

The Idea of the Common Good: Interdisciplinary Contributions to Catholic Higher Education

Kristin E. Heyer

A robust, interdisciplinary engagement of the idea of the common good is well poised to make a timely contribution to the project of Catholic higher education. Reflection on shared goods as essential to civic and moral formation can serve to critique not only market models of education but also broader cultural currents that influence today's students. At the same time, Catholic universities would do well to galvanize collaboration across the disciplines to refine traditional understandings and applications of the concept of the common good. Fostering interdisciplinary approaches in curricula and research, together with opportunities for global and local experiential learning, holds promise for reinvigorating the common good in the context of Catholic higher education and enhancing the education of integrated persons.

"We can know a good in common that we cannot know alone."

Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*

"An authentic dialogue is, in every case, an encounter between persons with a name, a face, a past, and not merely a meeting of ideas."

**Pope Francis, Address to Pontifical Representation in Istanbul, Turkey
November 30, 2014**

Kristin E. Heyer is a professor of theology at Boston College, having previously served as the Bernard J. Hanley Professor of Religious Studies at Santa Clara University. Her research focuses on the ethics of immigration, Catholic political engagement, moral agency, and Christian social ethics. She is the author of *Prophetic and Public: The Social Witness of U.S. Catholicism and Kinship Across Borders: A Christian Ethic of Immigration*, and has recently edited, with David DeCosse, *Conscience & Catholicism: Rights, Responsibilities & Institutional Responses*.

Catholic higher education institutions today face significant economic, cultural, and demographic changes impacting their ability to live and transmit their mission.¹ Some worry the various pressures and incentives of a larger utilitarian and careerist culture governed by accreditation standards and rankings pursued by secular universities hold sway and threaten Catholic identity.² Increasingly, institutions wrestle with the decentering of the traditionally “architectonic” disciplines of theology and philosophy in core curricula. Most campuses welcome student populations formed more by technological habituation than faith traditions and who are swiftly saddled with debt. Different forms of intellectual mistrust of religious truth claims and moral realism persist among faculty members as well, who are drawn to teaching positions in such universities in the present job market for a variety of reasons.

The idea of the common good offers an opportunity to at once anchor Catholic universities in tradition and engage diverse stakeholders across disciplines.

Whereas significant currents run counter to certain ideals and aims of Catholic higher education, framing institutional identity and the challenges of pluralism exclusively in terms of a negative tension risks misconstruing the tradition and missing opportunities to invite creative engagement around shared goods. The idea of the common good offers an opportunity to at once anchor Catholic universities in tradition and engage diverse stakeholders across disciplines to critically develop its implications in a conciliar spirit of dialogic universalism.³ Catholic universities’ welcome understanding of mission integration as properly academic (rather than exclusively restricted to campus ministry or student affairs) is not at odds with concomitant commitments to academic rigor that includes openness to the tradition’s critical development. Without minimizing the need for theological literacy—or the challenge posed by mutual suspicions aroused

1 I wish to express my gratitude to Lisa Hastings for her invitation to join the Roundtable and write on this topic, and to participants and colleagues Laura Nichols and Erik Owens for their helpful comments at its inception. Parts of this essay draw upon and adapt earlier publications, such as my *Kinship Across Borders: A Christian Ethic of Migration* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2012) chapters 3-4, and “The Common Good and the American Bishops’ Guidelines,” in Richard Miller, ed., *We Hold These Truths: Catholicism and American Public Life* (Liguori Press, 2008), 45-62.

2 Michael Naughton, Don Briel, Kenneth E. Goodpaster, “Our Reason for Being,” *America* (February 1, 2016).

3 The Second Vatican Council affirmed the deep roots of a vision of good life in the gospel, and it also upheld the possibility of bringing Christian convictions about the common good into fruitful engagement with alternate conceptions, calling for dialogue with the sciences, diverse cultures, and other religions. For a helpful discussion of the impact of Vatican II on this particular conception of the common good (which he terms “dialogic universalism”), see David Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter 6.

by affirmations that a common good is identifiable or desirable on the one hand or irreducibly pluralist in nature on the other—a robust, interdisciplinary engagement of the idea of the common good is well poised to make a timely contribution to the project of Catholic higher education. It offers an opportunity to integrate the educational experience of students, contribute to understandings of shared goods beyond the university, counter isolating tendencies in academia and fragmentation in the wider world, and refine traditional understandings of the common good in need of renewal.

Theological Warrants for Interdisciplinary Encounter: Beyond Coexistence

Reflection on Catholic higher education has long accepted the presence and in some instances welcomed the value of various intellectual traditions contributing in an atmosphere of academic freedom.⁴ Whether theologically grounded in the incarnational principle, sacramental imagination, compatibility of faith and reason, or the *telos* of higher education, Catholic mission-identifying faculty and administrators have ample religious cause to embrace interdisciplinary collaboration that preserves the integrity of other disciplines. Such strands underscore the basic compatibility of the pursuit of knowledge with universities' religious mission, rightly orienting the role of a Catholic university toward interdisciplinary engagement of the concrete, interrelated aspects of human life. Catholic commitments also attune participants to the pursuit of truth, justice, beauty, holistic flourishing, and integral development, and surface contextual questions regarding the ends of new knowledge pursued. Such communities may consider how their reason is "compassionate" and how their (collective) intelligence is "moved by mercy."⁵

The Catholic intellectual tradition that anchors and animates the distinctive identity of its universities itself continues to accumulate insights from the light of reason as well as the light of faith. Its heritage is not "static in its contents; rather, it is a dynamic, cumulative, and living heritage that has been developing throughout history."⁶ The tradition has been interpreted from within as open-ended and entailing conversation rather than as a body of doctrine to be assimilated or assented to *per se*: at its best this conversation invites participants into an "uninhibited process of questioning that leads across disciplinary boundaries with an openness to questions of ultimacy, a conversation in which all are invited to participate as a leaven for their scholarly lives."⁷ Such an

4 See, e.g., the agreement of Michael J. Buckley and David O'Brien on these points in Buckley's *The Catholic University as Promise and Project: Reflections in a Jesuit Idiom* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1998), 45.

