matter when thinking about and discussing questions of morality and the practice of one’s faith may appear to be an obvious statement. However, as Pope Francis writes about marriage, “At times we have also proposed a far too abstract and almost artificial theological idea of marriage, far removed from the concrete situations and practical possibilities of real families” (No. 36). With a degree of candor unusual for church documents, “The Joy of Love” acknowledges the possibility that abstract and overly idealized depictions of how life “should look” has caused many individuals and families great difficulty and pain.

One is reminded of Jesus’ admonitions in the Gospels to religious leaders who place moral and juridical burdens on the shoulders of their people without making any effort to assist them in alleviating such obligations and unrealistic expectations (e.g., Mt 23:4). For too long this has been the modus operandi of many contemporary religious leaders, who have justified judgmental preaching, refusal of the sacraments and inadequate pastoral sensitivity under the perhaps well-intentioned but nevertheless misguided effort to show the “tough love” of justice. Of course, as Pope Francis has repeated throughout his pontificate, what has been lacking is the necessary mercy that reveals the compassionate face of God Christ revealed throughout the Gospels. And that mercy always took into account the context of the individual.

While the understandable focus of the exhortation is on the nuclear family and the sacrament of marriage, this recognition of the importance of context can and should be extended to other areas in the life of the church. Over the centuries, there are many ways that particular contexts—like Eurocentric thinking and experience—have been uncritically presented as universal realities and the abstract ideal for a global community. At best, this was a naïve and unintentional lack of awareness about diversity in all times and places. At worst, it was a form of cultural colonialism that conflated the experience of a few with the truth of the Gospel and led to the suppression of differences, traditions, languages, cultures and even whole populations. This is not only a phenomenon of the past but a dynamic that can at times be bolstered by the effects of globalization today.

In response, Pope Francis has shone a bright light on the teaching of the Second Vatican Council about the primacy of conscience and the importance of local discernment in response to particular moral questions about the family. This is a step in the right direction. But can we dare to imagine a fuller appreciation of context and particularity in other areas of life?

Take, for example, the potentially damaging effects of rigid gender identities. To say that a “woman” or a “man” acts, dresses, speaks, looks, thinks and feels X, Y or Z unrealistically and unfairly generalizes a single privileged abstraction over the multitude of lived realities. Women and men who do not conform to a narrow depiction of such an abstract ideal can be made to feel inadequate or somehow defective.

As the exhortation challenges us to consider the importance of context over abstraction in marriage and the family, we should likewise encourage a deeper appreciation for the lived realities of women and men in all aspects of life. This should be the starting point of all theological reflection and pastoral ministry, not some painfully unreal abstraction.
If you have ever found it tempting to eat dessert before the main course, then I would encourage you to indulge this streak and read the second part of this memoir first. For readers unfamiliar with the life and philosophy of Dietrich von Hildebrand, the profundity of his struggle, the manner of his Catholic thinking and the reason why the Nazi Gestapo might want to assassinate him, the short essays at the end of this memoir bring all of this into focus. Originally published in his Viennese journal *Der Christliche Ständestaat*, the essays warn 1930s Catholics not to be “morally blunted” by National Socialism, to stand up for the Jews and to take on anti-Nazism as a Catholic religious imperative. The dessert is delicious and sets up the main course extraordinarily well.

In the first part of this memoir we are introduced to von Hildebrand, whose life when read through the eyes of liberals or democrats might seem neither appealing nor all that interesting. He was born into Germany’s cultural aristocracy (his father was a famous German sculptor whose studio was in Italy). Although of military age, since he was recently married and a father, he avoided any whiff of grapeshot during World War I by serving as an assistant to a doctor in a Munich hospital. Both he and his wife Gretchen converted to Roman Catholicism during the first year of the war. He received his doctorate under Edmund Husserl at Göttingen in 1912. His wartime service permitted him time to publish his first book in 1916, and by 1924 he was an assistant professor in philosophy at the University of Munich.

There is nothing much proletarian about von Hildebrand. He dines with duchesses, hosts industrialists, lionizes clergy, longs for the return of the Hapsburgs and ingratiates himself with various German cultural and political elites. In our own age, when the plight of refugees is at the front of the public mind, we may strain to find deep sympathy with a person whose flight from danger in Germany entailed traveling by train to his family’s hillside villa in Florence. Von Hildebrand bemoans the fact that as a Florentine refugee he will no longer be able to have long lunches with the Spanish Infanta.

