

NEWMAN AND INTERCONNECTEDNESS: INTEGRATION AND UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Abstract

Prompted by Newman's advocacy of interconnectedness as a goal for Catholic university education, this article links integration as a major life-task with integration as a priority for university education. First, I explain what I mean by integration as a task for each of us before commenting on what Newman has to say about integration in university learning. Then I present five types of challenge that must be taken into account if integration is to be pursued seriously as a priority in university. Finally I indicate some of the ways that faculty might set about addressing these challenges.

I write as a committed (if sometimes uncomfortable and critical) insider to the Catholic tradition, aiming to draw out a particular implication of a Catholic worldview for the priorities addressed in university education. There is a legitimate plurality of views as to what are the key features of this tradition. Even when agreement can be reached as to the constitutive features, there remains a significant degree of disagreement, both as regards their relative priorities and as to how these priorities should be implemented in practice. Views about Catholicism are contentious, not only within the Church, but even more so within society more generally.

This applies to many students and staff in Catholic universities, only some of whom attend because they subscribe to the faith that is meant to underpin those educational communities. Present in the mix there will likely be people of many faiths and some people who do not subscribe to any form of religion. While some members of such universities do wish to deepen their understanding of and commitment to faith and therefore are open to faith development initiatives, many will be indifferent to these opportunities and some will resist them vigorously. Nevertheless, it remains the case that one can (and one should) draw out educational implications from the Catholic tradition and take steps to breathe life into them at Catholic universities, so long as these educational opportunities are offered and experienced as invitations, not as impositions. The particular educational priority that is the focus of this paper is one that is, in many respects, shared by Christians of different denominations and also by many Jews and Muslims.

The curriculum subject Religious Education (RE) can be distinguished from the various processes that are involved in faith education and development. The focus for RE is on literacy about religion, information and concepts; RE does not depend on prior commitment; it does not assume membership of any particular faith. Its goal is to promote understanding about religious matters: the stories, scriptures, beliefs, practices, traditions and customs associated with a religion, or, more often in recent years, religions in the plural. RE aims to promote informed and intelligent thinking about a religion rather than fidelity to it. It is led by the norms of education rather than by those of the Gospel.

When it comes to faith education, the phrase 'educating faith' can have two slightly different emphases. The first puts the focus on how a set of activities can make someone's faith more educated in some way: for example, move from being accepted to being understood, from being passive to being more thoughtful, critical, reflective, better informed, more coherent, able to deal with objections. The second puts the focus on allowing one's engagement in the life of faith to educate one: that is, to change one for the better, by crossing the threshold of revelation to see a new world, deepening one's commitment, strengthening one's character, influencing the whole person, not only the mind, but also the affections and the will, including how we treat the body. This is a different activity to RE, but one that can be at least partly assisted and prompted by it, for example by the critical questioning and deeper understanding of religious matters facilitated by RE. Similarly, engagement in faith development activities can provide experiences that can usefully feed into and be reflected upon in RE. I have argued elsewhere (Sullivan, 2010a) that one should

not turn the distinction between education and evangelisation into a total separation, indicating several ways that these two activities can mutually reinforce each other.¹

1. The task of integration

We all face the challenge of integration in our lives – becoming one, whole, comprehensive (catholic) person: ordering our drives, needs and desires; coordinating our gifts, inclinations and talents; integration through establishing a proper balance of attention both to self and to others; moving towards personal integration. Body, mind, emotions, conscience, spirit, intelligence – all of these need to be gradually built into one ‘building,’ a temple of God’s Spirit, oriented to God’s Kingdom, so that we grow ever more from being an image into a very particular and unique likeness of God.

Educational work for the church calls for both the example of personal integration (in our behavior and in our modeling of discipleship) and the facilitation of conceptual integration, where all elements of knowledge are shown to interact on each other, rather than offer a fragmented curriculum. For catechists, clergy, teachers and others there needs to be a blend or integration of intellectual development, spiritual development and professional/pedagogical development. Classroom and educational work needs to be envisaged in terms that can be integrated with Kingdom work, professionalism with discipleship. This applies as much in Catholic universities as in Catholic primary and secondary schools. Our personal and spiritual standards and yardsticks should mesh with, be displayed in, and find themselves integrated into our academic and professional standards and yardsticks; the personal/spiritual and the academic/professional should not operate in isolation from each other, nor, of course, should they work in opposition to each other. This will not be easy. On the way to achieving it there will be pain, difficulties and tension.