5 For a discussion of Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría's ideas of "compassionate reason" and "intelligence moved by mercy" see Jon Sobrino, *The Principle of Mercy: Taking the Crucified Down from the Cross* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994), 188, and Kevin Burke, S.J., *The Ground Beneath the Cross: The Theology of Ellacuría* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 199.

6 John C. Haughey, S.J., *Where Is Knowing Going? The Horizons of the Knowing Subject* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2009), xiv.

7 Gregory A. Kalscheur, S.J., "A Response to Kenneth Garcia: Healthy Secularity and the Task of a Catholic University," *Theological Studies* 73(4) (December 2012), 924-934, at 934.

endeavor remains thick and inclusive, meaning-making yet expansive. This model warrants wide promotion and institutionalization, as it has potential to draw in faculty who work at Catholic universities both because of its distinctive tradition and in some cases, initially, in spite of it.

In practice, assumptions or prior experiences may prevent some faculty members from encountering the Catholic intellectual tradition in that mode. Sometimes in practice, monologue masquerades as dialogue or “live and let live” becomes the *modus operandi*. Without jettisoning its distinctive, life-giving, often countercultural offerings, explicit attention to the Catholic intellectual tradition’s “growing edges” in need of development might serve to invite new stakeholders into a candid and wider dialogue about the shared goods to which universities wish to orient students, institutions themselves, and wider society. Questions of the transcendent should remain on the table in such conversations given the nature of the institution (and reality), even as disciplines retain their rightful autonomy. Particular challenges engaging certain interlocutors might seem insuperable, such as those rejecting any correspondence theory of proof, yet opportunities to investigate where traditional claims have become ossified may ensue even in unexpected exchanges. For the hospitality of exchange to be genuinely mutual, the caretakers of the Catholic intellectual tradition will bear a humble willingness to learn as well as to convey its riches, remaining truly open to more adequate formulations and deeper challenges. A living tradition need not be threatened by such give-and-take, for at their best such exchanges can safeguard against insular fundamentalisms and gauge “fruitfulness, connection to people’s basic questions, and further insight into reality.”⁸

The Catholic tradition also has ample grounds for engaging in such practices of hospitality and encounter.

The Catholic tradition also has ample grounds for engaging in such practices of hospitality and encounter. A “praxis of intellectual hospitality,” we might call it, will perceive diversity not as a threat or aberration to be tolerated but as a gift and expression of catholicity. As John Haughey reflects:

The Church has to learn how to host the work of God taking place not only within but also outside the borders of its own self-understanding and institutions. The work of God is both secular and eschatological at the same time; it is secular in the sense of being grounded in this world in its particularity, and it is eschatological in the sense of its anticipation of wholeness that will be attained through the particularities of work, nature, relationships, sufferings, and joys. This catholicity will be fully realized only at the end of history. But between now

8 Haughey, *Where is Knowing Going*, 100.

and then, there have to be partial realizations of it to stoke the hope for entireties that lie beyond our sight.⁹

Gaudium et Spes similarly invites the Church and world into reflection together on what it means to be human—flawed and fragile yet called to share in divine life, and bound in solidarity. In light of its theological anthropology and ecclesiological charge, living out the call of the pastoral constitution at least demands that followers appreciate that “nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts.”¹⁰ Pope Francis has renewed this emphasis on the inclusively communal nature of the search for truth in a conciliar vein, evident in his emphases on building cultures of accompaniment and encounter, calls for bold candor and humility in the journey of synodality, and his own lived example. A praxis of intellectual hospitality can help theological and philosophical reflection guard against collapsing into ideologies that seek to “tame the mystery,” as he has cautioned.

Hence whereas such encounters are consonant with deep Catholic commitments, rare is the explicit, inclusive invitation that makes clear that pluralism is not a regrettable necessity but a value in itself, and that interdisciplinary engagement should be a two-way street given the value and finitude of the Catholic intellectual tradition. Such undertakings could supplement mission integration efforts that strengthen and nourish a core cohort that leavens the wider community with initiatives that invite a more widely construed collaborative enterprise. Encounter in this vein requires deep listening and the courage to genuinely engage beyond disciplinary familiarity and tempting echo chambers. A distinctively Catholic vision of the good, then, is appropriately light and leaven as well as dynamic and emergent. Whereas an incarnational sense of mission integration may work more effectively when preaching to the choir (or in some cases ensuring they sing in unison), introducing strands accenting hospitality and humility or mutuality might incorporate the syncopated rhythms of the skeptical and initially dismissive, or invite virtuosos into ensemble performances.

The Idea of the Common Good in the Catholic Tradition: Prophetic and Public

If the development of the Catholic tradition can ensue with and amid an interdisciplinary, diverse community of intellectual neighbors, its idea of the common good offers a particularly promising site for orienting this praxis of hospitality. The Catholic idea of the common good—grounded in tradition and genuinely dialogical in development—resists dismissals as an “imperialistic throwback” or “diluted sellout” precisely as it remains thick yet thin, rooted yet underdetermined. Employed as a lens rather than a fixed body of doctrine, the idea is particularly well poised to orient Catholic higher education’s endeavors in its formative and countercultural modes as well as in its inclusive collaborative modes. It offers opportunities for universities to advance the

9 Haughey, *Where is Knowing Going*, 35.

10 Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*, 1965), 1, online at www.vatican.va.

common good as a countersign to market models of education and harmful cultural currents alike as well as to engage interdisciplinary partners in the refinement of its articulation and application. Such prophetic and collaborative modes are appropriate to Catholic ecclesiology, ethics, and education.

The idea of the common good has deep historical roots in traditions of Western thought. Classical Greek philosophy shaped a vision of the good life, with Aristotle arguing that the good of the community should guide individuals' lives, and articulating the pursuit of the general welfare of the *polis* in a context of participatory self-governance. Augustine and Aquinas built upon this understanding but conceived of the ultimate good as the fullness of life in God, such that the earthly common good may be achieved only partially or analogously. According to Aquinas, right relationship to God requires commitment to the common good of our neighbors and of all creation.¹¹ As the principle has evolved in Catholic thought, the order of the universal common good or spiritual *telos* of all persons remains distinct from but related to the order of the temporal, political common good. For if salvation is a social phenomenon—"ultimate union with God and neighbor that images the communion between the persons of the Trinity"—then other more proximate forms of fulfillment in history are social phenomena as well, in spheres of the family, economy, politics, or education.¹²

The Catholic common good tradition is rooted in a vision of the human person as loved into being by God and created for relationship. Created in the *imago Dei* and social and political by nature, persons are endowed with inviolable dignity and human rights. According to this theological anthropology, persons' social nature is inherent, not extrinsic, for fulfillment is achieved through participation in the shared life of a community. Hence human rights are claims to goods necessary for each to participate with dignity in community life. Pope Francis has recently drawn attention anew to climate as a common good in terms of persons' joint responsibilities toward protecting our shared planetary home in *Laudato Si'*. There he emphasizes the interconnected nature of social and environmental harms and their redress in terms of an integral ecology.

