A School of Friendship and Wisdom: The Catholic University as the Space of Global Resistance to Globalization

Kevin L. Hughes

Globalization is a deeply ambivalent phenomenon, involving both widened horizons of understanding and the commodification of natural and human resources. The Catholic university's engagement with our new global situation needs to keep this ambivalence very much in mind. We should remember and renew our sense of ourselves as standing within an institution, the Catholic Church, that is one of the few truly multicultural global institutions on the planet, with a long history of both success and failure in global exchange. In this way, we may have resources to "think globally" in alternative ways that opt out of or resist the commodification of global interest. This essay will use Matteo Ricci as a model and attempt to distinguish analogically between those modes of global engagement that emerge from and then renew the deep roots of our own identity and those modes that deracinate.

Our task for the last gathering of this "class" of the Boston College Roundtable is to reflect on, variously, "the role of the academy in the world" or "the global impact of Catholic higher education." I want to take advantage of my ignorance here—I find it difficult to think in a programmatic way about our role in the midst of these complex, interlocking, and often conflicting forms of commerce and exchange that we group under the heading "globalization." I'd like to use my own inadequacy to the task as an opportunity to do what I can—to name some of the threats and opportunities that we encounter as we are drawn, ever-more-inexorably, into these various networks of global

Kevin L. Hughes *is an associate professor of theology and religious studies and chair of both the Humanities department and Classical Studies program at Villanova University. His research specialties are in ancient and medieval Christian theology, spirituality, and history. Among his books are* Augustine and Liberal Education; Constructing Antichrist; *and* Church History: Faith Handed On. *His articles have appeared in journals such as* Modern Theology; The Heythrop Journal; Theological Studies; *and* Franciscan Studies.

relationship. And I do mean "threats *and opportunities.*" While I do think there is reason for concern, I am firmly convinced that our new global horizon holds new opportunities both to deepen and widen our collective seeking out of the *universitas*, the whole of everything, so I do not intend this as a jeremiad, by any stretch. Rather, I hope to issue counsel of the ways in which we may be "as wise as serpents, and as gentle as doves" as we face up to globalization.

In a nutshell, what I hope to argue is this: the globalization of our present age is a deeply ambivalent phenomenon, as tied up with the forces of global capital as with spreading democratic movements of this or that "Spring." And even these latter movements are prey to the exploitation of new global movements—such as al Qaeda or ISIS—as equipped as any to exploit the global leveling technologies of social media to promote themselves. There are therefore very good reasons to devote some of our energies as Catholic universities to developing strategies of resistance to globalization. But the development of such strategies cannot amount to isolation or retreat; rather, we will need to think creatively about different modes of advance, creating alternative paths of relationship among institutions and persons across boundaries. Such creative thinking may begin through a *ressourcement*,[1] as it were, a reflective turn to our own history as a global movement, to learn from both our mistakes and our successes as we try to reason analogically into a global Catholic education for the twenty-first century.

I. The Ambivalence of Globalization and the Cosmopolitan Ethic

Globalization is a complex phenomenon. While there are "global skeptics,"[2] they are increasingly in the minority. The question has become less *whether* a globalizing transformation is underway and more *how significant* the changes will be and *how quickly* we will all feel the impact. Among the ingredients of our new global situation are economic concentration, global climate change, technological transformation, and political revolution. Many applaud the spreading of democratic movements around the world and are energized by the leveling and connecting possibilities offered through global technologies, above all the internet and social media. Think of the hopes many had for phenomena like the "Occupy" movement and the Arab Spring as networks of events underwritten by technological social media. On the positive side, then, "globalization" signals a kind of connectedness that we experience to the plight and promise of populations around the world. We are immediately and, it seems, viscerally and emotionally connected to sufferings of victims of natural or human disasters around

---

1   I am alluding to the *Ressourcement* movement of theology, represented by French Catholic theologians Henri de Lubac, Jean Daniélou, and Marie-Dominique Chenu, among others. *Ressourcement* theologians advocated a return to the classic patristic and medieval "resources" as a way of "re-sourcing" theological engagement with contemporary questions. *Ressourcement* theology was roundly criticized, and even silenced, in the early twentieth century, but it became foundational to the framework of the Second Vatican Council.