Education, throughout history, and in any culture, no matter which worldview prevails in a particular time or place, is about the capacities of human nature and how these are developed, oriented, ordered and integrated. These capacities include energy, emotions, intelligence, memory, will, conscience and wonder. While these elements within human beings may be understood differently at different times, and despite the fact that some elements may receive emphasis while others are relatively neglected, nevertheless, all necessarily play a part in our human condition and each of them will both exert influence and be subject to influence during any process of education, whether formal or informal. Even as we might focus, for example, in higher education, on sharpening the mind, on training the intellect, on prompting critical thinking, the faculty seeking to pursue such goals will themselves be people with a ‘hinterland’ of all of the other elements and capacities - other than mind or intellect - aspects of their being which simultaneously work to enhance and to obstruct, to filter and to modify what it is they are teaching. Who we are can get in the way of what we teach, with the effect that the message we seek to convey cannot properly be heard. On the other hand, even when our grasp of what we seek to teach is weaker than it ought to be, and when our professional skill-set and repertoire are more limited than they should be, the cumulative effect of all the other elements of our being can sometimes make up for these defects – again because who we are as persons conveys more than the sum of the verbal or intellectual ‘messages’ we try to transmit. In the armory of a wise teacher there must be self-knowledge and an awareness of how the content of her teaching is being mediated by the nature of her character and personality, for better or worse.

John Henry Newman was a strong advocate of the need to be alert to the multiple dimensions of our nature and attentive to the call of integration, in the ways I have indicated above. He contributed importantly to our thinking on such topics as how faith and reason are related, how historical appreciation and understanding of doctrine develops, how lay people have a crucial part to play in safeguarding the church, how we relate to God, how theology joins other disciplines in the university, learning from them but also contributing to their learning. He championed the sacredness of conscience and its role in helping us become tuned to God. He gave excellent advice about the importance of balancing the needs of the mind, the needs of our spirit and the needs of belonging to the community. He brought out some key features of an education that is worthwhile, that makes us better people, that equips us for the important things in life.

He was a strong believer in the centrality of personal influence, heart speaking to heart; he envisaged teaching as one life touching another life. "Persons influence us, voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us," he said in his *Grammar of Assent*, a book that continues to be very important for religious educators in the church (Newman, 1979, p.89). He would agree that the teacher needs self-knowledge. "To gain religious starting points, we must interrogate our hearts, our consciences, the God who dwells there," he said in his letters and diaries. There is for him an intellectual component to faith, one that needs to be cultivated, but it is only *one* component, not the whole. He was deeply aware of the 'hinterland' within, the many dimensions of our lives that provide a foundation for our intellectual operations, operations that are never as autonomous or logical as we might like to pretend.

Newman is an exemplary defender of the essential unity of knowledge, believing that every area of investigation points to and depends upon its source and goal – God (Newman, 1912, pp.45, 47, 50 – 51, 99, 137). His ideal outcome from university education is

a true enlargement of the mind ... the power of viewing many things at once as a whole, of referring them severally to their true place in the universal system, of understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence (Newman, 1912, p.137).

Furthermore, a university

professes to assign to each study which it receives, its proper place and its just boundaries; to define the rights, to establish the mutual relations and to effect the intercommunion of one and all. To keep in check the ambitious and encroaching, and to succor and maintain those which from time to time are succumbing under the more popular or the more fortunately circumstanced; to keep the peace between them all, and to convert their mutual differences and contrarities into the common good (Newman, 1912, pp.457-8).

Clearly, in this vision for a university, the pressures of the market must not rule the construction of the curriculum! For Newman, enlargement of mind and strengthening and deepening of spirit go hand in hand. He has a noble vision of education but also a realistic one. On the need for integration he still has much to teach us. He offers us a vision of an approach to education and to educating faith that is engaged, experiential and imaginative; it is concrete, rather than abstract; it is very much living and personal knowledge that he promotes. For him, we might say, religious education is in the business of realization, making real. In his life and writings we see intermingled and integrated the interplay of memory, habit, active and critical thinking, prayer, imagination, feeling, belonging, the voice of conscience, our aesthetic sense, the mysterious workings of grace and the part played by theology and doctrine and the church, plus the power of witness.

I have been arguing that education must support the task of personal integration and that to do so it must take into account the whole person.