The Catholic social tradition has elaborated dimensions of the temporal common good in increasingly expansive ways over recent decades, incorporating a consideration of relations among sovereign states and questions of a global common good beginning in the 1960s. *Gaudium et Spes* articulates its scope as "the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment."¹³ A utilitarian calculus threatens to exclude individuals and groups, whereas participation of every member is central to Catholic common good theory. The option for the poor and vulnerable in the Catholic social

11 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, III, 17.

12 Todd David Whitmore, "Catholic Social Teaching: Starting with the Common Good," in Kathleen Maas Weigert and Alexia K. Kelley, *Living the Catholic Social Tradition* (Lanham, MD: Sheed & Ward, 2005), 59-86, at 62.

13 *Gaudium et Spes*, 26.

tradition seeks to incorporate disempowered and marginalized persons into full participation in the life of the community, enabling all to share in and contribute to the common good.¹⁴ For if “the dignity of persons can be realized only in community, genuine community, in its turn, can only exist where the substantial freedom and dignity of [every] human person is secured.”¹⁵ A rights-based conception of common good in Catholic social thought functions to bridge communitarianism and individualism. For example, its generalized respect for the concrete other—envisioned as “solidarity with near and distant neighbors”—mediates between the communitarian recognition of concrete members and strangers and liberalism’s respect for “abstract citizens.”¹⁶

*Pursuing the common good shapes questions rather
than predetermines answers in this model.*

The common good refers not only to outcomes like the *telos* of a given community or policies enabling fulfillment but it also serves as a hermeneutical lens. The principle “does not offer an already-out-there, ready-to-be-grasped norm of justice but rather a set of goals to be arrived at through open debate and public consensus.”¹⁷ Such deliberate engagement constitutes both a route toward and a characteristic of a good community; that is, a place where people genuinely depend upon one another through decision making about their common purposes.¹⁸ “Solidarity in a community of freedom” is not a zero sum game wherein participants must give up freedom in order to sign on to shared or common goods.¹⁹ Pursuing the common good shapes questions rather than predetermines answers in this model.

Because the common good does not refer to a static outcome but encompasses these meanings of process and criterion with an increasingly expansive scope, “the quest for a common good takes place *within* and not *against* the experience of plurality.”²⁰ Pluralism

14 See National Council of Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (NCCB: Washington, DC, 1986), 88.

15 John A. Coleman, S.J., “The Common Good and Catholic Social Thought,” in Margaret O’Brien Steinfels, ed., *American Catholics and Civic Engagement: A Distinctive Voice* (Lanham, MD: Sheed & Ward, 2004), 3-18, at 13.

16 William O’Neill, S.J., “Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Forced Displacement,” *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 127:1 (Spring/Summer 2007), 123. O’Neill alludes to the call in *Gaudium et Spes* to “make ourselves the neighbor of every person without exception.” Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes*, 27.

17 Drew Christiansen, S.J., “The Common Good and the Politics of Self-Interest: A Catholic Contribution to the Practice of Citizenship,” in Donald L. Gelpi, S.J., *Beyond Individualism: Toward a Retrieval of Moral Discourse in America* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 54-86, at 82.

18 Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*, 42.

19 Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*, chapter 3.

20 Philip Selznick, *The Moral Commonwealth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 538.

is, in fact, essential to the common good “because different communities center on the pursuit of different components of the complex human good . . . and because no one association can claim to be a perfect community.”²¹ John Courtney Murray utilized the metaphor of conversation to characterize the common good, urging civil conversation about the truths we hold in common across our different “life worlds.”²² Confronted with an atmosphere of religious pluralism whose intellectual experience was confusion, Murray sought not to eliminate pluralism but, as he put it, to clarify real pluralisms so that we would not have “ignorant armies clashing by night,” but persons locked together in genuine argument, a truly *civil* society. More recently, David Hollenbach has termed this common pursuit of a shared vision of the good life “intellectual solidarity.” Utilizing the concept of the common good in an effort to similarly clarify competing values and seriously engage fundamental questions could help move beyond the silos of scholarly inquiry in university settings or the increasingly reductive rhetoric that characterizes contemporary political discourse.

Such intellectual solidarity, Hollenbach contends, is both a demand of human reasonableness and an implication of a distinctively Christian understanding of the human good. Commitment to dialogue remains at once an expression of fidelity to the gospel and respect for the other, and it retains a conviction that there is a truth about the human good that claims us all and that must be pursued. While retaining a thickly situated point of departure, it takes dialogue partners seriously enough to trust that each may learn from one another. This common pursuit of a shared vision of the good life is reflective not only of a conciliar ecclesiology but also of a deliberative democracy model, in contrast to a Rawlsian method of avoidance.

Tendencies to consider morality a private matter challenge the belief that the good of the individual is inseparable from the good of his or her community and diminish concern about the quality of public life.²³ An emphasis on private virtue “minimize[s] the moral substance of our public world, the way our institutions empower or impoverish, emancipate or debase.”²⁴ Beyond moral privatism, the idea of the common good swims against other cultural tides influencing students and faculty alike: whether libertarianism, market fundamentalism, relativism(s), emotivism, or polarizing ideological divisions—each of which hardens resistance to communitarian assumptions and common understandings of shared realities, much less shared goods. The all-American credo that we pull ourselves up by our bootstraps and make our own fate is perhaps as entrenched as it is incompatible with a solidaristic idea that we share each other’s fate. The Catholic conception of the common good radically challenges a culture that prioritizes economic efficiency over solidarity with the weak and marginalized, or

21 Brian Stiltner, *Religion and the Common Good* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 178.

22 See John Courtney Murray, S.J., *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960), esp. 103-139.

23 Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*, 27.