2   See, e.g., Paul Q. Hirst and Grahame Thompson, *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance* (Malden: Polity Press, 1996).

the world. Less dramatically, but no less significantly, simply anyone is within reach of a "skyped" face-to-face encounter from any corner of the globe. The possibilities seem ripe for a kind of global humanism of compassion, mutual support, and intercultural conversation.[3]

On the other hand, few dispute that global economic change is the engine that drives globalization as a wider phenomenon. The ins and outs of the economics themselves are beyond my poor competence to name and analyze, but the broad outlines of the phenomenon are easy enough to sketch. The rapid centralization of global capital into a small number of (mostly Western) corporations, themselves not subject to any one national government, has diminished the sovereignty of the high-modern nation-state, and no larger political authority has emerged to take its place. Wealth has continued to concentrate into the hands of fewer and fewer people. The share of the poorest fifth of the world's population in global income has dropped from 2.3% in 1989 to 1.4% in 2007.[4] The richest fifth's share in global income, in that same time frame, has gone from 76% to 91%.[5] The widespread global dissemination of internet technology has promised freedom and opportunity to an "interconnected world," but it is precisely those "interconnections" that have reinforced and even encouraged a wider global stratification of labor that serves to widen the income gap even further. In our own experience, we see every 24-hour tech support line connecting to the Indian subcontinent, where wages are a fraction of a comparable laborer in North America or Europe.

Nation-state governance continually bids to hold its place of influence through the shift of responsibility into provision of services—security, prosperity, safety. In so doing, however, it bears witness to the emptying and re-valuing of the state and other social institutions, making "nation," "family," "work" into "shell institutions," institutions, according to Anthony Giddens, "that appear the same as they used to from the outside, but inside have become quite different...institutions that are inadequate to the tasks they are called upon to perform."[6] As Zygmunt Bauman summarizes,

> Society is no longer protected by the state, or at least it is unlikely to trust the protection on offer; it is now exposed to the rapacity of forces it does not control and no longer hopes or intends to recapture or subdue. It is for that reason, in the first place, that state governments struggling, day in, day out, to weather the current storms stumble from one ad hoc crisis-management campaign and one

---

3   I am inclined to agree with Charles Taylor and Ivan Illich, from whom Taylor takes inspiration, that the broad institutional globalization we see on such a grand scale before our eyes both succeeds and fails because it represents the broad institutionalization—and therefore corruption—of fundamental Christian impulses toward compassion beyond narrow national identities. See David Cayley, *The Rivers North of the Future: The Testament of Ivan Illich*, as told to David Cayley (Toronto: Anansi, 2005), and Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge and London: Belknap Press, 2007), *737-743*.

4   World Bank, "World Bank Indicator," http://data.worldbank.org/indicator, accessed October 12, 2014.

5   Martin Sokol, *Economic Geographies of Globalization* (London: Edwin Elgar, 2011), 3.

6   Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping Our Lives* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

set of emergency measures to another…'Open' and increasingly defenseless on both sides, the nation state loses its might, now evaporating into global space, and its political acumen and dexterity, now increasingly relegated to the sphere of individual 'life politics' and 'subsidiarized' to individual men and women.[7]

In the face of these transformations, individual men and women often are encouraged to develop a "life politics" framed by an "ethic of cosmopolitanism" or "global citizenship."

Cosmopolitanism's advocates, such as Kwame Anthony Appiah, propose it as an alternative model or a solution to the commodified excesses of globalization. It "begins with the simple idea," says Appiah, "that in the human community as in national communities, we need to develop habits of coexistence."[8] As state boundaries and powers recede, Appiah's recommendation is to move from the local community and culture of one's origins out into global "conversations" with "the stranger." Appiah's model of conversation tries to honor the tension between the universal summons of our common humanity and the particular cultural identities we find in ourselves and in our interlocutors, but in the end he can only generate and recommend a kind of broad ethical stance for stateless individuals who stand apart from the claims of nations or polities and are ready to be inserted into any situation with a ready action plan for success.