An all-round education seeks to develop every aspect of the individual: social, intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual. For there is an *ecology of human growth* which means that if any of these is overlooked, all the others suffer (John Paul II, quoted by D'Orsa & D'Orsa, 2010, p.177).

I have also argued that integration must be striven for both at the personal and the conceptual level. Thus, on the one hand, education should address, work upon and deploy the multiple dimensions of our personhood; on the other hand, it should assist learners (which means all of us) in relating the different kinds of truth we come to know.

Without the first kind of integration, it is likely that many educational efforts will be unbalanced, unhealthy or infertile. Without the second kind of integration we gain at best a very limited, fragmented and distorted picture of truth. For Christians the salvific truth to be found in Scripture and in the life of the church must be related to all the other kinds of truth we find in the world.

There are three reasons that drive efforts to connect these different kinds of truth. First, our use of and response to the truths to be found in the world need to be illuminated and guided by God's offer of salvation. Second, the religious truths we learn in Scripture and the church are not to be preserved for a precious, isolated and 'holy' part of life; they are to be applied and embodied in our negotiations with all aspects of our earthly existence and the truths associated with these aspects, material, economic, scientific, political, social, cultural and so forth. Third, the truths we learn from studying aspects of the world can illuminate and help us more effectively penetrate and appreciate the truths of salvation to be found in Scripture and the church.

2. Challenges

Any attempt to promote integration as one of the principal tasks of life must face the fact that we are confronted by compartmentalization. Alasdair MacIntyre comments on this feature of our existence:

Each of the separate spheres of activity through which individuals pass in the course of a day or a week or a month has its own distinctive culture, its own modes of relationship, its own specific norms. ... [A]s individuals pass from home and family to workplace to school to leisure-time activities and to political or religious associations, they become adroit in leaving behind the roles, norms, and attitudes appropriate to the sphere that they have just left and assuming those of the sphere that they are about to enter (MacIntyre, 2001, p.15).

He laments that, as a result of the pervasive effects of compartmentalization, it has become increasingly difficult for people to find a way to see life whole, with all its parts interconnected; there is no natural position from which to establish an overall perspective and to make evaluative judgments in relation to some architectonic, all-embracing (and external) standard. He wants students to be helped by their university education to integrate all aspects of what they are learning and all aspects of their lives. He takes into account their learning "in the language laboratory and in the chapel, on the basketball court and in the library, in the social relationships of the residence hall and in those of the philosophy seminar" (MacIntyre, 2001, p.18). A random collection of experts does not, in his view, make for a university as understood in the Catholic tradition. Jean Bethke Elshtain supports his advocacy of integration as a major goal in education: "the student who is formed within an integrative context can, if all has gone well, stand back and assess the standards of human flourishing she has absorbed. Integration offers notions of a plurality of goods as well as ways to evaluate these goods" (Elshtain, 2001, p.136.) For Elshtain, what is at stake here is the formation of the character of the student, what kind of person she is becoming. I will return to this in my final section.

Compartmentalization is a well-established pattern within our universities, partly an outcome of a very understandable division of labor between scholars. Aspiring academics learn to see the world through the eyes of their particular discipline and can, in the process, remain ignorant of, perhaps even dismissive of, the methods and insights of other disciplines. Jensen notes the "tendency of disciplines to overextend their valid scope and lose sight of the conceptual limitations built into their formative metaphors" (Jensen, 2009, p.44). He proposes five reasons for universities to strive to develop interdisciplinary and integrative work. I quote them in full to bring out the force of the case for integration. Without taking the full measure of the case for integration it would be only too easy to cave in before the very real challenges such integration is bound to face. Jensen argues against being satisfied with the current division of labor.

Even when disciplines are operating on their own turf – on the very problems and phenomena they are created to address – they still cannot offer an exclusive and exhaustive account of what they describe or analyze. 2) Academic disciplines are self-promoting institutions perpetually competing for resources and prestige. Even the research practices and root metaphors of these disciplines are apt to be affected by these dynamics. 3) Academic disciplines serve the broader society, or at least derive their ultimate significance through connections with society. Their structures are apt to reflect the sins and pathologies of the wider society of which they are a part. 4) Academic foundational metaphors are not conceived arbitrarily; probably without exception they reflect some valid and significant feature of reality in their very conception. But our world is complex and multi-dimensional; these metaphors are

not inevitable, and they are always subject to re-negotiation and improvement. 5) There really is such a thing as 'methodological atheism,' and some aspects of academic knowledge reflect a deliberate attempt to marginalize religious authority. Academic scholars should not simply take the workings of their own discipline for granted, and assume that faith integration is merely a special task for those interested in interdisciplinary research (Jensen, 2009, p.54).