24 Franklin I. Gamwell, “Calling for the Common Good,” *Living Pulpit* 5:2 (April-June 1996), 22-23, at 22.

narrow national interest over global concern. A culture in which “good fences make good neighbors,” either due to intellectual wariness or isolationist fears, significantly hinders deliberative engagement about common goods.

Hence to the extent that contemporary notions of liberal education reflect libertarian or utilitarian perspectives, commitment to the common good orients Catholic higher education on a decidedly different trajectory. Catholic universities’ chief concern is neither cultivating freedom to seek duties we choose nor professional skill building alone. Yet these universities’ transcendent orientation may prove valuable rather than threatening to secular disciplines in the face of complex challenges; as one example, leading climate change specialists have admitted the planet’s chief environmental problems may not be biodiversity loss or ecosystem collapse but greed and apathy, requiring a spiritual transformation that climate science and policy paradigms alone remain ill equipped to address.²⁵ At the same time a rights-based conception of the common good in the Catholic tradition has been a developing one undergoing expansion, refinement, and in some cases reversals. Robust interdisciplinary exchange can help ensure the common good tradition remains sufficiently attentive to evolving demands, insights from others, and distorting blind spots. Hence an invitation to join commitments to intellectual solidarity with a praxis of intellectual hospitality may explicitly signal that inclusive dialogue cannot remain on “our” terms if it is to remain true dialogue and foster genuine encounter.

Praxis of Intellectual Hospitality: Interdisciplinary Exchange at the Growing Edges

Hence the substantive and procedural dimensions of the common good tradition serve to critique not only market models of education but also broader cultural currents that influence today’s students: from expressive individualism, to moral privatism, to cultures of indifference. At the same time, Catholic universities would do well to galvanize collaboration across the disciplines to refine traditional understandings and applications of the concept of the common good. For grasping the common good necessarily falls short on this side of the eschaton. The good life of the Aristotelian *polis* held appeal as long as you were not a woman or a slave. Intentionally widening the conversation could help alert Catholic intellectual communities to what common good talk obscures and whom it excludes, illuminating barriers to its apprehension and approximation. If disordered loves or apparent goods can attract thinkers of any or no faith tradition, given finitude and sin are as universal as human dignity, inclusive dialogue can facilitate the concrete apprehension of the good and true. For example, dialogue between philosophy and theology and the social sciences could yield deeper understandings of the ways structures and ideologies interact to limit one’s grasp and pursuit of shared goods. Exchanges with literature and the arts can alert participants to the role that narratives, artifacts, and aesthetic experiences play in shaping imagination around shared goods. Attention to insights from gender studies and critical race studies can serve to interrogate the

25 Daniel Crockett, “Connection Will Be the Next Big Human Trend,” *Huffington Post*, August 22, 2014.

classical subject and shed light upon whose “equal rights” remain unequally violated. Fostering interdisciplinary approaches in curricula and research, together with opportunities for global and local experiential learning, holds promise for reinvigorating the common good in the context of Catholic higher education and enhancing the education of integrated persons. In the section that follows I signal several growing edges of the common good tradition as it has developed in Catholic thought with attention to ways interdisciplinary engagement contributes to its critical development.

Even where human dignity is affirmed in law or ostensible social consensus about what constitutes common good, we encounter those whose equal dignity is unequally endangered,²⁶ whether in racialized incidents of police violence, repressive abuse of religious minorities, or pervasive exploitation of women. Causality is complex, but in some cases the construal of the ideal subject in traditional reflection has served to harm dignity and freedom. Dialogue with anthropology, sociology, gender studies, critical race studies, and other disciplines can help uncover lacunae or harmful assumptions. In the case of a primary cell of the common good, the family, idealized norms can overlook significant realities and serve to reinforce oppression. Given how thoroughly the sanctity and social mission of the family in the Catholic tradition contest harmful economic and migration practices, attention to them at the recent Synod on the Family was welcome. Yet assumptions about the nature of women and the value of caregiving labor also contribute to harmful patterns.

For the assaulted Guatemalan migrant is victimized not only by her smuggler’s debasing actions but also by harmful attitudes that facilitate such behavior: assumptions about the value of indigenous women or gendered expectations of sexual behavior. Mexican anthropologist Olivia Ruíz Marrujo’s research reveals how gender relations heighten migrants’ susceptibility to misconduct: “in daily conversation [women in southern Mexico] refer to sexual relations with their partners as ‘*cuando hace uso de mi*’—‘when he makes use of me,’” and local emergency rooms regularly treat women rendered unconscious due to domestic violence.²⁷ Influential transnational postures of sexism and violence, as well as more culturally specific norms like *marianismo*, shape women’s and men’s expectations and behaviors in ways that heighten vulnerability. As a result, she notes, “[a]n undocumented Central American woman for whom sexual relations has rarely, if ever, been consensual, may consider a [smuggler] or supervisor’s demand for sex expected male behavior.”²⁸ In a similar vein, sociological research on family life sheds light on how the nanny from Manila who raises the children of working parents

26 William O’Neill, S.J., “No Amnesty for Sorrow: The Privilege of the Poor in Christian Social Ethics,” *Theological Studies* 55:4 (Dec. 1994), 646-47.

27 Olivia Ruíz Marrujo, “The Gender of Risk: Sexual Violence against Undocumented Women,” in *A Promised Land, A Perilous Journey: Theological Perspectives on Migration*, ed. Daniel Groody and Gioacchino Campese (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 225-42, at 232.