A son of privilege who had reached privileged status, von Hildebrand had every reason to go along to get along with the rising Nazi party. Many young academics found it easy to view Nazism as another form of nationalism. Not so for von Hildebrand, whose earliest reaction to Nazism was visceral.

As the memoir unfolds, even von Hildebrand’s wishful monarchism evaporates under the force of his philosophical personalism and extraordinary faith. Here is a philosopher pushed into anti-Nazism precisely by the power of his new philosophical view. If Camus is counted as the father of political *engagement*, then he should be seen as the stepchild of von Hildebrand, who pioneered the place of the philosopher as a public and political nemesis to Nazism.

Von Hildebrand viewed Nazism not simply as another form of collectivism, but rather as a worldview based in a materialism as equally destructive to the soul as Bolshevism.

For von Hildebrand, personalism meant that all humans were in some sense transcendent. Under the influence of Max Scheler (1874-1928), von Hildebrand now saw the human person as “the value of all values.” The materialist “what” of the person was superseded by the transcendental “who” of the person. This new equation, grounded in Husserl’s “essences,” and distilled by Scheler, gave von Hildebrand a new and prophetic freedom in pronouncing on Nazism.

For von Hildebrand, Nazism’s statist impulse denuded the soul of its transcendent meaning. It devalued humanity. The “value” of the person—whatever race, ethnicity or creed—was obliterated by sole identification with the state. This is what Achille Ratti, Pope Pius XI, called “stateolatry,” the idolatry of the state. The free exercise of religion and the exercise of conscience were anathema to Nazism, von Hildebrand argued, even if some Nazi politicians made piecemeal concessions. In its origins and in full flush, Nazism was intrinsically evil. “It would be better,” von Hildebrand concluded, “if it could be destroyed altogether.”
Incredibly, von Hildebrand was forming these conclusions as early as 1923, when he witnessed Hitler’s **putsch** in Munich. He was vocalizing them shortly after. For von Hildebrand, Nazism was not simply a carbuncle on the German body politic, it was the Antichrist. Hitler and his associates were simply “criminals.” With a double-thrust of the pen, von Hildebrand characterized the Nazi ethos and its public pomp as nothing more than “kitsch.” Von Hildebrand railed at Nazi anti-Semitism as not only inhumane, but un-Christian. He particularly singled out Catholics who either tried to reconcile with or make concessions to Nazism. These Catholics had become “infected” with National Socialism and were in desperate need of reconversion.

How could such a young philosophy professor become so intensely anti-Nazi so shortly after the birth of Nazism? The memoir moves us to consider how the new philosophy of personalism, combined with a vibrant life of prayer, made such protest possible. To the mind of this reviewer, von Hildebrand’s personalism acted as a unique impetus for protest because it was completely removed from the dominant Thomism and neo-Thomism of the day. Aquinas shackled his adherents to the obeisance of civilly constituted governments. (An exception here would be Jacques Maritain.) For Aquinas, civil government was “subordinated” to divine law and acted on a mandate only to approximate the divine order. Consequently, Aquinas did not compel the church to pass judgment on the style of a state, only on its relationship with the church.

Personalism cut through such distinctions, especially since the style of the state clearly showed intent to devalue human life. Thomists were left to wrestle with the fact that Hitler’s legal ascent to power left him as the “civilly constituted authority.” Von Hildebrand saw the Hitler govern-
As von Hildebrand began to indict liberal Catholics in the wake of “Humane Vitae,” many theological critics began to dismiss him as nothing more than an angry crank. Consequently, scholars began to gloss over, if not cast aside altogether, von Hildebrand’s earlier career as an anti-Nazi. By the 1970s his trenchant warnings against Hitler and Catholic anti-Semitism were in danger of being sidelined from the discussion altogether. This edited memoir is a long-overdue accomplishment that snatches back the complex story of one philosopher’s antifascism, and should be considered for placement on every Catholic bookshelf.

LEO D. LEFEBURE

HOW DIFFERENT?