In addition to Jensen's cogent argument for integration in the university, John Paul II (1996, p.15) also claims that integration should be a key feature of a Catholic university (along with a dialogue between faith and reason, an ethical concern and a theological perspective). In *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (p.6) he calls for scholars to relate all aspects of the truth they investigate to the supreme Truth, who is God. He wants students to develop an organic vision of reality and their teachers to demonstrate that they have integrated faith and life and linked professional competence with Christian wisdom (John Paul II, 1996, pp.18 – 19).

There are many challenges to be faced when one considers what is entailed in promoting integration in education. In this paper I briefly outline and comment on five types of difficulty or challenge. These relate, respectively, first, to the amount of subject matter to be covered, second, to relationships between the disciplines, third, to the multiple dimensions of being a person and how subjectivity impinges on scholarship, fourth, to theological differences among Christians, and fifth, to the need for what Newman called 'elbow room' or sufficient psychological 'space' and time for individual learning to occur in freedom.

One difficulty stems from the sheer amount of subject matter to be taken into account. There seems simply too much to get to know. Mastering a body of knowledge to a level where one may justifiably be confident that one can discern its essential features, key concepts, internal structures, modes of reasoning and approaches to testing for reality is demanding enough. Without that degree of knowledge one cannot claim to have entered in any adequate way into an academic discipline. If one then attempts to integrate even a single area of knowledge with another area of knowledge, no sound bridges can be built between them without solid foundations on both sides of the bridge. Is there time, in the relatively limited period of formal and accredited study, to do justice to two areas of knowledge, let alone more than two? In addition to the problem of time, this difficulty raises the specter that learning will be superficial, in that, inevitably, in order to make room for addressing more than one subject area, there will have to be compromises with regard to curriculum coverage, compromises that put in jeopardy the attainment of appropriate depth of penetration.

A second kind of difficulty is that, if integration is taken to be an educational imperative, depending on their current position (with regard to prestige, funding and the potential rewards available), one discipline might slip into displaying an imperialistic attitude towards other disciplines, lacking humility and failing to display reciprocity in being willing to learn. If the relationship between disciplines turns out to be unilateral, with one subject area providing an agenda, or criteria for judgment, or key concepts, for another, this will reduce the scope for all to contribute as valuably as they might. It will be reductionist in another sense too, leading interpretation in one discipline or field to be carried out according to the canons, norms, rationality and priorities of a different one, thereby failing to respect the appropriate degree of autonomy of other disciplines. Ultimately, one cannot claim full autonomy for any discipline; conceptually, each one is interdependent on at least some others and speaking theologically, each, under God, has only a derived or relative autonomy (see Losinger, 1997).

Newman was well aware that, where there is no proper balance within the circle of knowledge, academics are likely to claim more than is appropriate for their own particular discipline and acknowledge less than is appropriate for disciplines outside their own. He argued that theology had a rightful place in the circle of knowledge, that when theology is omitted, other disciplines tend to exceed their jurisdiction. Of course, it is also possible that theology itself will act in an imperialistic manner, dictating to other disciplines, or at least unduly constraining them. Even in a situation where no single discipline dominates, the integrative imperative can be open to the danger that it invites undue competition and conflict between disciplines as they come together to produce a jointly constructed curriculum. Humility, restraint and openness to the

other are needed here, as well as well-grounded confident advocacy of the special insights and methods of any particular discipline (see Sullivan, 2010, 183 – 199).

A third kind of difficulty that can arise when academics aim to give high priority to integration in education is that they can be tempted to over-emphasize the conceptual and cognitive aspect of knowledge and neglect other dimensions that play a part in our coming to know. Also to be taken into account in the integrative process in education, there is the role of the body, affect, relationships, community, ways of living, the company we keep, aesthetic considerations and the sheer serendipity of experience. Knowledge has multiple strands, strands it is often almost impossible to unravel.

As scholars, each of us operates from a complex personal *habitus*. This *habitus* is an acquired pattern of thoughts, judgment, outlook, values, behavior and taste, a pattern that emerges gradually as an outcome of how we internalize standards and expectations from exemplars and significant others, but also from the culture around us and the social structures that surround us. Thus “our ideas and values are connected to each other in complicated webs of relation and reference that have as much to do with our autobiographies as with pure logic” (Jacobsen, 2004, p.56). Our interests, hopes and fears are intermingled with both our seeking and our finding. Our thoughts are influenced by our bodily and emotional states (Pelias, 2004; Springer, 2009). Our subjectivity saturates our scholarship.