28 Marrujo, “The Gender of Risk,” 228.

Attending to interdisciplinary research on the concrete pressures facing families may help Catholics better appreciate the violence, fragility, and cultural forces that directly impact families' lives.

in Manhattan is propelled not only by a global capitalist order to which “commoditized love” belongs but also by assumptions about the nature of caregiving work.²⁹

Hence promoting the well-being of families entails examining not only personal failures and external societal forces that hinder their flourishing but also the Catholic tradition’s own ideals in the service of an effective response to the range of impediments that harm families. Assumptions about the complementarity of the sexes that often lurk below Catholic family ethics bolster unequal burdens for the work of social reproduction with ontological status and religious sanction. Unquestioned conceptions of the nature of women and caregiving work have conspired to make aspects of women’s labor invisible, legitimize a “second shift”—felt most poignantly by women at the bottom economic rungs struggling for their own and their families’ survival—and increasingly pit women against one another in shouldering the work of social production. For example, a lack of shared responsibility for the daunting demands facing mothers in the low-wage workforce is frequently camouflaged by lip service given to a narrow construal of “family values.” As upper- and middle-class women have been liberated from some domestic tasks, in many cases this is accomplished by relying upon low-wage workers, thereby duplicating gendered labor or reinforcing traditional divisions of labor. Whereas one class of women may gain liberation from such tasks in the service of external workplace participation (or leisure), this dynamic ensures that the work remains women’s work. Anthropologist Jennifer Hirsch describes this “outsourcing of caring” in the developed world in vivid, racialized terms: “now the changing of diapers of both the very young and the very old—as well as the cleaning of the toilets of those who are, however temporarily, between Huggies and Depends—is done largely by darker-skinned hands.”³⁰ Attending to interdisciplinary research on the concrete pressures facing families may help Catholic communities of reflection better appreciate the violence, fragility, and cultural forces—beyond relativism or sexual libertarianism—that directly impact families’ lives. This may illuminate how building up families demands social supports that concretely value caregiving work; authentically convey witness to the equal dignity of women and

29 See, for example, Arlie Russell Hochschild, “Love and Gold,” in *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (New York: Holt, 2004), 15-30.

30 Jennifer S. Hirsch, “‘Love Makes a Family’: Globalization, Companionate Marriage, and the Modernization of Gender Inequality,” in Mark B. Padilla, Jennifer S. Hirsch, Miguel Muñoz-Laboy, Robert E. Sember, and Richard G. Parker, eds., *Love and Globalization: Transformations of Intimacy in the Contemporary World* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2007), 93-106, at 103.

women's bodies; and promote economic and migration policies that unite rather than divide families. Such exchange can caution against a narrow focus on marital and sexual norms that obscures social factors harming families or ahistorical portrayals of marriage and family that can issue inadequate ideals.

Findings from neuroscience, evolutionary biology, and moral psychology about the significant role of nonrational factors in the apprehension and pursuit of goods suggest further cause for robust exchange across the disciplines. If, as psychologist Jonathan Haidt has argued, reason is at best riding the “elephant” of our emotions as it seeks to make judgments of conscience, for example, getting arguments about the common good more adequate may be necessary but not sufficient.³¹ Dialogue regarding how emotion, imagination, culture, or the accidents of moral luck shape human discernment would be beneficial for reflection on the pursuit of shared goods in general and moral and student formation in particular. Attending to nonrational factors that inhibit interconnectedness may require further engagement with social science disciplines that shed light on such (structural and ideological) modes of resistance to a sense of coresponsibility. Catholic understandings of discernment on an individual level traditionally assume unencumbered, autonomous agents, overlooking significant contexts that often constrain persons' agency: whether internalized racism, economic desperation, cultural shame, or even habituated indifference. Putting social scientific resources related to constructed identity, internalized borders, structural violence, and the operations and impact of social geometries of power into dialogue with theology and moral philosophy could refine models of agency that more adequately reflect how (real) people morally reason and act. Interdisciplinary exchange could illuminate the complexities of pursuing the common good amid structures that harm and internalized ideologies that conceal.

Insights from sociologists about how structures embody value relationships and operate not only outside of persons but also within them have proven valuable for developing conceptions of social sin in the Catholic tradition, for example.³² Different elements of social sin—dehumanizing trends, unjust structures, and harmful ideologies—shape complex dynamics at play in resistance to an ethic of the common good. In *Evangeliū Gaudium*, Pope Francis warns that our “economy of exclusion and inequality kills.” He rightly challenges not only the reductive market ethos dominating trade and migration policies but also its desensitizing effects: “The culture of prosperity deadens us; we

31 See Jonathan Haidt, “The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment,” *Psychological Review* 108 (2001), 814-834, and Haidt, *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion* (New York: Vintage, 2012). For a discussion about how such findings in moral psychology should impact Catholic understandings of conscience, see Stephen Pope, “Conscience, Catholicism, and the New Science of Morality,” in David E. DeCossé and Kristin E. Heyer, *Conscience & Catholicism: Rights, Responsibilities & Institutional Responses* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 2015), chapter 4.

32 See Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Anchor, 1966), and Gregory Baum, *Religion and Alienation: A Theological Reading of Sociology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1975).

are thrilled if the market offers us something new to purchase; and in the meantime all those lives stunted for lack of opportunity seem a mere spectacle; they fail to move us.”³³ The elevation of wealth and influence to absolute status can become an authentic bondage. Idolatries focused on having over being can directly impede solidarity: they shape loyalties, frame questions, and inform votes and spending practices. If systemic sinfulness takes diverse forms in structures that stifle freedom, impose gross inequality, or facilitate individual selfishness, we might readily imagine various disciplinary approaches to exposing and analyzing these embedded disvalues in social, political, economic, cultural, and religious realms. Universities marked by compassionate reason are well poised to unmask collective lies at the service of solidarity with the crucified, whether idols that conceal demonization amid a climate of anti-refugee or anti-Muslim sentiment, for example, or idols of utility, prestige, autonomy, consumerism—the concrete realms in which the university can serve this unmasking function are myriad.

Pope Francis has coupled his sustained emphasis on exposing and healing social sins with a posture of humility. In his homily on Lampedusa, for example, he emphasized the pervasive idolatry that facilitates migrants’ deaths and robs us of the ability to weep. Amid his admission that even he remains “disoriented,” and his plea for the grace to weep, he did not merely condemn “the world” for this indifference and its consequences but rather repented: “Forgive us Lord!” whether for being closed in on our own well-being in a way that leads to anesthesia of the heart, or making global decisions creating situations that lead to these tragedies.³⁴ The pope’s reflections and symbolism underscore an ongoing need for ecclesial and civic repentance from complicity in injustice. He has continually indicated how naming the reality of sin helps shed light on the structures and attitudes that harm so many victims of “a throwaway culture.”

