

THE  
INSTITUTE  
FOR ADVANCED  
CATHOLIC  
STUDIES



P R O S P E C T U S

## Origins

The proposal to establish in the United States of America an Institute for Advanced Catholic Studies is, to use the phrasing suggested by the Code of Canon Law, an "initiative of the faithful" intended for the common good of the Church in its performance of the increasingly significant roles it is called upon to play as a participant in the development of modern cultures around the globe. The idea for the Institute was inspired by the Church's embrace of both the problems and the possibilities of contemporary life. It is grounded in the sense of responsibility that issued refreshed from the Second Vatican Council's reaffirmation of the sacred dignity not only of the Catholic faithful, but of all human persons in all traditions in all societies throughout the world. Finally, as an institutional design of a specialized and particular kind, it is a response to the

call for a renewal of Christian intellectual life voiced in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, specifically its encouragement to devise the new forms of institutional capacity required for the ongoing task of "cooperation between Catholic universities and other universities, and with other research and educational institutions, both private and governmental."

The Institute's aim is to contribute to the fulfillment of this need for cooperation in the vital sector of scholarly research on all aspects of Catholic life and thought, past and present. That purpose is premised on the confident hope that in its continuing encounter with the pluralism of modern life, the voice of the Catholic Church in public dialogue will be enhanced by the fruits that come from the hard work of scholarship and critical reflection rooted within the Catholic tradition. The watchword *aggiornamento* brings with it a new duty on the part of the Church to



actively develop knowledge of its own heritage and its relations with others, and to that task the Institute is dedicated.

The elaboration and refinement of the institute idea was the work of the Commission on Catholic Scholarship, a private, voluntary association of Catholic lay people, clergy, and members of religious orders that was established in October 1997 in Washington, D.C. Broadly experienced in the worlds of higher education and scholarship, members of the Commission were drawn together by the shared conviction that the cultural circumstances of today call upon the Catholic scholarly community to accomplish more than it is capable of accomplishing as presently organized, focused, and funded. Members were aware of the diversity and complexity of Catholic institutions of higher learning in America and elsewhere and familiar with the problems each continues to confront in coping with the swift-moving currents of pluralism and modernity. Members were knowledgeable about the great qualitative improvements that have occurred in the range and depth of faculties on Catholic campuses in recent decades, particularly in the leading research universities within the system. They were also conscious of the growing number of initiatives on local campuses throughout America to reassert their identity as Catholic educational institutions by providing new programs of Catholic studies of varying focus and emphasis, each of them laudable and, indeed, more than laudable — fundamentally necessary for the future vitality of Catholic education and culture.

Despite these encouraging trends and achievements, however, members of the Commission were convinced

that something more and different is required for the long-term flourishing of Catholic intellectual traditions, something that can help to quicken the pace of relevant scholarly developments and exert a multiplier effect upon the most promising efforts that are underway. There is an urgent need to augment the institutional framework within which the collaborative creativity of Catholic scholarship has developed and proceeds. Unless that need is met with the appropriate kinds of institutional innovation, the atmosphere of confusion and occasional tension that marks today's search for a reinvigorated sense of Catholic identity and integrity is likely to persist. The problem taken up by the Commission, therefore, was one of institutional appraisal and design.

Consider the historical situation. Throughout the developed world, the great age of founding Catholic colleges and universities has long been over. In the United States, in the course of many decades, a vast system of nearly 240 Catholic institutions of higher education has been laboriously created by pioneering bishops, religious orders, and lay people, each one of them intended as a focal point for Catholic intelligence and its encounter with both the practical and theoretical problems of modern life. Collectively, because of the kind of teaching and learning that goes on in them, they represent a great asset of the Church in America. They vary in many ways: in size, history, emphasis, and breadth of competence. Despite this diversity, however, the idea behind each founding was to set up an educational agency capable of participating effectively in secular life without being overwhelmed by it at the cost of religious knowledge and its tradition.

The kind of institutional life that





resulted is hard for outsiders, both Catholic and non-Catholic, to appreciate. A modern college or university is a complex organizational reality because it brings so many different objectives, each with its own validity and exigencies, into one general framework of institutional coordination. There is the need to educate the young in many different fields, the need for faculties to master many different fields and professions and train not only the young but also in greater depth their own successors in the disciplines and professions, and finally the need not only to keep abreast of what is known but to actively advance knowledge through research in each of the separate fields and professions. Complexity of this kind is common to all universities. In the case of Catholic universities, still another dimension of complexity is necessarily involved: the mixture of sacred and secular fields of learning, each with its own autonomy, its own problems, its own norms and methods, and its own attentive constituencies.