To be adequately self-reflexive we need to work hard to detect how our attention, perceptions, thinking, priorities, judgments and evaluations are linked to our location and context, our commitments and aversions. Our priorities are modified by our allegiances and affiliations, and the arguments that we find persuasive are linked both to the worldviews we inhabit and the plausibility structures that are significant for us. Our practices carry the seeds of future knowledge within them; they are not simply applications of what we have already come to know. As Iain McGilchrist says, quoting Lakoff and Johnson, “our conceptual systems draw largely upon the commonalities of our bodies and of the environments we live in” (McGilchrist, 2009, p.149). There is an unavoidable interconnectedness between the different dimensions of our being and the complex ways we come to know. No one was more aware of this than the French Catholic lay philosopher, Maurice Blondel (1861-1949) (see Blanchette, 2010). In the midst of his huge panorama of the pilgrimage of the human spirit across creation towards God, Blondel points out that “matter is that which can be vitalized, life is that which can be spiritualized and the spirit is that which is capable of aspiring to God and can be deified by grace” (Blondel, 1935, p.263; see also Sullivan, 1988, pp.60 - 83).

It can be assumed too automatically that what is being integrated is faith and learning, with the intellectual dimension of both being intended. But there are other kinds of integration to be considered too: body and soul, learning and love, learning and hope, faith and justice, mind and heart. In the mix of learning we should aspire not only to equip students to become acute and discerning map-readers, capable of interpreting and using the accumulated knowledge made available through the various academic disciplines. We should also prepare them to become map-makers, stretching boundaries of knowledge, taking it into new fields and making new connections of their own. Integrative efforts in education can include linking critical appreciation of tradition with creative appropriations of it. Other kinds of integration seek to bring together faith and culture, knowledge and ethics, and coordinating the needs of individuals with the needs of society.

A fourth difficulty is to adopt too quickly some available strongly argued approach to integration, without taking into account possible alternative ways of envisaging the task of integration. It must not be assumed that there is only one, obvious approach to or paradigm for integration. Douglas and Rhonda Jacobsen draw attention to the diversity of Christian models of integration, for example, Calvinist/Reformed, Catholic, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Pentecostal, Anabaptist, commenting that “some of the core theological concerns of non-Reformed Christian traditions simply do not translate into integration-speak” (Jacobsen, 2004, p.26). There is much scope here for ecumenical learning. Different Christian traditions relate doctrine and intellectual expression of faith, community, worship, and service in different ways, so that the

interaction of scripture, tradition, reason, faith, and action intermingle in subtle and complexly contrasting patterns. Given that revelation – its nature, scope and relationship to ‘ordinary’ knowledge - is understood differently in the various Christian traditions, it is inevitable that Christian approaches to integration in education will be affected by these differences of emphasis. In analyzing the way that different spiritual traditions have implications for academic life, the Jacobsens provide a succinct summary:

The contemplative tradition reminds us of the need to make room for divine mystery in our academic interpretations of the world. The holiness tradition points to the fact that the habits we cultivate ... have the potential to shape our scholarship in subtle ways for good or for ill. The charismatic tradition underscores the fact that reality can surprise us: miracles can happen. It also reminds us that one need not be a scholar in order to be used powerfully by God. The social justice tradition implies that virtually all our scholarship has ethical implications and asks whether our work truly benefits the poor and needy of the world. The evangelical tradition suggests that scholarship connects with faith most powerfully in the practice of apologetics – explaining the world intelligently in a way that promotes belief and submission to God’s will for our lives and for the world as a whole. The incarnational tradition encourages us to put academic resources to work in the service of ordinary human beings and to find the holy in the ordinary structures of the world (Jacobsen, 2004, p.93).