If nonrational forces play influential roles in our moral reasoning and sinful neglect alike, then attention to shaping the affections and the imagination takes on critical significance. Beyond the welcome use of art, music, and literature in philosophy and theology courses to bring the Catholic intellectual tradition to life, such disciplines have substantive and critical perspectives to contribute to the common good tradition’s growing edges as well. In her *If These Walls Could Talk: Community Muralism and the Beauty of Justice*, Maureen O’Connell outlines ways in which the arts awaken the moral imagination, significant not only for student formation but, in her view, for the “body politic” as Jacques Maritain understood it. The arts facilitate organic associations and affiliations of multi-dimensional selves who come together and discern how we ought to live together so that material and supernatural ends can be met. O’Connell writes that Maritain understood art as a virtue because “it exercises the underutilized aspects of our intellect and perfects our creative abilities so that we might become more fully human in embracing our

33 Pope Francis, apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (2013), 54, at www.vatican.va.

34 Pope Francis, “The Globalization of Indifference,” Vatican Radio (July 8, 2013), www.news.va/en/news/pope-on-lampedusa-the-globalization-of-indifferenc.

Experiences of imagination, creativity, and self-expression, then, are places where persons experience “the good of being a community at all.”

‘personality’ and ‘individuality.’”³⁵ Experiences of imagination, creativity, and self-expression, then, are places where persons experience “the good of being a community at all.” In other words, through the arts we feel community, not simply know it. Drawing upon Philadelphia’s community muralism movement, she suggests that through creativity, we come to know experientially—and not just intellectually—that if we are indeed made in God’s image and likeness, then we do not simply react to the conditions of our lives but rather have the proactive capability to construct them by bringing new things, ideas, energies, perspectives into being in our current situation. Creativity, both individual and collective, serves as a minimum condition for life community or a “common good,” as well as an expression of fulfillment or authenticity via potential for wholeness, integration, and coresponsibility.³⁶

The aesthetic imagination (or “sacramental imaginary”) leavens an overly intellectual understanding of the common good in myriad enriching ways. Further, explicit “mission attention” to various disciplines’ study of beauty could help thicken a sense of Catholic identity beyond social justice concerns, given beauty’s ability to open students to the “quest for the divine,” leading them to the good and true.³⁷

Another growing edge of traditional Catholic thought on the common good relates to its tendency to prioritize unity, harmony and synthesis in ways that circumvent conflict. Some observers have characterized the encyclical tradition’s development of solidarity as marked by caution at the service of safeguarding social peace. Whereas Pope John Paul II acknowledges the changes in lifestyle, established power structures, and models of production and consumption solidarity requires, he “qualifies the radical implications of this claim, emphasizing, in line with his predecessors, that justice will be achieved not by overturning all current economic or social structures, but by re-orienting them to their authentic purposes in service of the common good.”³⁸ Even where he draws

35 Maureen H. O’Connell, *If These Walls Could Talk: Community Muralism and the Beauty of Justice* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 198. She relies upon Jacques Maritain’s *Creative Intuition in Arts & Poetry* (Princeton University Press, 1978), 3-35.

36 O’Connell, *If These Walls Could Talk*, 199-200. For her collection addressing how multimedia works (including portraiture, photography, hip-hop music, and poetry) link moral agency to creativity in resisting degradation and joining beauty to justice and truth, see O’Connell and Laurie Cassidy, eds., *She Who Imagines: Feminist Theological Aesthetics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press), 2012.

37 Anne Clifford, “Identity and Vision at Catholic Colleges and Universities,” *Horizons* 35, no. 2 (2008) 335-379, at 369-70.

38 Christine Firer Hinze, “The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)possibility of Solidarity: Reinhold Niebuhr and Modern Catholic Social Teaching,” *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22.4 (2009), 448, drawing upon John Paul II, encyclical *Centesimus Annus* (1991), 58, online at www.vatican.va.

upon the liberationist preferential option for the poor, he seeks to temper its conflictual implications by emphasizing that solidarity entails collaboration among rich and poor, and among the poor themselves.³⁹ Bryan Massingale's employment of the contributions of Frederick Douglass and Malcolm X as a corrective to this tendency again signals the promise of interdisciplinary exchange. He notes that the African American tradition is severely critical of a "solidarity without social struggle,"⁴⁰ the dominant approach that summons the powerful to care for the weak or presumes that, "imbued with the virtue of solidarity, social elites voluntarily will undertake practices of social dispossession and divestment of privilege."⁴¹ He offers Frederick Douglass's classic expression of this critique and an alternative approach:

If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, yet deprecate agitation, are [people] who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its mighty waters. This struggle may be a moral one; or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but there must be struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will.⁴²

For Massingale, as for Malcolm X, amid contexts of injustice and social conflict, "authentic faith-inspired solidarity forbids an attitude of neutrality and demands an unambiguous commitment on behalf of the victims of injustice."⁴³ His insistence that genuine solidarity cannot evade conflict if it is to serve social transformation is especially relevant to the exploitative injustices of the global economy and its racially charged causes and consequences. In light of these insights from "outsiders," Massingale proposes a "conflictual solidarity" takes seriously how the virtue is lived in the midst of reality marked by social conflict and attuned to exploited subjects who bear God's image.⁴⁴ Given the lie that accompanies injustice, warnings that social Catholicism underestimates "both the recalcitrance of the privileged and the potential power of the dispossessed" are well

39 Hinze, "The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)possibility of Solidarity," 447.

40 Other observers level similar critiques, as Massingale notes: William K. Tabb, "John Paul II and Fidel Castro: Two Views of Development," and Mary E. Hobgood, "Conflicting Paradigms in Social Analysis," both in *The Logic of Solidarity: Commentaries on Pope John Paul's Encyclical "On Social Concern,"* ed. Gregory Baum and Robert Ellsberg (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1989) as cited in Bryan Massingale, "Vox Victimarum, Vox Dei: Malcolm X as a Neglected 'Classic' for Catholic Theological Reflection," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 65 (2010): 63-88, at 82.

41 Massingale, "Vox Victimarum, Vox Dei," 81-2. Like Malcolm X, Martin Luther King was convinced that "privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily." Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (April 16, 1963).

