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I. INTRODUCTION

My reflections today center on the interplay between the liberal arts and the professions. The dialogue between Martha and Jesus in Chapter 10 of Luke’s Gospel captures the essence of this relationship between labor and leisure. Mary sits at Jesus’s feet, attentively listening to him, while Martha serves the guests: “Martha, burdened with much serving, came to [Jesus] and said, ‘Lord, do you not care that my sister has left me by myself to do the serving? Tell her to help me.’” Jesus replied, “Martha, Martha, you are anxious and worried about many things. There is need of only one thing. Mary has chosen the better part and it will not be taken from her.”

Reflecting on this passage in his Angelus message on July 18, 2010, Pope Benedict XVI said that this Gospel passage “recalls the fact that the human person must indeed work and be involved in domestic and professional occupations, but first and foremost needs God, who is the inner light of Love and Truth. . . . And who, if not Jesus Christ, gives us Love and Truth?” Robert Cardinal Sarah expands on this theme: “Jesus rebukes Martha, not for being busy in the kitchen—after all, she did have to prepare the meal—but for her inattentive interior attitude, betrayed by her annoyance with her sister. . . . Jesus seems to sketch the outlines of a spiritual pedagogy: we should always make sure to be Mary before becoming

2. Id. at 10:41–42.
Martha." Without this, “we run the risk of becoming literally bogged down in activism and agitation.”

Ora et Labora—pray and work—are both vital for this life. Work is important for two vital reasons. First, most of us need to work to sustain ourselves and our families. More importantly, God is a Creator, and we are given the task to work with God as co-creators. But we must put first things first. As the Gospel says, “seek first the kingdom [of God] and his righteousness and all these things will be given you besides.”

What can this seeming tension between the contemplative and the active, the spiritual and the material, mean for higher education generally and professional education specifically? Cardinal Newman lecturing in the 1850s, Josef Pieper lecturing in the 1950s, and Alasdair MacIntyre writing and teaching in our own day suggest an answer for the Catholic University. Each of them was responding to powerful forces pushing the university toward the practical end of preparing future laborers for their important but narrow professional labor.

None of these three preeminent scholars would suggest that a Catholic University should focus solely on the liberal arts, or what we might also call the liberating arts. Saint John Paul II agrees:

Students are challenged to pursue an education that combines excellence in humanistic and cultural development with specialized professional training. Most especially, they are challenged to continue the search for truth and for meaning throughout their lives, since the human spirit must be cultivated in such a way that there results a growth in its ability to wonder, to understand, to contemplate, to make personal judgments, and to develop a religious, moral, and social sense.


5. Id. at 28.

6. See Pope John Paul II, Centesimus Annus § 6 (May 1, 1991) (quoting Pope Leo XIII, Rerum Novarum § 44), http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jpii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus.html (“Pope Leo XIII affirmed the fundamental rights of workers. Indeed, the key to reading the Encyclical [Rerum Novarum] is the dignity of the worker as such, and, for the same reason, the dignity of work, which is defined as follows: “to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the various purposes of life, and first of all for self-preservation”) (emphasis added).

7. See Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church ¶ 256 (2004) (“Work is part of the original state of man and precedes his fall; it is therefore not a punishment or curse.”) (emphasis omitted).


10. See generally Josef Pieper, Leisure the Basis of Culture (Alexander Dru trans., 1952).

11. See generally Alasdair MacIntyre, God, Philosophy, Universities (2009).

Very few students can afford to leave the world of work for four years without some practical training in a specific discipline. Most of us must, and all of us should, participate in labora—what Pieper calls the servile arts,\(^{13}\) or what might be better called the serving arts. And for those serving arts requiring a college degree, a university deeply enmeshed in its Catholic identity is a particularly good place to receive such practical training for reasons I’ll suggest below.

II. BACKGROUND ON CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Before sharing my vision for a rich Catholic education, I’ll tell two stories from my nearly three decades of teaching law that deeply inform my judgment regarding the importance of Catholic education done well.