The Jacobsens point out that there can be close connections between an emphasis on worldview – marked in some Christian traditions, but not in others – and the place of theory within academic disciplines. The role of worldview features more prominently in many Protestant works on integration in Christian higher education than it does in Catholic ones; Catholic educators can benefit greatly by studying how such thinkers apply Christian faith in service of the task of integration in education (Claerbaut, 2004; Dockery & Thornbury, 2002; Dockery, 2007; Downey & Porter, 2009; Harris, 2004; Litfin, 2004; Sire, 2004). A person’s worldview influences what he or she notices, takes in, and accepts. It shapes how they perceive messages being sent to them by various individuals and groups. It orients what they care about. It helps them fit incoming messages or lessons from experience into what they already hold, know and are committed to and, indeed, what they do afterwards with what they are learning now. One’s worldview is about configuration, inter-connectedness and mutual reinforcement in those leading perspectives we have that function as the keys to our main perceptions of reality and our judgments.

However, the ideas and viewpoints that comprise our worldview do not emerge on strictly logical grounds nor do they get deployed on purely logical lines. Rather they are embedded in a pattern of behaving and belonging that ‘carries’ whatever reasoning goes into them beyond any strict remit that flows from reason alone. That is, people are formed (and sustained) in a worldview largely through the company they keep, the practices they engage in and the lives they lead. Their worldview gives them some kind of rationale for this and a picture of the whole and a sense of meaning within the flux and ambiguities of life. A worldview is, for most people, rough and ready rather than sharply shaped or clearly defined; it is often not reflected upon, nor articulated; it operates clandestinely rather than explicitly in many cases. It can contain irreconcilable elements, inner contradictions that do not get resolved, but which do not prevent us from living on the basis of the worldview. However, the Jacobsens rightly claim that “the integration paradigm often flounders when applied either to disciplines that are more neutrally descriptive or pragmatic in orientation or to disciplines in which issues of human meaning rarely enter the mix” (Jacobsen, 2004, p.27).

A fifth challenge relates to both psychological ‘space’ and to time. There must be room for individual growth and freedom. Too tight an integrative ‘script’ can be deadening or suffocating. This applies not only to the room required for experiment and for feeling their way among students, if they are to have a chance to own their knowledge, to assimilate it according to their own priorities and commitments; it also applies to faculty if creativity in their pedagogy is not to be stifled. Furthermore, the results of our educational efforts need time to incubate. Sometimes it will be years after a class or a course that what is learned flowers into life, expression or application. The initial impulse of learning can be separated from later fruition by many intermediary experiences and long periods that appear to be fallow, but where the duration of time allows a deeper level of internalization.

3. For further attention

From the first challenge indicated above, I take it that it is incumbent on faculty to identify the central values, key concepts and most important claims of their discipline with regard to contributing to the education of the whole person. Without maintaining a sharp focus on what is central, any negotiation within and between subject teams about what should be taught will be seriously hampered. Curriculum design and pedagogical planning cannot help but be 'on the move' because of changes in student and faculty composition, the availability of resources, external pressures and opportunities, and so forth; however, faculty should be reluctant to make too many changes too quickly with regard to what is considered 'core', even though there cannot be complete agreement about this.

As for the second challenge, universities can set about organizing things in such a way as to facilitate better understanding and mutual appreciation between disciplines. This might be via their systems of hiring faculty, of pump-priming interdisciplinary projects, of fostering joint seminars, of encouraging enriched programs of training for research students as well as through curriculum design for undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses. Mechanisms for faculty evaluation and promotion too can reward engagement with the institutional mission to promote greater levels of integration in curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, research, and outreach.

With regard to the third area of difficulty, I believe that there is much scope for stressing, much more than is currently the case, the need for self-knowledge as an important dimension of a university education. In the end it will be the student who does the 'heavy lifting' in integration – or fails to do so. "In accomplishing the unity of the university curriculum and the disciplines and knowledge within them, one becomes aware that genuine unity resides in the individual intellect of the student. The mere fusion of courses is no guarantee that such unity will take place" (Joseph, 2003, p.141). It should be possible to invite students to engage in structured reflection on how the questions of their courses relate to the questions of their lives, to model for them how to become aware of the ways that our respective lenses for seeing the world are ineluctably connected to our biology and biography, the company we keep, the pattern of life we are constructing.

Such self-reflection does not have to slip into narcissism or superficial navel-gazing. It can help students to avoid separating their inner and their outer lives, to bring into greater harmony the multiple dimensions of their being. It must be remembered that this task is elusive and unending. But the university can assist students in coming to recognize how their choices have consequences, positively and negatively, and to acknowledge that some choices make later ones much more difficult to make, while some others open the door for us and smooth our path towards building the kind of character that, while flawed (as we all are), nevertheless displays coherence and consistency, that shows what we stand for, that recognizes what undermines our best self and where help can be found in resisting such threats.