**A**s an historical phenomenon, the development of this Catholic system was a response to institutional developments in the surrounding secular culture. Here the secular must be understood in a positive way, not as a deficiency necessarily inimical to religion, but as a way of public life premised on the strict legal separation of Church and state concerns, an ethical and Constitutional necessity in a modernizing, multicultural society. At the beginning the architects of university development, whether secular or Catholic, assumed that research in all the disciplines would flourish as a natural byproduct of university life, given the essential role of the advancement

of knowledge in the modern scheme of things and its natural place in the university idea. Soon enough this proved not to be the case. Research and writing did indeed grow naturally out of the university environment, but the pace and intensity of the research enterprise have been uncertain and varied from field to field.

Gradually it became clear that to increase the volume and velocity of research activity and to encourage it in new directions, new institutional conditions and inducements were required. The secular culture of 20th-century America pioneered the creation of two agencies that have played leading parts in this new way of forcing the development of knowledge: the large-scale philanthropic foundation devoted to the patronage of science and scholarship, and the free-standing independent institute for advanced study, devoted exclusively to the demands of scholarly and scientific creativity, as distinct from the other duties that compose the multiple obligations of academic life. While the institutes were specialized organizations concentrating on research as a distinct kind of activity, the research philanthropies were specialists in "scientific charity," a new form of concentrated and sustained attention aimed at pressing against the boundaries of those bodies of knowledge upon which modern social life depends. As distinct from giving alms to the poor, which was common among religious charities, the new scientific charity aimed at shaping the underlying trend of long-term cultural improvement by pushing against the limits of the known.

Both types of institutions were devoted to a vision of long-run strategic changes in human culture to be wrought by the intensive deepening of





knowledge. What was required was money, patience, a focus on fundamentals, and the disposition to keep at arm's length the pressing social and economic demands of the moment lest they undermine the rest. Both types of institutions stood in a secondary or indirect relation to the development of affairs in the secular universities, supporting through grants or fellowships the best work of the universities' scientists and scholars in the fields to which they, the new secondary institutions, were committed.

Both types of agency have been remarkably successful. They have indeed wrought changes in the character of modern culture and civilization, and no account of the deep changes underway in modern life could be true and complete without some report of their work. The Catholic community, as a community, had little to do with any of this. While the research-oriented philanthropic foundations and the major independent institutes for advanced studies played central roles in the extraordinary flowering of the kinds of knowledge to which they devoted their attention, no comparable institutions were set up in the Catholic world to perform similar tasks. For many reasons — cultural, social, and, not least, financial — Catholic institutional creativity and experimentation *stopped with the university idea* and did not develop secondary institutions of support, which proved to be so beneficent in the secular sphere. The imbalance that had existed from the beginning in America between the dominant secular system and the Catholic system in terms of the command of specialized academic competence and distinction was for a time exacerbated by the effects of the new secondary agencies. There was little participation in them

on the part of Catholic faculties, though individual faculty members were eligible to participate in their capacities as competent specialists in the secular disciplines. Only in recent decades has the imbalance begun to be redressed, as Catholic universities embarked on a sustained drive to build up the overall academic excellence of their faculties.

From the standpoint of the developmental needs of the Catholic scholarly and intellectual community, however, the most important feature of the new secondary agencies of support was their limitation of focus to the needs of the secular disciplines at their highest level of understanding and practice. As a matter of principle the foundations and institutes operated in total independence from the problems and concerns of religious communities. They concentrated upon the proximate issues in their fields of concern, convinced that progress on these would have some long-term, helpful bearing upon the quality of life for the members of all religious communities and those with no religious commitments as well, and left controversial questions of ultimate concern to other agencies and individuals. Perhaps unwittingly these choices reinforced what came to be called the privatization of religion in modern culture, the notion that, strictly speaking, religious beliefs have no general cognitive value. While religious beliefs may be of benefit to individuals, the benefits are those of merely subjective preferences and have no proper grounding in the life of the mind *per se*, of the kind that arises from reflection on ordinary experience in a fashion accessible to all human beings.