But the fraying at the edges of the Westphalian international order carries with it a deep anxiety that Appiah's cosmopolitan ethos does not quite come to terms with. Where the nation-state had once promised if not complete security then at least a well-defined enemy and a clear sense of economic, political, and cultural boundaries, the declining hegemony of that state creates a general tenor of uncertainty on all these fronts. In the face of insecurity, says Bauman,

> [what] is left for your concerns and efforts, and having to attract most of your attention and powers, is the fight against *losing*: try at least to stay among the *hunters,* since the only alternative is to find yourself among the *hunted*. To perform properly and with a chance of success, the fight against losing will require your full, undivided attention, vigilance twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, and above all keeping on the move, as fast as you can.[9]

Such perpetual motion outward can be a movement into cosmopolitan conversation and yet still be a "fight against losing," a ceaseless stepping forward into the global marketplace. One might see the "cosmopolitan" or "global citizen" college graduate as perfectly suited for a multinational global financial firm or consulting group. In this reading, the "global citizen" is the perfect utility tool for economic globalization: social mobility, fungible skillsets, and lack of local and communal ties all contribute to the construction of an effective global white collar "knowledge worker."[10]

---

7   Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty* (Malden: Polity Press, 2007), 25.

8   Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010), xix.

9   Bauman, *Liquid Times,* 104.

10   Indeed, one of our most successful graduates recently landed a job with Deloitte & Touche, and her first

II. Education Abroad as Ambivalent Proto-globalization

The seeds of my reflection have been sown in my ongoing encounters as an academic advisor and department chair with the rapidly expanding system of study abroad experiences. I have begun to wonder if the very structure of our study abroad experience often anticipates and mimics the post-graduate production of global-individualized knowledge workers, already in its practice shaping them *in utero*. Most will be familiar with the fact that there are two fundamental strategies for university students studying abroad. Either they enroll in a program sponsored and staffed by their own U.S. institution in some foreign destination—for example a "Rome campus" for Boston College, Notre Dame, or Villanova students—wherein the academic quality and institutional stability of the program is guaranteed by the originating institution, but the academic experience is consequently much the same as what they would experience on their home campus. This has the advantage of quality control and relative safety and predictability, but it has the disadvantages of the "satellite" or "bubble." One is not getting a full exposure and immersion in another culture, and one's limited engagement with that culture can always occur on one's own terms—I choose when to go out and sit in a sidewalk café, or whatever. Like a corporate branch office, satellite campus experiences tend to diminish the opportunities for encounter and conversation.

The other frequent opportunity is mediated through the several not-for-profit or for-profit study abroad agencies who arrange for relationships between institutions, handle questions of accreditation, arrange for students' living arrangements, and so on. Practically speaking, these agencies, or sometimes universities, who specialize in abroad programs arrange for a deep encounter of the student with the culture and life of their abroad location, and they provide a service, the need of which has outstripped most individual institutions' capacities to provide. At the same time, the alliance between academic institutions and these agencies has led to allegations of price-fixing financial exploitation of students,[11] and the overall structure of this model tends to cast the study abroad process in the image of individual consumer choice, wherein locations, institutions, and courses are selected from an extensive menu by students and then retroactively are slated into place to fulfill the requirements of their home institutions. One of our primary modes of forming global citizens is thereby at the same time yet another mode of forming isolated individual consumers of global services.

I do not intend to paint quite so dark a picture of things. There are, indeed, good and great things to be had in a global education, and it seems irresponsible in our twenty-first century context to imagine retreating from the intrinsic good of encounters with different cultures and peoples from around the world. As an academic advisor to about

major assignment was in Mumbai, India, preparing Indian business professionals for "cooperation" with Western business culture. In many ways, she relates, it was a dream assignment—exotic location, influential work, etc.—while at the same time she wasn't sure what it would all add up to.

11 Laura Pappano, "The Foreign Legions," *New York Times*, November 4, 2007, www.nytimes.com/2007/11/04/education/edlife/studyabroad.html, accessed 10/4/2014.