42 Frederick Douglass, "West Indian Emancipation Speech," August 4, 1857. The text of this address can be found in Lerone Bennett, Jr., *Before the Mayflower: A History of Black America*, Fifth Edition (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), 160-1.

43 Massingale, "Vox Victimarum, Vox Dei," 83.

44 Massingale, "Vox Victimarum, Vox Dei," 83-4. Sally Scholz similarly characterizes "political solidarity" as oppositional in nature and informed by the influence of strong moral obligations. Sally J. Scholz, *Political Solidarity* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 2008), 36.

taken. Such recalcitrance may “yield only in the face of sustained demands, determined pressure, ideological struggle, and nonviolent social conflict.”⁴⁵ Massingale has described cross-racial solidarity as entailing lament, compassion, and transformative love in order to avoid merely “superficial palliatives that leave the deep roots of justice undisturbed.”⁴⁶ Engagement with the history of social movements or diaspora studies might further contribute to this corrective strain at the service of seeking the common good in situations of significant injustice and disparity.

Given the depth and lure of resistance to the steep challenge solidarity imparts and the isolating and insulating temptations of the academy, intentionally cultivating an “incarnational solidarity” to complement intellectual and conflictual solidarities remains critical to formation for the common good. In the face of the cultural currents outlined above, some observers describe the reception of recent Catholic teaching on solidarity as “inconsistent, superficial or non-existent.”⁴⁷ Many factors contribute to such “moral torpor,” such as the privatization and domestication of sin more generally⁴⁸ and the distancing that geography, social circumstance, and informational ambiguity impart.⁴⁹

Christine Firer Hinze’s evocative metaphors for the reach of consumerism reflect both the idolatrous and concealing features outlined above: she writes of a culture whose “kudzu-like values and practices so crowd the landscape of daily lives that solidarity finds precious little ground in which to take root.”⁵⁰ She highlights consumerist culture’s use of seduction and misdirection to

lay a soothing, obfuscating mantle over systemic injustices that solidarity would expose, [as] its participants are fitted with Oz-like lenses, fed a stream of distractions and novelties, and situated in a 24/7 schedule of work-spend-consume that virtually ensures they will ‘pay no attention’ to the suffering multitudes behind the curtain.⁵¹

Incarnational solidarity departs from valuable intellectual and institutional dimensions of solidarity to undertake embodied practices of presence and service in the real world. Hinze describes the virtue in terms of “cultivating concrete, habitual ways of acknowledging our we-ness by being *with* the neighbor, especially the suffering and needy neighbor.” She distinguishes incarnational solidarity from the “cheap, ‘virtual,’

45 Bryan N. Massingale, “The Scandal of Poverty: ‘Cultured Indifference’ and the Option for the Poor Post-Katrina,” in *Journal of Religion and Society* Supplement Series 4, ed. Dennis Hamm, S.J., and Gail S. Risch (Omaha: The Kripke Center, 2008), 55-72, at 61.

46 Bryan Massingale, *Racial Justice and the Catholic Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 120.

47 Hinze, “The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)possibility of Solidarity,” 448.

48 See John Mahoney, *The Making of Moral Theology: A Study of the Roman Catholic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1987.

49 Hinze, “The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)possibility of Solidarity,” 448.

50 Christine Firer Hinze, “Straining toward Solidarity in a Suffering World: *Gaudium et Spes* ‘After Forty Years,’” in William Madges, ed., *Vatican II: Forty Years Later*, College Theology Society Annual Volume 51 (Maryknoll: Orbis Press, 2005), 165-95, at 180.

51 Hinze, “Straining toward Solidarity in a Suffering World,” 181-82.

or sentimental forms of solidarity proffered by a consumerist culture and economy.”⁵² Such virtual solidarity legitimates the consumer’s subjectivity rather than disrupts it. As Vincent Miller distinguishes:

[u]nlike the symbolic solidarity of consumption, real solidarity requires the effort of departing from the well-worn channels of our lifestyle niches. We must make time in our daily routines, travel to parts of town we do not frequent, struggle with language barriers, wrestle with just what we want from or for these other people who have their own lives and projects. This is both inconvenient and excruciating. It is much easier to have them [streaming on our iPhone] as we write a check to a relief organization [or prompting us to “like” their cause or retweet their appeal] and go on living lives largely untroubled by their struggles.⁵³

Technology conspires to distance us at least as much as genuinely connect. Constant media exposure to news stories about global suffering not only serves to desensitize but deceive students into equating such awareness of social injustice with actual solidarity with others.⁵⁴ Opportunities immersive and community-based learning provide to encounter the realities of suffering persons and accompany them can productively challenges students’ paradigms for understanding social problems and solutions. Encounters by way of experience are frequently more likely to interrupt complacency and reform imaginations than abstract principles or their carefully crafted corollaries. Dean Brackley terms opportunities to “act ourselves into new ways of thinking” cognitive hygiene, emphasizing the importance of engagement at the level of practice in order to adequately challenge intellectual and moral commitments.⁵⁵

Catholic education must become ever more informed by mutual dialogue not only across disciplines, then, but with the “existential extremities.” Pope Francis has sounded this call with clarity and intensity, from his primary identification of those on the periphery with the gospel to his preference for a street-bound over a risk-averse and “self-referential” Church. Many Catholic universities’ justice education programs resonate with the culture of encounter the pope has emphasized, poised to pop the soap bubbles of indifference in which faculty and students alike can remain trapped. Ensuring we remain open to God’s ongoing communication across the planet demands universities train not cultural warriors, triumphalist in possession of truth, but ambassadors and border-crossers, open to conversion by the suffering and resilience of those in need.

52 Hinze, “Straining toward Solidarity in a Suffering World,” 174.

53 Vincent Miller, *Consuming Religion: Christian Faith and Practice in a Consumer Culture* (New York: Continuum, 2005), 137. For an analysis of Internet tech that closely parallels Miller’s commodification critique see Jaron Lanier, *You Are Not a Gadget: A Manifesto* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010).

54 Christine D. Pohl, *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1999), 91.

55 Dean Brackley, S.J., “Higher Standards for Higher Education: The Christian University and Solidarity,” address delivered at Creighton University, November 4, 1999.