Since the entire tradition of





Catholic thought and practice is premised on the compatibility of Christian faith and reason, the trend towards privatization is profoundly hostile to the integrity of its religious heritage. Compatibility and identity are different things, as the Church has long understood. Improvement in the competence and caliber of faculties in the secular disciplines on Catholic campuses, while desirable in its own right and necessary for the continued success of educational institutions in a competitive environment, does not meet the problem. This point has become clear to Catholic educators and administrators, and has inspired the development of new programs in Catholic studies on their campuses. The deep reasons, philosophical and historical, for the need to resist the trend to marginalize religion are developed *in extenso* in John Paul II's recent encyclical *Fides et Ratio*, the most remarkable recapitulation of the tradition in the literature of papal writings.

In the discussions of the Commission on Catholic Scholarship, all the relevant issues converged on the question of how to effectively resist the trend toward the privatization of religious belief in Catholic institutions of higher education and research. As the problem is complex, since Catholicism is *not* opposed to secularity (as distinct from secularism) but on the contrary determined to embrace secular life and participate in its improvement, so the answers will be complex. It is likely they will entail many separate initiatives in different local situations over a long period of time, in trial-and-error fashion. On a more general level of analysis, however, the one thing that *must* be done to encourage the vitality of Catholic scholarly and intellectual life

is the development of secondary agencies of support of the modern kind to nourish the enterprise as a whole. Without these no amount of good will can make a difference, and the imbalance between modern secular learning and modern religious learning will grow apace. A community is composed not simply of shared ideas, ideals, and values, but of shared institutions as well. The institutional repertory of modern Catholicism is incomplete. As a community we are searching for the next step in the evolution of our institutions of higher learning, and that step requires the construction of an institution that can contribute significantly to the dynamism of Catholic thought in its ecumenical and interfaith encounter with other traditions of life and all forms of secular learning.

## Examining the Institutes

This conclusion is the result of analysis. Before reaching it the nature and operating principles of the secular secondary agencies of support had to be thought through and the question of whether an adaptation of these to the distinctive needs of the modern Church as a complex religious community was feasible had to be asked. A good working model for the particular kind of agency that is most needed was provided in the examination of the origins and development of the major secular institutes for advanced studies in modern America, and this task has been a principal work of the Commission on Catholic Scholarship.

The process began with study of the largest, most famous, and most financially secure of such institutions, the Institute for Advanced Study at





Princeton, N.J., the pioneering agency of its kind. The institute was established in 1930 with a major founding gift — in today's terms it would amount to roughly \$50,000,000 — from philanthropist Louis Bamberger and his sister, Mrs. Felix Fuld. Their collaborator in developing the idea was Dr. Abraham Flexner, an influential theorist in the possibilities of new kinds of philanthropy who helped to found the institute and served as director for its first decade. The founders understood their initiative as an experiment in stimulating the conditions of creativity for modern secular scholarship and science. In the words of its original mission statement, the institute's "primary purpose is the pursuit of advanced learning and exploration in the fields of pure science and high scholarship to the utmost degree that the facilities of the Institution and the ability of the faculty will permit."

Gradually the institute came to be organized in four schools (though it is not a teaching institution in the usual sense and has no students): historical studies, mathematics, natural sciences, and social science. Over the decades its long-term senior fellows have included many of the major architects of 20th-century science and scholarship, among them Albert Einstein, Rudolph Carnap, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Kurt Godel, Paul Frankl, John von Neumann, Erwin Panofsky, George F. Kennan, Clifford Geertz, and many others. Today the institute provides a home for the research work of 22 permanent senior fellows and approximately 160 visiting scholars, called "members," annually. With an operating endowment in excess of \$240,000,000, the organization is capable of maintaining its core program of research without regard to

changing scientific fashions or the changing enthusiasms of the research-oriented philanthropies. A separately incorporated organization, the institute is a self-governing entity, entirely independent of the broader university community, which it serves indirectly through the operation of its visiting scholars program.