50 or so undergraduate students, I sign off on about a dozen departures each semester, and the students return from these study abroad programs with valued experiences of encounters with cultures and peoples they come to love and appreciate. And the practical matters still have force: as we seek to offer education abroad opportunities for more and more students, it will occur inevitably that certain intermediate agencies provide a vital function of coordinating between vastly different institutions and cultures. My question is not a question "whether," then: *whether or not* we should advocate a global and intercultural experience as part of our students' education. I take it as a given that we should. Rather, my question is how. Specifically, *How can we*, as Catholic universities, bring our resources to bear in a way that can mitigate some of the distorting and dehumanizing dimensions of globalization and offer an alternative model of global encounter?

> *The Church must take a certain responsibility for the perversities and dangers of globalization and do what is within its power to heal and repair the practices that conduce to it.*

III. The Church as Global Institution: Learning from Failure and Success

If cosmopolitanism fails because it can find too little in common upon which to build the foundations for the conversation that it seeks to cultivate, we might consider drawing upon the resources of our own tradition of transnational identity to learn another way of proceeding. The Lutheran theologian Robert Jenson used to say in the 1980s that there are really only two truly global and multicultural institutions in the world: the Communist Internationale and the Roman Catholic Church. The former seems to have fallen on rather hard times of late, which leaves the latter as the last one standing. Indeed, it may be the case, as Ivan Illich and Charles Taylor have suggested, that the globalization regime of our late-modern age represents a late chapter in the secularization (or, as Illich would have it, the corruption) of the Christian global missionary imperative.[12] If this is so, then the Church must take a certain responsibility for the perversities and dangers of globalization and do what is within its power to heal and repair the practices that conduce to it. If globalization is the latest chapter in this secular age, how can we turn back a few pages and re-examine past chapters, to draw upon and learn from both the successes and failures of the 2000-year history of global Catholicism? How can we do so in such a way as to re-imagine possibilities for an alternative model of global cultural exchange? How can we make best use of our current status as a truly global and multicultural institution to form and educate our students for the twenty-first century?

---

12 Cayley, *The Rivers North of the Future*; Taylor, *A Secular Age*.

First Lesson from Diognetus and Augustine: In and Out, or Pilgrims and Resident Aliens

From its Pentecostal birth, the Church always has had to negotiate its own identity in relation to multiple cultures. Christians, says the apostolic *Epistle to Diognetus*,

> ...pass their lives in whatever region...the lot of each has determined, but... though they are residents at home in their own countries, their behavior is more like that of transients; they take their full part as citizens, but they also submit to anything and everything as if they were aliens. For them, any foreign country is a motherland, and any motherland is a foreign country.[13]

As such "resident aliens," Christians' allegiances to a particular land, nation, or culture may be held strongly, but nevertheless they are always tempered and relativized by their deeper identity and communion in the Body of Christ. Augustine carries this same insight further:

> While this heavenly City, therefore, is on pilgrimage in this world, she calls out citizens from all nations and so collects a society of aliens, speaking all languages. She takes no account of any difference in customs, laws, and institutions, by which earthly peace is achieved and preserved...she maintains them and follows them, for whatever divergences there are among diverse nations, those institutions have one single aim—earthly peace.[14]

Christian identity is, in itself, a transcultural, transnational identity. We are pilgrims and resident aliens, and this "both in and out" sensibility makes for both an inevitable alienation from any culture or nation—even our home culture. At the same time, it also makes for a deep sense of filiation and friendship across borders and barriers of language. Membership in the Church thus forms a foundational context for global affiliation in terms that depart from the horns of the cosmopolitan dilemma. Rather than the individual suspended as sole mediator between a particular culture of origin and an amorphous common global humanity, Christian self-understanding places the person in relation to other persons, both in an out of every particular culture, and bound to each other through the common bond of membership in the Body of Christ.

For Catholics in particular, this common bond has concrete institutional form in and through the worldwide Church—not only its curial offices and episcopal administrations but through other institutions which share, for example, liturgical practice and intellectual heritage. I know many a Catholic who has been both consoled and intrigued by the experience of Mass in a foreign land, as strangeness and familiarity interweave to give even the smallest sacramental taste of the kind of identity we see described in *Diognetus* and in Augustine. From this ritual and liturgical center, we can extend this fellowship into the particular institutions formed by Catholics in those foreign lands—schools, hospitals, religious communities—as places of encounter with

---

13 "Epistle to Diognetus," *Early Christian Writings, rev. ed.,* ed. Andrew Louth (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1987), 144-45.