Ensuring we remain open to God's ongoing communication across the planet demands universities train ambassadors and border-crossers, open to conversion by the suffering and resilience of those in need.

Finally, Catholic graduate schools, where faculty and students are directly in dialogue with the culture of the profession students are training to enter, bringing the Catholic tradition and disciplinary insights into mutual clarification, show similar promise.⁵⁶ Whereas the paradigms of law, business, engineering, education, nursing, public health, and medicine typically exclude religious perspectives, they remain ripe for interdisciplinary cross-fertilization about concrete approximations of the common good. For instance, a common good framework could inform standard protocols in vaccine trials or engineering design plans to consider how well various stakeholders understand the meaning of the risk or consent at issue. The paradigm could also suggest how social virtues can complement “preventive ethics” approaches to professional (mis)conduct.⁵⁷ Even in professions that idealize “value-free” stances, “the capacity to engage in respectful and productive dialogue across religious differences becomes an essential aspect of any effort to develop the nexus between religious resources, professional decision making, and pursuing the ideals of justice and the common good in society.”⁵⁸

Whether in graduate or undergraduate university settings, barriers to robust intellectual and social engagement around the common good include not only theoretical suspicions or cultural obstacles but also intra-institutional constraints. James Keenan has recently lamented that universities’ governance structures, marked as they are by “fiefdoms,” hinder the cultivation of a university-wide culture of ethics.⁵⁹ Addressing “the growing inhospitality of hyperspecialization” of the disciplines and the seclusion of academic from student affairs will also prove critical to advancing the endeavors proposed herein. As Haughey puts it,

One of the negative outcomes that can result from the balkanization of academia is a fragmentation of meaning and purpose, which runs contrary to the unitary purposes of academic institutions. If the term university means anything, it

⁵⁶ See Amelia J. Uelmen, “A Response to Kenneth Garcia: Where They Are, Just as They Are,” *Theological Studies* 73 (December 2012), 909-923, on Catholic legal education in this respect. See also Michael James, Thomas Masters, and Amy Uelmen, *Education's Highest Aim: Teaching and Learning through a Spirituality of Communion* (Hyde Park, NY: New City, 2010), 97-101.

⁵⁷ See, e.g., Charles E. Harris, Jr., “The Good Engineer: Giving Virtue its Due in Engineering Ethics,” *Science and Engineering Ethics* 14 (2008), 153-164.

⁵⁸ Uelmen, “Where They Are, Just as They Are,” 919.

⁵⁹ James Keenan, S.J., *University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

must be vectored toward the unitary. Catholic universities in particular must be institutions that have time for otherness, whatever form it may take, and be open to learn from the guests they have chosen to host.⁶⁰

Catholic universities would do well, then, to consider how to better support efforts to cross traditions and language games; understand theory and praxis as interdependent rather than incommensurate pursuits; integrate discussions of the values promoted in a new core and the climate of student life outside the classroom; or concretely value the efforts of scholars as public intellectuals. Commitment to the common good orients universities to questions of justice within as well as beyond their institutions.

Tensions between preserving a core subculture (or “pure remnant”) and a more universalistic notion of catholicity remain when it comes to the task of balancing Catholic identity with institutional pluralism. Yet on this model of a praxis of intellectual humility, thick theological particularism and efforts in pursuit of the common good need not be mutually exclusive. Amidst exile in Babylon, Jeremiah brought the Israelites a new word:

Build houses and live in them. Plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof . . . And seek the welfare of the city in which I have placed you in exile, for in its welfare you will find your welfare. Seek the shalom of the city in which I have placed you in exile, for in its shalom you will find your shalom. (Jer 29: 4-9)

With a biblical understanding that Christians will realize our own good with reference to the common good, former Fuller Theological Seminary President Richard Mouw has reflected “We will realize our own shalom as we seek the shalom of the city in which God has placed us.”⁶¹ Methods that join “tradition-constituted,” particularist contributions with open, self-critical, mutual engagement not only invite diverse stakeholders into a common project but also help shield Catholicism from ideological distortion from within.⁶²

This proposal may risk hopeless idealism, facile reconciliation, or dilettantism in the eyes of some. It may pitch too big a tent given the specter of secularizing drifts in others’. Admittedly critical retrievals of the Catholic tradition, development of its growing edges,

60 Haughey, *Where Is Knowing Going*, 36.

61 Richard Mouw, “Evangelical Protestants in the Public Square: Drawbacks and Opportunities,” Annual Lecture on Prophetic Voices of the Church, Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life, Boston College (April 10, 2003), 1-17, at 10; transcript available at www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/centers/boisi/pdf/s03/Prophetic%20Voices%202003%20-%20Mouw.pdf.

62 Werner Jeanrond, “Theology in the Context of Pluralism and Postmodernity: David Tracy’s Theological Method,” in *Postmodernism, Literature, and Theology*, ed. David Jasper (London: Macmillan Press, 1993), 143-63, at 145. David Tracy’s models of “classic” and “conversation,” like Hollenbach’s “intellectual solidarity,” help ensure that Catholic public engagement remains firmly grounded in Catholic identity and takes seriously the temporal on its own terms. See Tracy, “Defending the Public Character of Theology,” *The Christian Century* 98 (April 1981), 350-6. Johan Verstraeten has similarly argued that Catholic social thought “should preserve the tradition but remain open to new insights and new forms, some of which will come from other traditions and from secular thought, even if at first they seem incommensurable.” See Verstraeten, “Rethinking Catholic Social Thought as Tradition,” in *Catholic Social Thought: Twilight or Renaissance?* ed. J.S. Boswell, F.P. McHugh, and J. Verstraeten (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 59-77.

and interdisciplinary collaboration already ensue in certain fields (like theological ethics) or institutional practices (like core renewal). Yet these practices and the depth of their significance do not shape the typical perception of the role of the Catholic intellectual heritage in the life of the university, particularly for “unusual suspects.” Highlighting such undertakings and making explicit such commitments in terms of mission integration initiatives could help universities reach new participants, form integrated students, and serve the common good of the civic and ecclesial communities in which universities take part. Engaging substantive and procedural modes of the Catholic common good tradition with virtues of solidarity and epistemological humility invites participants to embody gospel hospitality in university communities in a spirit of prophetic courage and hope.