The second of the major American institutes opened in Palo Alto, California, in the fall of 1954 near Stanford University. The decision to establish the Center for Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences as an experiment in institution building was taken by officials of the recently organized Ford Foundation in New York, who intended the founding as a contribution to the fundamental infrastructure of American social science. The Ford Foundation appointed a Board of Trustees, which in turn appointed an advisory committee of distinguished social scientists that met regularly between 1952 and 1954 to deal with matters of institutional design and programming, site selection, the construction of facilities, and selection of the first group of fellows. The stated purpose of the Center was to increase "knowledge of the principles that govern human behavior" by identifying and working through the advice of those scholars and social scientists "who show exceptional accomplishment or promise in their fields." Present fields of interest include, but are not limited to, anthropology, art history, biology, classics, economics, education, geography, history, law, linguistics, literature, mathematical and statistical specialties, medicine, philosophy, political science, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology.





**T**he Palo Alto Center brings in 45 to 50 distinguished fellows annually. With a small permanent staff and no permanent or long-term fellows, its facilities include individual studies for the fellows, a library specialized in current periodicals and bibliographic resources, computer facilities and assistance in using them, meeting rooms, and dining facilities. With an annual operating budget now in excess of \$6,000,000, the Center is managed on stable principles intended to maintain its current levels of operation indefinitely. Its Ralph Tyler collection, a library named in honor of a former director and composed of books that the Center had some role in supporting from its beginnings to the present, contains many, perhaps even most, of the influential works in social science of the past half-century.

The next major American institute to be founded was the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, now housed in specially designed, permanent, "state-of-the-art" facilities only blocks from the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. Established by Congress in 1968 as the nation's official memorial to former President Wilson as a statesman and scholar, the Center was intended as an institute for advanced study "symbolizing and strengthening fruitful relations between the world of learning and the world of public affairs." With its motto of "knowledge in the public service" the Center supports annually the work of scores of scholars from around the globe. Its congressional charter makes it unique among the independent institutes for advanced study; it is the only one of them faced with both the benefits and the perils of annual appropriations. Now operat-

ing with an annual budget of roughly \$12,000,000, approximately half of which comes from private, non-governmental sources, its work emphasizes scholarly research in those disciplines that by their nature are closest to the issues of public affairs — political science, law, history, and international relations are among them. In addition to its program of research and writing, the Center sponsors an extensive outreach program of public meetings, radio broadcasts, and publications of various kinds.

The last of the major independent American institutes for advanced study, the National Humanities Center, was opened in 1978 in the research triangle area — North Carolina's high-tech research and development zone in the Raleigh-Durham, Chapel Hill vicinity — with start-up support from a small group of philanthropic foundations. As the name suggests, this center was established to compensate for what its advocates considered insufficient attention to the humanistic disciplines on the part of the other institutes. The Center concentrates exclusively on the humanities. It has a small professional staff and no permanent or long-term fellows. It appoints roughly 35 distinguished fellows annually. Its building, not far from the campuses of Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and North Carolina State University, provides individual studies for fellows, staff offices, meeting rooms, dining facilities, and a small library.

## Community Building Functions

**S**ome members of the Commission studied in detail the history, achievements, operating





principles, and administrative practices of these major secular institutes for advanced study. Despite the variation among them in size, history, focus, and relation to the general public audience, members observed that each of them performed the same basic functions of scholarly community formation and development. Three aspects of that process were singled out for attention and appraisal. Most important was the secondary or indirect relation of the institutes' programs to university affairs, since that indirect relation worked to turn loose creative energy and made possible an extraordinary increase in the productivity of the system as a whole. From the legal standpoint, the institutes are autonomous corporations dedicated to the advancement of knowledge in their chosen fields. Their governance is totally independent of the administrative authorities of the universities, an arrangement that frees them to concentrate exclusively on the fundamentals involved in encouraging the growth of knowledge in their special areas of competence and concern. This differentiation in institutional affairs has shown itself to be in the long-term interest of the university community, and university faculties are the prime beneficiaries of the institutes' programs.

Each institute operates as a "system server" and not a "centralizer." They serve the whole by quickening the pace, volume and intensity of published research. While none of them would claim sole credit for results that draw so heavily upon the established university culture on which they all depend, as specialized research agencies each can point to impressive records of accomplishment as measured by bibliographic data of a depth and quality that are beyond the capac-

ity of the separate universities, no matter how well intentioned and financed, to match. The institutes' histories offer proof positive of the benefits that have accrued from this new form of cooperation among autonomous institutions of higher education and research. What is going on is the interplay of specialized research institutions and the evolving scholarly life of general purpose universities.