14 Augustine, *City of God* XIX.17, trans. Henry Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1984), 878.

> *Shared membership in the "heavenly city on pilgrimage" unites us, ironically, in a common sense of alienation from any particular culture or any regime's efforts to give our identity its deepest root.*

fellow aliens residing in other home countries. Shared membership in the "heavenly city on pilgrimage" unites us, ironically, in a common sense of alienation from any particular culture or any regime's efforts to give our identity its deepest root. This shared alienation and shared membership creates a rich context for exchange and friendship, precisely because our differences, however significant, cannot be defining.

Of course, I have given a rather idealized and romantic picture of this global Catholic fellowship, but my hope is to engage our imaginations so that we might re-frame the context of our global engagement. If we imagine the frame and the possibilities differently, then, however imperfectly we are able to actualize these possibilities, we will change the nature of our exchange. We will, perhaps, engage in a kind of counter-globalization that may equip our institutions more generally, and our students quite specifically, with the tools of resistance to the current global-consumption regime.

Second Lesson from Matteo Ricci: The Thickness of Cultures and the Dangers of Alliances

The Church's longest and most consistent global presence has been in the form of Christian missions. It may seem counterintuitive or even scandalous to take lessons for global engagement from the history of Christian missions, as the confident "making disciples of all nations" seems at one level to be the antithesis of the kind of global encounter with the other that our age seems to recommend. Indeed, I think that this history has as much to teach us from its failures and from its successes, and perhaps it has most to teach us in those moments or places where it is most difficult to discern exactly what has been a success or failure. But the history and theology of missions, both classical and contemporary, from Boniface to Bartolomeo de las Casas to Charles de Foucauld and the Trappist martyrs of Tibhirine, represent a long and sustained conversation about the encounter with the culturally-other, and we would be foolish to ignore its wisdom (won, as I say, from both success and failure), even as we must translate and adapt that wisdom to different, seemingly extra-missional contexts of global encounter.[15]

---

15 I say "seemingly extra-missional" because it seems to me that (i) Christian encounter is, at some level, always "in mission" in that we are sent to the nations with good news, and (ii) the nature of that mission, as described in current missiology, is far less confrontational and proselytizing than we tend to assume. On the first, see Henri de Lubac, "The Theological Foundations of the Missions," *Theology in History*, trans. Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996), 367-427. For the developing nature of the language of "mission" in present practice, see, e.g., Paul V. Kollman, "Remembering Evangelization: The Option for the Poor in Mission History," *International Bulletin*

The lessons we might glean from this long history are many, but I will draw our attention to only two. First (and perhaps this is stating the obvious), we must beware of Christian encounter with the other that finds easy alliance with institutional power. Perhaps our awareness of the complicity of the Church with colonial powers in the early modern period is so commonplace that it can be taken for granted. We may well know the havoc wreaked by Catholic missionaries allied with the imperial powers of Spain and Portugal in the Southern Hemisphere, wherein "evangelization," "civilization," and, too often, enslavement blended in a deadly and dehumanizing regime of power and corruption from which Latin American cultures still struggle to recover. Despite the best efforts of missionaries to restrain *conquistador* violence, even their restraints were converted into instruments of enslavement. *El Requerimiento* in 1510 was a document drafted by Dominican missionaries intended to make the *conquistadors* justify their aggression on the principles of just war, but, in practice, it served to justify Spanish aggression. A member of the attacking force would stand outside a village or town and read the *Requerimiento*, conversationally and in Spanish, inviting the indigenous community in the distance to submit both to Christian faith and Spanish rule. When the local communities shockingly failed to comply with these unintelligible and inaudible demands, the Spanish forces had license to enslave the entire community and seize all their possessions.