A. Students No Longer Ask “Why”

The first story comes from my time teaching students Constitutional Law at the University of Oklahoma. Early in the semester, we would read and discuss \textit{Dred Scott v. Sandford}, the 1857 U.S. Supreme Court case that constitutionalized slavery.\(^{14}\) I would ask my students whether slavery was wrong in every place and time; nearly every student answered affirmatively.\(^{15}\) I would then ask, why is slavery wrong? Students struggled to answer. The most popular answer was an emotional answer born of self-preservation: if I could own you then you could own me. I responded saying that such an argument was derived by fear or cowardice—not universal moral principles. Over the years, few students ever made any argument approaching a natural law argument. Alternatively, at least one student usually offered a religious argument against slavery, which was usually followed by derisions and snickers; a few students would argue that religion should not enter into the discussion, especially at a public university.

From this annual exercise, I concluded that my students were trained that slavery is wrong in the same way that I trained my dog to sit: they hear the command “slavery” and respond with the proper reaction, “no.” By and large, however, the students had not learned why slavery is wrong.\(^{16}\) They had not learned what or who the human person is. With religion relegated to campus ministries on the margins of most campuses, and with natural law

\(^{13}\) Pieper, supra note 10, at 27–28.

\(^{14}\) 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1857).

\(^{15}\) A few students would change their answers when I pointed out that this stance prevented them from claiming later that they were moral relativists.

\(^{16}\) Cf., C.S. Lewis, \textit{The Abolition of Man} 23 (2001) (“Where the old [system of education rooted in natural law] initiated, the new merely ‘conditions.’ The old dealt with its pupils as grown birds deal with young birds when they teach them to fly; the new deals with them more as the poultry-keeper deals with young birds – making them thus or thus for purposes of which the birds know nothing. In a word, the old was a kind of propagation – men transmitting manhood to men; the new is merely propaganda.”).
either ignored or derided as a cheap trick by religionists to smuggle their theology into philosophy, the students lacked not only an adequate anthropology, but they lacked any coherent anthropology. What is worse, they were unaware of this deficiency in their education. Like the school boys studying from Gaius and Titius’s *Green Book* in C.S. Lewis’s *The Abolition of Man*, they have received a relativistic education not as a theory, “but an assumption, which ten years hence, its origin forgotten and its presence unconscious, will condition him to take one side in a controversy which he has never recognized as a controversy at all.”  

### B. Students Live Disintegrated Lives

The other story comes from my ethics class, which is a required course in every law school in the country. Each semester, I would show the students a clip from the pilot episode of the 1980s lawyer show, *L.A. Law*. In this segment, criminal defense attorney Michael Kuzak represents a trust-fund kid accused, along with two other thugs, of raping a dying woman. The attorneys decide to defend their clients by turning the tables on the victim and alleging consent in a demeaning and badgering fashion, hoping the woman quits or dies before a trial is concluded. Kuzak goes along with this scheme although he is visibly uncomfortable with it.

I have surveyed more than 1,000 students over the years and around half argue that zealous advocacy required this type of defense. One such student said that, although he would feel bad, to do so would be his job, and he’d just have to live with it. I asked him how he’d “live with it,” and he replied, “I’d go home and drink.” This poignant moment provided me with an opportunity to underscore the metanarrative of the class—a happy, healthy lawyer is one who practices law in harmony with her core beliefs. I replied by stating the obvious: if you have to drink in the evening because of what you did during the day, there is a problem.

17. *Id.* at 5.
19. The comments to the Model Rules of Professional Conduct suggest that zealous advocacy does not require this tactic:

> [a] lawyer must also act with commitment and dedication to the interests of the client and with zeal in advocacy upon the client’s behalf. A lawyer is not bound, however, to press for every advantage that might be realized for a client. . . . The lawyer’s duty to act with reasonable diligence does not require the use of offensive tactics or preclude the treating of all persons involved in the legal process with courtesy and respect.

*MODEL RULES OF PROF’L CONDUCT r. 1.3 cmt. 1 (A.M. BAR ASS’N 2016).*

20. The Model Rules of Professional Conduct anticipate difficult choices by lawyers:

> [v]irtually all difficult ethical problems arise from conflict between a lawyer’s responsibilities to clients, to the legal system and to the lawyer’s own interest in remaining an ethical person while earning a satisfactory living. The Rules of Professional Conduct often prescribe terms for resolving such conflicts. Within the framework of these Rules, however, many difficult issues of professional discretion can arise. Such issues must be resolved through the exercise of sensitive professional and moral judgment guided by the basic principles underlying the Rules.