With the exception of a modest-sized permanent faculty at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, the core activity of each organization was to function as a protected resource and facility for visiting scholars on annual appointments in selected areas of work. Commission members observed that for this reason the growth of the institutes did not occur at the cost of diminished research activities in the universities. On the contrary, it stimulated and reinforced the performance of that particular academic duty. Participation in the institutes' programs soon became a prestigious academic honor and an opportunity for faculty members working at the cutting edge of their individual disciplines. Such scholars returned to their home campuses from temporary institute appointments with a deeper and clearer grasp of their chosen line of work. One of the things they typically carried back with them was a personal acquaintance in some depth with a new community of others like themselves preoccupied with the same problems of inquiry and interpretation. This common experience suggests the second function of the institutes' programs. Beyond the increase in scholarly productivity they helped to generate, the residential experience of intensive research and





communication in an atmosphere of high standards and high expectations, which they provided naturally, produced new networks of personal relationships, shared interests, and newly arising agendas of inquiry. In this fashion the institutes worked as agents of new community formation within the world's established scholarly communities.

The third distinctive function performed by the programs of the new-style institutes is obvious but easily overlooked. By virtue of their exclusive focus on the precise and identifiable "best bet" needs of the enterprise of research itself at any given moment, the programs of the institutes serve as vehicles for the exercise of scholarly leadership, vehicles that are simply not available within the departmental context of the university environment. One institute director referred to the essential premise upon which his organization went about its business as the principle of "inducing ferment at the top." The top in this sense is inhabited by those who have most successfully mastered a given area. "Ferment at the top" means the stimulation of new inquiry by bringing together small groups of scholars with broad common interests, each of whom has compiled a personal record of outstanding achievement or unusual promise. Scholarly leadership is a function of the quality, range, and suggestiveness of published work, all of it publicly open to refutation and critical appraisal. The institutes work as vehicles for scholarly leadership by turning over to the authors of the most influential work the key roles of advising and evaluating projects and candidates for appointment. In this way they perform as the amplifiers of influence and contribute to the rapid

diffusion and direction of scholarly trends.

## Thinking Within Tradition

From its review of the history and workings of the secular institutes for advanced study, members of the Commission concluded that a comparable institution specially designed to assist in meeting the needs of the Catholic scholarly and intellectual community will be of great benefit to the Church and its many institutions of higher learning. The second major task addressed by the Commission was to determine the appropriate character of the scholarly program of the institution. In concentrating upon the scope and focus of studies that ought to be encouraged by the Institute, members of the Commission began with the conviction that it should promote, with equal enthusiasm and opportunity, two types of research. The first will be aimed at the scholarly recovery of the Catholic tradition in all its expressions: textual, liturgical, artistic, institutional, intellectual, social, spiritual, and so on through all its elements. At work here is the scholarly mediation of the past, one of the ways in which the Church sustains or recovers its constitutive memory, the heritage by which it lives and from which it always has more to learn. The second type of work would be aimed at helping that heritage to *remain* alive, indeed to become more alive, by promoting Catholic research into the questions that today define the challenges that confront humanity and the Church as a participant in and agent of history. This work involves questions of contemporary interest, scholarly studies that are at the cutting





edge of societal and cultural developments and address problems the Church cannot effectively meet without serious investigation and thought.

While the two types of research are in a sense distinct, they may also in particular cases be quite closely related. It often happens that a new question is posed to the past because of recently developed sensitivities, interests, and demands — which is why history always has to be reexamined from new angles and rewritten in every generation. In turn, the close study of a past moment may provide insights that permit a recasting of a contemporary question or the expansion of the horizon of an investigation. Both possibilities illustrate what it means to think *within* a tradition, and both activities are necessary dimensions of interest in the life of the proposed new institute.

**T**he program of the IACS will thus provide selected scholars an opportunity — time, space, and financial support — to work in these broad areas. As in the case of the secular institutes, the program will be residential in character. In addition to financial and institutional support for a stated period, it will also provide access to library and other resources, experience in a face-to-face community of inquiry, and opportunities for common worship. Its primary goal will be the continuing promotion of research, that is, scholarship honored and encouraged as having its own value, relevance, and exigencies and as having, by virtue of these, a distinct contribution to make to the life of the Church and to the broader society and culture. The IACS will not itself operate from a particular ideological stance nor, even though it might sponsor scholarly projects focused on par-

ticular contemporary problems, will it have a particular policy agenda. It is to be a scholarly institution and will not function as an advocacy institution or lobby group.