Similarly, we can witness the remarkable success of Christian missions in Japan that collapsed in persecution and martyrdom when these missions came to be understood in alliance with colonial power.[16] It was not until Spanish weapons arrived in Spain with a ship full of missionaries that the ascendant shogun Tokugawa Ieyasu began a broad-based crackdown on Christian missionaries in Japan in 1614. These examples, and the many others in Africa and Asia to which we could point, are indeed familiar, but they take on frightening new monitory resonance if we place them alongside the softer imperial power of global consumer capitalism. Insofar as our efforts to encounter the culturally-other in friendship and mutual care are funded or even coopted by the regime of global capital and the global marketing and consulting firms at its center, we are engaged in a perilous flirtation with a power that is ultimately hostile to the goods that we seek to cultivate. This dangerous analogy provides good impetus to seek our own alternatives to the global "study abroad" industry as a form of global resistance.

The second lesson I'd like to glean is, I hope, less dire. If we explore the historical precedent of Matteo Ricci, the Jesuit missionary to China in the seventeenth century, we may gain a deep appreciation for the patience and long-suffering that is attendant

---

of Mission Research 33.2 (April 2009), 59-65. For contemporary Magisterial thoughts on both topics, see Pope Francis's discussion of mission in *Evangelii gaudium*, especially chapter 1 (www.vatican.va/ evangelii-gaudium/en/).

16 See, e.g., Dale T. Irvin and Scott W. Sunquist, *History of the World Christian Movement, vol. 2: Modern Christianity from 1454-1800* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2012), chs. 3 & 7. For a profound fictional meditation on the collusion of mission with temporal colonial power, see Shusaku Endo, *The Samurai*, trans. Van Gessel (New York: New Directions Classic, 1982).

to real intercultural engagement. Briefly, for those who may not know the story, Matteo Ricci was an Italian Jesuit sent in mission to Asia. He was sent first to Macao in 1582, where he endeavored to gain facility in Chinese language, both written and spoken. After intense study for a year in Macao, Ricci and his companion Michele Ruggieri ventured into China, settling in the city of Zhaoqing and continuing their studies of Chinese language and culture for six years. During this time, they adopted the dress and manner of Buddhist monks, self-consciously setting themselves apart from Spanish and Portuguese imperial and mercantile communities and seeking to meet the Chinese in their own milieu. After some time, they discerned that the cultural leaders of China had little respect for Buddhist monks, and so they refashioned themselves after the manner of Confucian Mandarin intellectuals. While they did nothing to hide their Christian identity, they spent much of their time engaging their Chinese counterparts on questions of science, engineering, and education. Ricci, and those who inherited his role after his death, believed that the Confucian philosophy of his Chinese friends could be quite compatible with Christian revelation, and their ritual practices honoring their ancestors in heaven might be understood in ways compatible with the Catholic communion of saints. From Rome he obtained permission for Chinese Catholics who were converted by his patient friendship to celebrate liturgies and devotions in Chinese rather than Latin and to incorporate so-called "Chinese Rites" honoring ancestors into the wider circle of Christian devotion. However, with the suspicions of rival missionaries and the changing allegiances of Roman ecclesial politics back home, the Riccian project of inculturation was supported and condemned in turn in the course of nearly a century of debate, and it was finally condemned strongly in 1707. Chinese reaction to the condemnation was decisive: all missionaries were expelled in 1724, and anyone caught practicing Christianity was condemned to death in 1736. Christianity lost whatever tenuous foothold it had held in the Middle Kingdom, and the long controversy contributed to a broader suspicion of Western culture in China that, I think it fair to say, persists today.[17]

Again, at the risk of pointing out the obvious, let me lift up a few lessons from this fascinating but troubled history. First, Matteo Ricci's example demonstrates that cultures are thick phenomena, difficult to understand and requiring patience to engage in any depth. Ricci's years studying language, his own initial missteps imitating a Buddhist monk, and his wide-ranging engagement with Confucian friends over a number of years on a variety of topics all bear witness to the challenges of coming to know another culture and of the rewards of slow, patient effort. To this example we might add the more recent examples we find in Charles de Foucauld and the Trappist martyrs of Tibhirine, all of whom bear witness, even at the cost of their lives, to the task of patient accompanying. Both intercultural understanding and evangelical witness are made most manifest in a kind of faithful presence to those we encounter, even unto death. While we may acknowledge this as self-evident, our practice in study abroad and cultural exchange programs in our