*Id.* at PREAMBLE & SCOPE ¶ 9.
Kuzak and the students who would follow his lead are living dis-integrated lives. Kuzak treated his not-so-loveable client as an object—a means to a healthy income—and not as a moral subject. He treated himself as an object—a mere instrument of the law no different than a search warrant—and not as a subject engaged in a profession fraught with moral questions.21 Finally, he treated the rape victim as an object to be manipulated in a game of advocacy and not as a moral subject entitled to respect even by her adversaries.22

My conclusion from these experiences is that these highly trained students—all have at least a bachelor’s degree—are ill-prepared to be community leaders grappling with the most difficult moral issues of the day and, more importantly, ill prepared to live integrated lives in the face of challenges that will arise in the course of everyday life.23 They had not yet been awakened to wonder about themselves and their surroundings.24 Their formal education had not provided a framework for consciously asking, much less answering, “the fundamental questions which pervade human life: Who am I? Where have I come from and where am I going? Why is there evil? What is there after this life?”25 As Saint John Paul recognizes:

These are the questions which we find in the sacred writings of Israel, as also in the Veda and the Avesta; we find them in the writings of Confucius and Lao-Tze, and in the preaching of Tirthankara and Buddha; they appear in the poetry of Homer and in the tragedies of Euripides and Sophocles, as they do in the philosophical writings of Plato and Aristotle. They are questions which have their common source in the quest for meaning which has always compelled the human heart. In fact, the answer given to these questions decides the direction which people seek to give to their lives.26

21. See THOMAS L. SHAFFER & ROBERT F. COCHRAN, JR., LAWYERS, CLIENTS, AND MORAL RESPONSIBILITY 1 (2d ed. 2009) (“Law office conversations are almost always moral conversations. This is so because they involve law, and the law is a claim that people make on one another. The moral content is often implicit, but it is always there. Legal claims rest on normative considerations as well as objective rules. And when clients or their lawyers take advantage of the rules, they have decided that they ought to take advantage. They might have decided that they ought not to. If it is possible for a serious conversation between a lawyer and a client in a law office to be without moral content, we cannot think of an example.”).

22. Id.

23. See Newman, supra note 9, at 123 (“[A] man who has been trained to think upon one subject or for one subject only, will never be a good judge even of that one: whereas the enlargement of his circle gives him increased knowledge and power in a rapidly increasing ratio. . . . Judgment lives as it were by comparisons and discrimination.”).


26. Id.
These are precisely the questions that the typical American university qua university cannot offer an answer, so the questions go unasked.

Why do life’s existential questions go unasked at the typical American university? The organization, curricula, and pedagogy of a university are necessarily built upon assumptions—often unstated—about the nature of the human person. And most American universities, including many Catholic universities, operate, as Alasdair MacIntyre observed, from a “practical atheism,” which renders “their secular curriculum Godless.” The Godlessness is “not just a matter of the subtraction of God from the range of objects studied, but also and quite as much the absence of any integrated and overall view of things.” These universities are perhaps better called multiversities because “each academic discipline is treated as autonomous and self-defining, so that its practitioners . . . prescribe to those entering the discipline what its scope and limits are. And in order to excel in any one particular discipline, one need in general know little or nothing about any of the others.” And the individuals—both faculty and students—inhabiting these universities are similarly seen as autonomous and self-defining sovereign self-choosers, “colleagues” only in a very loose sense as governed by the Faculty Handbook.

III. THE MODERN UNIVERSITY

The main building of my alma mater, the University of Texas, has Jesus’s words, “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free,” inscribed prominently on it. Perhaps a more fitting inscription for today’s typical American university is Pilate’s words: “What is truth?” All in all, the contemporary American university, precisely because it lacks

---

27. See MACINTYRE, supra note 11, at 15 (Universities’ “forms of organization, their curricula, their modes of teaching presuppose answers to questions that are central to the projects of theistic philosophical inquiry, questions about the relationships of philosophy both to theology and the whole range of secular academic disciplines.”).

28. Id. at 17 (“[B]y either eliminating mention of God from the curriculum altogether (departments of religious studies concern themselves with various types of belief in God, not with God), or by restricting reference to God to departments of theology, such universities render their secular curriculum Godless.”).