In keeping with the achievements resulting from the functions performed by the secular institutes for advanced studies, over time the IACS can be expected plausibly to generate a number of benefits to the Church and its system of higher educational institutions. Among these benefits the following are most important:

◆ It will provide a publicly visible institutional point of focus, administratively independent of the Catholic university system in order to contribute efficiently to serving the long-term need for scholarly development of the system as a whole. The institute will offer scholars working within the Catholic tradition the type of support that is abundantly available to leading scholars in all of the secular fields of learning. What is missing at the moment, *and missing systematically*, is support for the work of those who are especially concerned with the religious dimension of things, its past and its present implications. This is the kind of knowledge that must be developed, diffused, and brought into meaningful relation to the perspectives of the secular disciplines. The institute's work will contribute powerfully over time to the deepening and elaboration of modern Catholic religious thought and help to make clear its bearings upon the social and cultural affairs of today. Such scholarship can be strongly expected to reinforce the most important trend to appear over the past decade on the campuses of many Catholic colleges and universities in their efforts to reinvigorate their role as curators of the Christian heritage,





namely the emergence of "Catholic Studies" programs at the level of undergraduate teaching offering a broad range of courses in different disciplines.

◆ It will promote a spirit of communal inquiry and engagement together with new habits of cooperation and collaboration on the part of Catholic scholars — lay persons, clergy, and religious — in many different disciplines located in many different institutions, thus contributing to the momentum and unity of their work and making its implications more widely known and culturally effective. That community is not confined to Catholic institutions of learning. There is a large but indeterminate diaspora of Catholic scholars and intellectuals, persons whose work probes, explores, or elucidates the Catholic tradition but who have pursued that work in secular institutional settings not always sympathetic to or comprehending of their interests. Such scholars, and their number includes many persons of great academic distinction, have often worked in comparative isolation with no more than intermittent contact with the larger Catholic intellectual community. One of the most fruitful contributions of the IACS will be to bring such scholars into contact with their counterparts from Catholic universities and colleges in an appropriately stimulating, supportive, and Catholic setting where they can learn from one another.

◆ It will provide a publicly visible and accountable framework for the intensive, effective support for continuing Catholic participation in the larger cultural conversation. In doing so it will help to counter the assumption, not uncommon in the

larger academic community in America and elsewhere, that religion and religiously inspired scholarship have no legitimate place in the great public debates of the modern world and cannot meet their standards of argument and evidence. But Catholicism is necessarily a *public religion*, and in fostering Catholic research at the highest levels of achievement, the Institute will work to counter the trend towards the privatization of religion in modern life. At present the Catholic community draws upon what happens to exist for its public purposes. The IACS must increase the quality and quantity of what exists for those purposes.

◆ The Catholic mind has never been inert. From the beginning its growth in depth and range has depended not simply upon the glories of the gift of its original endowment, but upon the scholarship that helped to preserve the integrity of that endowment and to clarify its ramifying universal implications. As an agent in human history, the Church has been a learner as well as a teacher. As Pope John Paul II said in *Fides et Ratio*: "The appeal to tradition is not a mere remembrance of the past; it involves rather the recognition of a cultural heritage which belongs to all of humanity. Indeed it may be said that it is we who belong to the tradition and that it is not ours to dispose of at will. Precisely by being rooted in the tradition will we be able today to develop for the future an original, new and constructive mode of thinking." The work of the Institute will further the distinctive contribution that scholarship rooted in the tradition must continue to make both to the inner life of the Church and to its redemptive role in society and history.





## The Institute at Work

**H**ow will the IACS operate? A selection committee of the Board of Trustees will have appointed on long-term contracts (perhaps five years, renewable) a small number, possibly four to six, of distinguished senior scholars of international reputation in the Institute's two areas of research emphasis. With their assistance and participation, another twenty scholars or more, some from other parts of the world, will be chosen for annual appointment on the basis of their scholarly accomplishments, promise, and the particular merits and potentials of their current research projects.