I find helpful here the picture of the human person given us by the orthodox theologian Nonna Harrison:

The human person is able to connect with the different levels of reality in the universe because he or she already participates in them. ... Our bodies have received protons and electrons from star dust, atoms from the earth, organic molecules from the biosphere, and genes from the animals. So we share in all the levels of reality in the universe, but on a smaller scale. This means that the human person is a microcosm, or a small world. Because [of this] the human being is able to unite things with each other and with God. Part of being in God's likeness is to serve as a *mediator*. ... To mediate is to bring God to the world in blessing and to bring the world to God in receptivity and thanksgiving (Harrison, 2010, pp.127-8).

As people who are created from both the earth and from God's breath, our task, Harrison says, is: to live harmonious lives, holding together the parts of ourselves that connect us with different parts of creation. As we struggle for harmony within ourselves, we are also contributing to the accomplishment of a much larger task: bringing harmony to the whole of creation. We are called to

worship God on behalf of the created universe, but we are also called to become peacemakers within the vast and varied creation' (p.131).

This notion of human beings as mediators between God and creation was central to the thought of Blondel. He too links this task with our identity as a microcosm (Blondel, 1973, p.95; Blondel, 1961, p.307; see also Flamand, 1969).

I stress the importance of promoting self-reflection as integral to university education because I believe that we should give very high priority to helping students think seriously about their vocation. I assume here that vocation is about God's call and our response. Our response includes taking into account first, our *attraction* to a calling, second, our *fitness* for it, third, that the calling addresses a real need in the ecclesial or wider community, and fourth, that this calling is *recognized* or validated by those authorized to do so within this community. "A human being is called when desire and duty become one, when the source of one's deepest longing is at the same time something to which one is obedient" (Schwehn, 2002, p.218).

For believers, their vocation is about who God wants them to be, rather than about any specific line of work. And, of course, the primary and enduring vocation of a Christian is to be disciple. However, even for non-religious students we can promote serious reflection about vocation in the sense of who they feel called to be, this calling being a blend of calling from within - to be true to themselves - and from without - to serve others. This entails relating a humble acknowledgment of our gifts and talents, together with a sound estimation of our strengths and weaknesses, to a considered evaluation of how we can best deploy who we are among our fellow human beings (see Miller, 2007). The question that should inform the central aim of a university is: what am I going to do with my life?

In order to address the fourth difficulty outlined above, what is needed is a deep commitment to both ecumenical and to inter-religious learning. This would be a way to enhance significantly the range of perspectives and ways of interpreting available to scholars and students, as resources for integration. I take it that there is bound to be a connection between ecumenism and education. Both endeavors involve building bridges: ecumenism aims to bridge differences between Christians who come from different parts of the family of faith; education builds bridges between the generations with regard to our cultural heritage. The bridge-building of education should contribute to ecumenism; the bridge-building of ecumenism should contribute to education. The inclusiveness of ecumenism is part of our appreciation of otherness and difference.

All of us - if we are to learn how to live in peace and harmony together - need to get better at appreciating our differences, how to learn from them, how to appreciate them, how to feel less threatened by them, how to grow through encounter with otherness. Indeed, having our worlds expanded is one of the benefits of university experience, and one of the best ways to have our world expanded is to meet with people who think differently from us - in matters of faith as in so many other matters. Our understanding of what is entailed by integration in education would be expanded by coming to an appreciation of how other Christians envisage this task and how they interpret the relationship between faith and the various types of knowledge we develop in studying. Inter-religious learning too has much to offer as a resource for greater integration in a university education. Islam, in particular, at this juncture of our history and culture, can be a valuable dialogue partner with regard to the circle of knowledge and how all things hang together in dependence on God as their creator.

As for the fifth challenge, this requires us, for all our seriousness about integration, not to press too hard, either our colleagues or our students. Invitation, not compulsion, should mark our style of approach to others. Example and encouragement, but not imposition and constraint, are what is needed. A good teacher knows intuitively, not only how to display passion for what he teaches, but compassion for who he teaches, and is aware when persistence can become oppressive of the spirit and an enemy of the lightness of touch that accompanies effective communication (a feature of teaching that Augustine called *hilaritas*).