29. Id.

30. Id. at 15–16.

31. Id. at 16. (“Consider by contrast the Marxist universities of the Soviet Union or of Communist Eastern Europe between 1917 and 1991. . . . They were of course atheistic and anti-theistic universities, but their atheism was not something merely negative, a denial of God’s existence. It was a consequence of the dialectical and historical materialist understanding of the nature of things that provided them with a framework within each of the academic disciplines could find its due place. So physics, history, and economics were all taught in a way that made their mutual relevance clear, and Marxist philosophy was assigned the tasks both of spelling out this relevance in contemporary terms and of explaining how philosophies of the past had failed . . . .”).


a thick understanding of what it means to be human, lacks the resources necessary to equip its students with the tools for critically analyzing the deep moral questions of the day or developing a framework for living an integrated life.

A. *The Catholic University*

What about a Catholic university’s understanding of what it means to be human? Does it possess the resources to address these most important questions? “Theism,” MacIntyre notes, “is not just a set of doctrines about God. It concerns the nature of the natural and social universe as created and sustained by God, as embodying his purposes. For theists understanding how things are is inseparable from understanding them as informed by God’s purposes.” Therefore, “any study of physics or history or political science or psychology that omits all reference to God will be importantly incomplete.”

The curriculum of a university that takes God seriously is radically different from today’s university. Such a university “would have to presuppose an underlying unity to the universe and therefore an underlying unity to the enquiries of each discipline into the various aspects of the natural and the social. Over and above the questions posed in each of these distinct disciplinary enquiries—the questions of the physicist or the biologist or the historian or the economist—there would be questions about what bearing each of them has on the others and how each contributes to an overall understanding of the nature of things” so that we are equipping people to take their place in building God’s kingdom right here and now. “Theology would be taught for its own sake and as a key to that overall understanding. And it would be the central task of philosophy in such a university to enquire into the nature of the relationship between theology and the secular disciplines.”

Educating the whole person requires formation not only in the classroom, but in the cafeteria, on the ball field, in the dorm, and in the chapel. Every single person employed by the university must see themselves as contributing to its students’ understanding of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness: the groundskeepers contribute to beauty; the coaches instill goodness when they model and teach discipline, teamwork, and healthy competition; and residence hall staff facilitate an understanding of the truth about the human person living in close community through their programming and, when

---

34. MacIntyre, supra note 11, at 15.
35. Id.; see also Newman, supra note 9, at 57 (“Religious Truth is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge. To blot it out is nothing short, if I may so speak, of unravelling the web of University Teaching.”).
36. MacIntyre, supra note 11, at 15.
37. Id. at 17.
needed, discipline. To fruitfully form students, the center of university life must be the rhythm of the Divine Office, culminating in the Eucharistic Feast. In these ways, a Catholic campus culture—inside and outside the classroom—has much more potential to form authentic Christians than an isolated Newman Center located on the outskirts of campus.

B. The Secular University

An education that forms the entire human person with unity of life is desperately needed today. Today’s general education requirements consist of a hodgepodge of courses; the requirements are usually the result of political compromise and thus create an education that is isolated and fragmented. My own experience confirms as much: looking back at my college education, I have no idea how taking lower-division astronomy or sociology has contributed to my life as a person, husband, father, citizen, lawyer, or professor of law. They were merely boxes to check on the way to a particular end—a bachelor’s degree. And my nearly thirty years as an academic leads me to strongly suspect that the Astronomy professor and the Sociology professor failed to see any connection between their two disciplines.

Typical universities state, and maybe even believe, that “[t]hese classes will equip you with a broad range of tools that can be used to approach problems in everyday life and work, and, ultimately, help you make a positive difference within communities, society, and the world.” But do they? Can they? Will taking a biology class from a professor whose unstated first principles emanate from either an atheistic materialism (likely) or a seven-day-young earth creationism (extremely unlikely); a literature class from a professor whose unstated first principles emanate from either a radical feminism (likely) or an orthodox Christianity (unlikely); and a history class from a professor whose unstated first principles emanate from either Marxism (likely) or distributivism (unlikely) equip students “with a broad range of tools. . .to approach problems in everyday life and work,” helping them become better citizens in their communities and the world?

My answer is a resounding “no” for several reasons. First, because each professor’s worldview is unstated, they will enter the students’ minds as assumptions to be accepted and not as theories to be wrestled with critically. Second, in contrast to the core of a Marxist or a Catholic education, these courses fail to provide students with any thick coherent proposal as to how to answer the students’ most pressing questions about purpose and


meaning in life. Without a foundation, there cannot be a hypothesis about what kind of life is "better" or what kind of contribution to family and society is "positive."