---

17   For a succinct treatment of Matteo Ricci and the Chinese Rites Controversy, see Irvin and Sunquist, 169-78.

universities suggests that we only feint in the direction of such acknowledgment while we proceed with various strategies of what amount more to student tourism than real intercultural education. Clearly we are not seeking this kind of long investment of life and time from our students in study abroad, but these examples all suggest a long-term institutional strategy that we might do well to consider. If we are to equip our students and faculty to resist a certain globalization and counter-propose an alternative, we will have to reconsider our institutional and curricular structures comprehensively in service of this goal, all the better to equip students to engage cultures in their thickness.

> *Our global intercultural engagements will require some vulnerability, some risk, and some trust to be fully effective.*

If we take that point that cultures are thick and difficult to understand, one further lesson in the obvious might suggest itself. The collapse of the Riccian model can be said to demonstrate a final lack of trust in those who have the deepest understanding of the phenomenon in question. Roman (and here, think "Counter-reformation and anti-Protestant European") anxieties about plurality and confusion were allowed, in the end, to trump the hard-won wisdom of several generations of local Jesuit engagement in Chinese culture. All this suggests that our global intercultural engagements will require some vulnerability, some risk, and some trust to be fully effective. Global intercultural engagement must, it seems, be a de-centered phenomenon, but de-centered in a way that provides for real communication and communion, for "checks and balances" in the context of trust and humility. And so at least de-centralized if not de-centered. Managing a de-centralized community in a way that remains coherent and true is difficult to imagine. But I wonder if it can ever be otherwise?

IV. Some Concluding Ideas or Recommendations

I will not be surprised if I have succeeded only in pointing to the obvious and self-evident today: "globalization has a dark side." "Our Christian faith renders us all 'resident aliens.'" "Catholic missions have often screwed things up." None of these amounts to original contributions to scholarship, by any stretch of the imagination. Nonetheless, it is my hope that, by holding these ideas up before our eyes in light of our broader question on the role of the academy in the world and on the global significance of the Catholic university, we might reflect on the very concrete and specific ways in which we "globally signify," and so offer strategies for both resistance to and repair of the world in the limited and small ways in which we may actually effect a change. So let me close with a few suggestions.

First, can we imagine models of intercultural engagement that better embody that deep sense of "in-and-out," of global community in the midst of difference? Specifically, can we better marshal the resources of Catholic institutions around the world to foster

longstanding relationships of exchange and fellowship among students and faculty? Many institutions have something like this already, but it may be that we can develop and foster these relationships with more intention. For example, the Humanities department at Villanova University has developed a strong relationship with Blackfriars Hall at the University of Oxford. The heart of this relationship is student exchange—we have sent seven of our majors to study over the last five years, but that relationship has blossomed out into faculty engagement and mutual support beyond the limits of a "semester abroad." As the Blackfriars faculty comes to know better and better the shape of our own curriculum and training, it has come to know what to expect in our students and how to contribute in particular ways to their ongoing formation. This relationship is built upon shared curricular strengths in theology and philosophy and upon shared institutional convictions about the place of faith in broader interdisciplinary engagements. This shared understanding has developed over time—indeed, it *could* only develop over time—and it stands to deepen the students' experience and ongoing education through the long, patient relationship. Beyond this, it has begun to foster conversation about further modes of engagement at the faculty and institutional level. At this point, these are just brainstorms, but I am excited to see what shape they may take in the next few years. We have begun to explore similar relationships with the Newman Institute in Uppsala, Sweden, and we are interested in cultivating other relationships like that with non-North Atlantic Catholic institutions in South America, Africa, and central and southern Asia. Such arrangements, of course, would of necessity be fewer and so in some ways more restricted than the plethora of offerings in the virtual marketplace of education abroad. But they would offer a deeper model of friendship and community that attends more fully to the personal and interpersonal character of Catholic education. It would be naïve to expect that such initiatives will ever displace the virtual marketplace, but they will offer fruitful alternatives that are rooted more deeply in our own Catholic soil.