JESUS AND BUDDHA
Friends in Conversation
By Paul Knitter and Roger Haight
Orbis Books. 304p $26.00

One of the great paradoxes of Buddhist-Christian relations is that Buddhist worldviews diverge so radically from Christian perspectives that in many ways it seems difficult to imagine any understanding at all between their respective adherents; yet many Christians, including myself, have found that engagement with the Buddhist tradition has strongly enriched their Christian practice. Mutual understanding is precarious: if a Christian assimilates Buddhist perspectives and practice too easily to familiar assumptions, one misses the otherness of the Buddhist tradition; if, on the other hand, one stresses the differences to the point that the two traditions are incommensurable, then no true communication appears possible, and no learning or enrichment will result. The relation is a gestalt that can be viewed in different ways, depending on whether one emphasizes the differences or the similarities.

In the middle of the 20th century, pioneers like Hugo Enomiya Lassalle, Thomas Merton and John S. Dunne crossed over to explore the resources of the Buddhist tradition and then returned home to the Catholic community enriched and transformed. They found positive resonances that changed their lives, but they also recognized that the Buddhist tradition differs profoundly from Christianity: Merton quipped that comparing Christianity and Zen Buddhism is rather like comparing math and tennis. Since that time, many Christians have explored Buddhist perspectives with appreciation. These explorations pose many questions for reflection. To what degree can a Christian coherently accept Buddhist views? Does it make sense for someone to claim to be both Buddhist and Christian? While a number of Christians describe themselves as practitioners of both Buddhism and Christianity, some critics, both Buddhist and Christian, have been skeptical. The Dalai Lama has compared the attempt to practice both Buddhism and Christianity to putting a yak’s head on a sheep’s body.

In this volume Paul Knitter and Roger Haight, S.J., explore this challenge in a series of engaging conversations with each other. They strongly endorse the project of Christians learning from Buddhists in the present climate, which they describe as marked by individualism, injustice and violence but also by an emerging corporate consciousness that is open to appreciating
religious diversity in pursuit of compassion, justice and peace. Each chapter in this volume unfolds as a dialogue, with a Christian perspective from Haight, a Buddhist perspective from Knitter, mutual responses and finally a joint statement, “It Seems to Us.” On the one hand, they stress the importance of strong borders to guarantee identity; on the other hand, they call for flexible borders to permit passing over and coming back.

The main interest of Haight and Knitter is not in theoretical issues but in spiritual practice, including both the practice of meditation and the engaged practice of transforming the world to relieve suffering. Their main interest in bringing the teachings of Jesus and the Buddha into dialogue is to guide life in the present world of massive inequity amid the threat of ecological catastrophe. On this level they give us many helpful insights and much to ponder on our journey.

These ventures start from a particular vantage point, and the discussions of Knitter and Haight reflect their own origins within the U.S. Catholic theological community of the middle and late 20th century. Haight writes as an experienced Catholic systematic theologian, drawing on the theological language of his tradition to interpret and respond to Buddhism and illuminate the relationship. At times Haight may assimilate Buddhist perspectives a bit too easily to Christian views, as when he describes the Spirit of God as “the Christian Buddha-nature,” or when he compares the Buddhist relationship between emptiness and form to Augustine's theology of cooperative grace, or when he describes the Mahayana Buddhist view of absolute truth as “critical and metaphysical.” While these types of comparisons can be thought-provoking, it is not clear that they fully recognize and respect the stark otherness of Buddhist worldviews.

One of Paul Knitter’s earlier books bore the bold title: Without Buddha I Could Not Be a Christian. Knitter’s vantage point in the new volume is playful and paradoxical, for he describes himself as both a Christian and a Buddhist, employing the Christological language of the Council of Chalcedon to suggest that the two practices are united in him, remaining truly different but
becoming one without being confused or changed. Whether the Buddhist and Christian practices are indeed not changed in this experimental union may be open to question. In this volume Knitter writes usually as a Buddhist; but occasionally he shifts voice, commenting from a Christian vantage point. For example, in the middle of offering a Buddhist perspective, Knitter abruptly warns that “the danger is that we Christians....”