Third, the professors operate in small technical silos across academic disciplines and often within one’s own field, further fracturing the educational core. No coherence exists across the curriculum. Interdisciplinary work, which is in fashion, involves important but limited utilitarian cooperation of two or more disciplines, but mostly without philosophical reflection of how they are related. Fourth, general education at most universities is divorced from life lived outside the classroom. Students attend a three-hour class twice a week for seventy-five minutes each, or three times a week for fifty minutes each. Students will see the professor or teaching assistant outside of the class only if they seek an audience with the professor during office hours. Most of a student’s life is lived outside of the academic world, in Greek life, dorm life, or apartment life, worlds apart—physically and intellectually—from the academic center of campus. Programming by Student Life will focus on such diverse activities as doing good and stimulating already raging hormones. The typical university does not tie these activities back to its academic core or suggest how these activities lead to the authentic good of the individual or of society.

IV. THE CATHOLIC RESPONSE

A Catholic liberal arts foundation, on the other hand, which is reinforced seamlessly throughout the curriculum and co-curriculum, develops habits of mind that liberate our students from narrow technical training and habits of flesh that liberate our students from unbridled passion. On a practical level, this provides alumni with great vertical and horizontal job mobility. Graduates of a Catholic university with a strong liberal arts foundation will be dependable and responsible employees possessing a strong work ethic because they will view the job as more than a means to a financial end, which it certainly is, but also as meaningful participation as co-creators in God’s creation. With a strong theological and philosophical foundation further awakened in their imaginations through a love of literature, they will act with integrity. And, given the breadth of their education, they will readily adapt to new crises, opportunities, and situations. At a deeper level, a Catholic liberal arts foundation provides students with a framework for being liberated from the fears and base appetites that control


41. See, e.g., Anthony Gockowski, UT Sex Week to Feature Porn Star Under Guise of ‘Sex Educator’, CAMPUS REFORM (Mar. 31, 2016), https://www.campusreform.org/?ID=7434 (referencing “Sex Week” at the University of Tennessee where porn Star, “Sophia St. James will give two lectures, one on anal sex and one on oral sex.”).
the lives of so many, allowing them to live a joy-filled life in service to others.  
How can a Catholic university realize this much needed vocation? It begins with strong leadership. The president must possess the vision for the university and model the desired virtues by her life on and off campus. In an existing university, the president must not be afraid to be disliked because there will be strong forces—especially among the faculty and its misguided concept of faculty governance—that will resist the shift in culture.

The faculty will resist a change in culture for many reasons. First, change itself, in whatever direction, can be unsettling and even threatening for faculty members. Second, to return to a coherent curriculum, where theology and philosophy have their proper and privileged place, will require the faculty to break down academic silos and embrace humility—a rare virtue in academia—as they come to share in a common enterprise. Even those who embrace the Catholic liberal arts vision will have difficulty accepting a more cooperative posture, which in an ironic way, may make collegiality more difficult, at least in the short term, as faculty collegiality moves from a negotiated peace to an embrace of a common enterprise. Finally, the existing university most likely did not hire for a mission centered on developing the whole person (despite statements to the contrary) through a robust Catholic liberal arts education. And many faculty members will resist this transformation on grounds that it restricts their academic freedom while imposing an excessively rigid and narrow understanding of Catholic and liberal arts. Successful culture transformation will require a strong president who acts, with the unwavering support of the Board of Directors, to transition the faculty from an individual-centric understanding of academic freedom to an understanding of an institution’s academic freedom to be authentically and completely a Catholic university with a liberal arts foundation.

Extant faculty and staff must be invited into this robust mission and given the tools to excel. Those who reject the mission explicitly or implicitly, including those who have tenure, must be treated with respect yet encouraged to explore opportunities elsewhere over the next couple of years, since it is clear that they will not be happy in the new environment and will only serve to hinder the advancement of the new mission.