I have not argued for any particular approach to integration. One might place one's emphasis on how students can be helped to draw upon several disciplines, while ensuring they are rooted more deeply in one of them. One might concentrate instead on problem-centered learning that depends upon multiple disciplines. One might turn one's attention to meta-cognitive skills, along the lines of the work of either Bernard Lonergan (1958; 1972) or Robert Sternberg (1997). Or one might focus on large themes in learning as a focus for integration, as does Martha Nussbaum (2010). An alternative approach to promoting integration in education would be to build on the work of Howard Gardner (2011) on multiple intelligences. In contrast, one might construct an integrated curriculum that engaged students in learning the relative scope and limits of experience, authority, intuition, and imagination in relation to various forms of rationality. I have done something much more limited here. I have merely proposed that integration should be a major task in education, as it is in our personal life-projects, outlined and analyzed several of the challenges such a task entails, before finally suggesting some of the lines along which these challenges might begin to be addressed within the university setting.

References

- Blanchette, O. (2010). *Maurice Blondel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Blondel, M. (1961). *Carnets Inimtes: Vol. 1*. Paris: Cerf.
- Blondel, M. (1973). *L'Action*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Blondel, M. (1935). *L'Être et les êtres*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Claerbaut, D. (2004). *Faith and learning on the edge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Dockery, D.S. & Thornbury, G.A. (2002). *Shaping a Christian worldview*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Dockery, D.S. (2007). *Renewing minds*. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing.
- D'Orsa, J. & T. (2010). *Explorers, guides and meaning-makers*. Mulgrave, Victoria: John Garratt Publishing.
- Downey, E.D. & Porter, S. E. (Eds.). (2009). *Christian worldview and the academic disciplines*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.
- Elshtain, J. B. (2001). What have we learned? In R. Sullivan (Ed.), *Higher learning and Catholic traditions* (pp.131 – 147). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Flamand, J. (1969). *L'idée de médiation chez M. Blondel*. Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts.
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind*. (3rd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Harris, R.A. (2004). *The integration of faith and learning*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Harrison, N. (2010). *God's many-splendored image*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Jacobsen, D & R.H. (2004). *Scholarship & Christian faith*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, S. (2009). Faith integration and the irreducible metaphors of disciplinary discourse. *Christian Scholars Review* 39 (1), pp.37 -55.
- Joseph, E. (2003). Philosophical foundations of the Catholic college and university curriculum. In. T. Hunt, R. J Nuzzi, E. I Joseph, & J.D. Geiger (Eds.), *Handbook of research in Catholic higher education* (pp. 137 – 154). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- John Paul II. (1996). *On Catholic universities. Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Litfin, D. (2004). *Conceiving the Christian college*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lonergan, B. (1958). *Insight*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Lonergan, B. (1972). *Method in Theology*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Losinger, A. (1997). *Relative autonomy*. Frankfurt Am Main: Peter Lang.
- MacIntyre, A. (2001). Catholic Universities: Dangers, hopes, choices. In R. Sullivan (Ed.), *Higher learning and Catholic traditions* (pp.1 – 21). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McGilchrist, I. (2009). *The Master and his Emissary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Miller, M. (2007). *Doing more with life. Connecting Christian higher education to a call to service.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Newman, J. H. (1912). *The idea of a university.* London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Newman, J. H. (1979). *An essay in aid of a grammar of assent.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2010). *Not for profit.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pelias, R. J. (2004). *A methodology of the heart.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Schwehn, M. (2002). Lutheran higher education in the twenty-first century. In P. Dovre (Ed.), *The future of religious colleges.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Sire, J. (2004). *Naming the elephant.* Downers Grove, Ill: Intervarsity Press.
- Springer, W.C. (2009). *This is my body.* Lanham, Maryland: University of America Press.
- Sternberg, R. (1997). *Thinking styles.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sullivan, J. (1988). Matter for Heaven: Blondel, Christ and creation. *Ephemeride Theologicae Lovanienses.* LXIV(1), 60 – 83.
- Sullivan, J. (2010a). Education and evangelisation. In J. Sullivan (Ed.), *Learning the language of faith* (pp. 32 – 46). Chelmsford, UK: Matthew James Publishing.
- Sullivan, J. (2010b). Connection without control: Theology and the university curriculum. In J. Sullivan (Ed.), *Learning the language of faith* (pp.183 – 199). Chelmsford, UK: Matthew James Publishing.

Note

¹ I am grateful for the comments of two referees who, apart from helping me reduce the number of shortcomings in the paper, also prompted me to clarify the assumptions on which the papers rests.

*John Sullivan is Professor of Christian Education at Liverpool Hope University, UK.