Haight and Knitter often pair the Buddhist term “Emptiness” with the Christian term “God” as analogous expressions for ineffable ultimate reality, which is described as both transcendent and immanent. Knitter views “Emptiness or God” through the lens of process theology: “Emptiness or God ‘depends’ on form or creatures, not for its existence, but for its activity.” While there is no one Buddhist understanding of Emptiness, most Buddhists would not view Emptiness as an alternate term for what Christians mean by God, and most would have questions about Knitter’s formulation.

Haight and Knitter challenge humans to realize “their connectedness to the power of creative Emptiness,” and they speak of functional analogies between emptiness and Jesus’ proclamation of the rule of God. This strategy risks domesticating the differences between Christian understandings of the transcendent God who creates the universe and Buddhist interpretations of emptiness, which is not a transcendent creator.

Because Haight and Knitter repeatedly describe the Buddhist perspectives as complementary and functionally analogous to Christian perspectives, one may question whether the otherness of the two traditions receives sufficient recognition and consideration. Nonetheless, this is a welcome and stimulating invitation to explore an important relationship.

LEO D. LEFEBURE teaches theology at Georgetown University.
Continuing Education

PENTECOST (C), MAY 15, 2016

Readings: Acts 2:1-11; Ps 104:1-34; Rom 8:8-17; Jn 14:23-26

“The Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything” (Jn 14:26)

If you have a teacher, you are a student and you have things to learn. There are, naturally, students who believe they know it all or, even if they do not, are not compelled to learn anything else. They are comfortable with what they know. Some students, too, are simply bored and uninterested. Whether they know a little or a lot, they are not inspired to put in the work to learn something new. These issues are cast into an interesting light when we recognize that one of the roles of the Holy Spirit is that of teacher.

In the farewell discourse in the Gospel of John, Jesus teaches his apostles to keep his “word,” reminding them that “those who love me will keep my word, and my Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them.” But as we are often reminded in John’s Gospel, not everything was clear to the disciples while Jesus was with them. In Jn 2:18-22, Jesus speaks of the destruction of the Temple, claiming that if it is razed to the ground, he will raise it up in three days. The redactor tells us that Jesus was speaking of his body, reminding them that “after he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this.” As with any students, Jesus’ disciples could forget things, not remember them to begin with or misunderstand the implications of his teaching until much later.

As a result, Jesus tells his apostles in John that “I have said these things to you while I am still with you. But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach (didaxei) you everything, and remind (hypomnēsei) you of all that I have said to you.” One of the roles of the Holy Spirit is the continuing education of the disciples of Jesus, but the Holy Spirit is not simply a substitute teacher. While still helping the disciples remember “all” that Jesus said to them, the Advocate teaches “everything.” The teaching role of the Holy Spirit includes Jesus’ previous words, but it also encompasses new lessons.

Beyond these generalities, though, what exactly do we need to learn and what exactly does the Holy Spirit teach? The scene at Pentecost gives us a clue as to the newness and boldness of the teaching of the Spirit, which cannot simply be relegated to remembering a list of things, like the rote memorization of letters. While the Holy Spirit brought to Pentecost the ability “to speak in other languages,” it would soon become clear it was not a language institute the church was building but a body of believers meant to include every nation on earth. The church’s universality was symbolized by the action of the Holy Spirit among Jewish followers of Jesus speaking numerous foreign languages and, later, by the outpouring of the Spirit among the Gentiles (Acts 10).

As we learn in Acts 11 and 15, the new lessons of the Holy Spirit, taught through the presence of the same Spirit moving through Gentile believers, shocked many of the Jewish believers. Some were unwilling to accept that God was working among people considered beyond the covenant relationship apart from circumcision and the Torah. The work of the Holy Spirit, therefore, had to be discussed, debated and argued before the church ultimately made a formal decision to verify the work of the Spirit among the Gentiles.

Learning is an ongoing process between teacher and students. The Spirit, sent to guide us, did not stop teaching at Pentecost, but we must also be receptive to learn. Paul tells the Romans that “the Spirit of God dwells in you,” a reality that still imbues each of us and orients us to the ways of God and away from the “flesh,” those things that are opposed to God. But this means that each of us, with the whole church, needs to be attentive to what the Holy Spirit dwelling in us is still teaching us today. Our education did not stop with Jesus’ ascension but continued with the giving of the Holy Spirit, our teacher.

JOHN W. MARTENS
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