New hires must fit the new mission of the university, which can be difficult to achieve for two reasons. First, faculty hiring traditionally is faculty-driven at the departmental level. If the faculty either fails to understand the mission or rejects the mission, they will unintentionally or intentionally subvert the goal of hiring to create a robust Catholic liberal arts foundation. Therefore, especially in the early years of the transition, the president and her like-minded provost must actively participate in hiring,
including drafting the job descriptions that highlight the university’s mission and vision, and expect the potential faculty member to fit within that framework. To ensure new faculty buy-in, all applicants for faculty positions should be required to write an essay detailing how they fit within the mission. Although it cuts against the grain in academia, the president and provost should be the first to review the applications and filter out those candidates deemed not suitable for the mission. After this filtering, the departments ought to be free to interview and recommend candidates for hire. The second problem is one of supply. Because most PhDs, even those who are Catholic and attended a Catholic university, are educated without the benefit of an integrated Catholic liberal arts foundation, there are few candidates who understand the mission, even if they are open to it.43

The key to success of this enterprise does not reside in Theology or Philosophy; it resides in the other disciplines. Strong faculty in math, history, literature, economics, accounting, psychology, education, nursing, etc., who understand the unity of knowledge, will privilege places of theology and philosophy within this structure. Who or what does the business enterprise serve? Can math, with its order, tell us anything about God, His universe, or the infinite? What can history, literature, and psychology tell us about the drama of human life and the struggle between good and evil in the heart and society? For those going into elementary and secondary education, what or who will they be teaching and toward what end? Does the nurse stand on holy ground when standing at the bedside of a patient?

Theology and philosophy provide the foundation, but most students cannot afford four years of leisure to explore the fundamental questions of life. They need a framework for responding to these questions, but they also need the practical skills necessary for gainful employment. A great Catholic university will coherently and seamlessly blend the best of leisure and labor.

V. Conclusion

Like Mary, a Catholic university will sit at the feet of Jesus absorbing the great Catholic liberal arts tradition, which liberates our minds, souls, and bodies, freeing us to take up our work with joy in service to our sisters and brothers. In this way, a Catholic university follows in the great Benedictine tradition. Saint Gregory the Great once said that Saint Benedict was a luminous star in the dark world that followed the collapse of the Roman Empire.44

---

43. One way to solve this problem is for serious Catholic universities to come together and offer a multi-day boot camp for PhD candidates who have the desire to teach in this environment but who lack the knowledge.

The ultimate goal of Catholic education (including higher education) is not to make good citizens, efficient business people, or competent professionals. The real goal, the ultimate goal, of Catholic education is to make saints. We have an Oklahoma model to guide us in this holy work. He wasn’t the smartest student in his class, having flunked out of his first seminary for his inability to master Latin. Blessed Stanley Rother was beatified in Oklahoma City on September 23, 2017, the first American-born martyr and the first American-born male to be beatified. He exemplifies what we should aim for in Catholic higher education; he daily practiced the gift of presence with those he encountered in both Oklahoma and Guatemala. By all accounts, he was excellent in his chosen profession—his vocation—in the professional arts, serving as pastor, serving as catechist to catechists, and ensuring that the Gospels were translated into his people’s native Tz’utujil language. He also excelled at the practical arts, farming alongside his flock. And he could do all this, including returning to his people in Guatemala knowing that he would likely be killed, because he had, through God’s grace, overcome fear, even fear of death. Only someone truly free can live—and die—like this. Giving oneself totally to our Creator is the key to this life, not education. Education, however, can aid or hinder this development. A secularized education with its incoherence disorients the student. An authentically Catholic liberal arts education will orient the student toward a good and holy life.

Reflecting on the Martha and Mary story, Pope Benedict XVI said: “Without love, even the most important activities lose their value and give no joy. Without a profound meaning, all our activities are reduced to sterile and unorganised activism.” Fr. Stanley Rother loved with a deep-abiding joy despite difficult circumstances. May he be a model of servant leadership for all of us who work at Catholic universities and for all of our students who will go forth to spread the Good News in whatever communities and professions God draws them.


47. See Michael A. Scaperlanda, Producing Trousered Apes in Dwyer’s Totalitarian State, 7 TEX. REV. L. & POL. 175, 208–09 (2002) (“The student will yearn from the depth of her being for some stability, along with meaning and coherence. Her deepest longings elude her when, instead of a hypothesis of meaning drawing from the deep wellsprings of her family’s culture . . . she is exposed to multiple forms of meaning and ways of life and told that her task will be to find the one that suits her best. She is told to engage in critical thinking and analysis, but is given no first principles from which to reason. She is told to live out her desires and preferences, but she is given no criteria for judging between conflicting desires, no yardstick to measure when desire should give way to duty.”) (emphasis added) (footnote omitted).