Extending from this model, we need not think of this as an exclusively Catholic parochial endeavor. Recent developments in interreligious dialogue such as the Scriptural Reasoning movement (in which I participate) have offered a model of religious engagement over shared study in a (literal or metaphorical) "tent of meeting," in which our deepest religious and cultural roots, and our investment in them, become the grounds not for division but for shared experiences in a practice that honors the particularities of religious commitment and prioritizes fellowship over agreement. That we all share a sense of intentional commitment to our respective religions and cultures becomes the foundation of friendship. This movement is, in this way, a post-secular engagement from the heart of our traditions more than it is a taking leave of them. Initially, and most commonly, Scriptural Reasoning is an Abrahamic phenomenon (that is, a practice shared among Jews, Christians, and Muslims), but more recently Scriptural Reasoners have explored engagements with Hindu and Confucian interlocutors. This post-liberal and post-secular engagement seems to me wholly consistent with the practice of Matteo Ricci and the life of Charles de Foucauld and the Tibhirine Trappists, and it

can offer rich possibilities as a model for intercultural exchange between universities on a global scale.[18]

A second thought to ponder: Can we think of our intercultural exchanges more broadly and comprehensively within our own institutions than the semester abroad phenomenon? If cultures are indeed thick and difficult to learn, might we think about capturing that insight in our college core curricula? As many schools are floundering a bit with a diversity requirement that seems suspect among contemporary theorists of social and economic difference, might we think about reshaping that requirement into a "second culture" requirement—something akin to what Georgetown University's theology program requires of its doctoral students, but here, more broadly cultural and ordered to undergraduate needs. Something like this: students would elect to study another culture, say, "Latin America" or "China" or "Islamic culture in the Middle East," in some depth, over the course of 9 or 12 credits, in an interdisciplinary way that would include language, religion, history, and cultural studies, and, perhaps, could culminate in a study-abroad experience. We could not pretend that such a requirement would prepare students to be Matteo Ricci, but we would at least communicate something of the challenging thickness and otherness of another culture. An awareness of this challenging thickness and its resistant-yet-attractive otherness would already be a stance of resistance toward the cultivation of global individual knowledge workers who are insertable into any cultural milieu—a sort of "slow culture" movement to parallel "slow food"!

Both of these suggestions would entail a "devolution," at least from a certain perspective—we could offer fewer opportunities, and this might appear limiting to our consumer-formed students as they shop for universities. I am, indeed, advocating a series of what social theorist Ivan Illich often called "foolish renunciations"—self-consciously stepping away from the institutionalized and institutionalizing practices of deracinating global consumption.[19] And the word that might best capture and encapsulate these several practices and recommendations I have made is another favorite word of Illich's, "hospitality."[20] Unlike Illich, I am daring to suggest that Catholic universities may be distinctively equipped to become "institutions of hospitality," something that Illich would have taken to be oxymoronic. To be more precise, I am suggesting that Catholic universities may serve as the space within which such hospitality may take place. You may have noticed that my examples all occur at the departmental level. This is due in part to the fact that I am a department chair—this is the sphere of my influence and my experience. But I would go so far as to suggest that scale does in fact matter. The kind of practices I'm advocating here will work best on a small scale of practical hospitality. The larger institution's role is thus one of making space, of providing support and encouragement for such small-scale, "local" endeavors of global engagement. The

---

18 For further information on Scriptural Reasoning, see the resources at www.scripturalreasoning.org.

19 Cayley, 101-103.

20 Cayley, 50-52.

universities might best serve their function by making space for global resistance, hospitality, and "foolish renunciations." This might be the best sort of resistance we can offer in the face of the oppressive uncertainty fostered by mainstream globalization.

Practically speaking, it is unrealistic to hope completely to transform our universities' relationships *ad extra,* to occasion so complete a conversion of heart and mind at the institutional level that our model for global engagement on the world stage would fundamentally alter. But it may be reasonable to hope to pilot such programs alongside the more traditional models, to encourage students who engage with their education in a less utilitarian way to pursue such alternatives. It may be reasonable to build lasting relationships between small communities within larger university structures. But they would at the same time be steps—small steps, I admit—toward an alternative model of global engagement and a more particular, more Catholic role for Catholic universities.