Scholarly creativity often emerges out of the stimulus and response of face-to-face community. The program of the IACS will be residential in character, and each of its scholars will have office space, facilities for common meals and meetings, access to library and computer resources, and a chapel. Fellows will be provided with research assistants, chosen from among the graduate students of the local area.

Within this institutional framework, fellows will sit to their individual work. A common lunch room provides them with occasions to converse with one another and with visitors. At the beginning of each academic year, fellows will be expected to make an initial public presentation of their research projects and their aims, and before the end of their tenure to give another public presentation of the results of some portion of their research. While the primary duty of each fellow will be to make headway on his or her individual research project, discussion groups devoted to the scholarly exploration of common

interests and problems will emerge. On occasion distinguished visitors will be brought in for lectures and other types of interaction with the fellows, staff, and supporters of the work of the Institute.

The Institute may also sponsor other types of programs intended to benefit the Catholic scholarly and intellectual community, in the form of "summer institutes," for example, which might bring in for a period of eight to ten weeks small groups of scholars and other kinds of professionals with a serious shared interest in a particular problem or topic, together with the disposition to make some collective headway on it. Its senior fellows and Board of Trustees will experiment from time to time with the formulation of themes of common interest around which new scholarship is both needed and feasible and will find suitable ways to develop them from the stage of merely "bright ideas" to the stage of publishable results. Inevitably the Institute will come to serve as the coordinating locus or "home site" for a series of special projects of collaborative investigation of themes and topics that arise out of the most fruitful interactions of its staff fellows, former fellows and networks of advisers. Each project that matures to a sufficient weight and quality will be subjected to the discipline of formal critical review and publication, public presentation and critique. In the weaving together of efforts of this kind, the Institute will provide for its fellows a lively and challenging annual season of events. For the broader public the same events will provide a continuing demonstration of Catholic thinking and criticism in action and some insight into the Catholic mind at work.





## Location and Facilities

The ideal institute facility will provide a campus-like atmosphere with the quiet and privacy required for the operations of the program but will be so situated as to ensure easy access coming and going on the part of its fellows and visitors in their business with the surrounding community. As a Catholic institution it will be constructed so as to suggest, in terms of contemporary architecture and landscape layout, what it means to work from within the living tradition, and the plan will show an appropriate consciousness and regard for its past achievements in architecture and design. The facility will include an auditorium, lecture rooms, individual studies for the fellows and offices for the administrative staff, a chapel, carrels and work stations for research assistants, interns, and short-term visitors, a well-planned small library concentrated on periodicals and bibliographic resources, and common dining facilities. It will have state of the art computer facilities with both the hardware and software necessary for the scholarly retrieval and use of information and also for "virtual" communication between the institute and educational and research institutions elsewhere. The ideal facility will also include some provision for the residential needs of a population of scholars, some no doubt with their families, who will be on annual appointments and in need of short-term accommodations.

The decision on where to locate the Institute and what precisely the scope and arrangement of its facilities are to be will be taken only after the resources necessary to establish the program as a whole are securely in hand. The Institute will be established

in a major metropolitan area, one with the depth and diversity of cultural resources and amenities to serve as a "magnet" area and crossroads of communication. Areas under consideration include the bay area of San Francisco, Boston, Chicago, the Princeton, N.J., vicinity on the edge of the New York metropolitan area, and the metropolitan region of Washington, D.C. The final decision on location will be driven by a number of factors. There is the need for assured and convenient access to a world-class research library in an area with outstanding collections in theology and other fields of learning. Convenient access to activities underway in other universities and research centers is also desirable.

## Governance of the Institute

The Institute has been established under the laws of the United States as an independent, free-standing, self-governing, autonomous, not-for-profit corporation devoted to research purposes for the public good. Like the secular institutes for advanced study, the governance of the IACS will be primarily the responsibility of its Board of Trustees. As the principal policy-making body of the new institute, the Board will hold both its mission and its assets *in trust*. The trustees are fiduciaries responsible for ensuring that the founding purposes of the institution are properly carried out. As trustees, their duty is to take the long view, to concentrate on the fundamental mission of the institution and the specific measures that have been devised to make headway towards the accomplishment of basic aims. As an initiative of the Catholic faithful, the





founding charter of the IACS provides for its Catholic character and its perpetuation through time. It will do so through its formal statement of purpose as an organization. Its aim is to promote scholarship on the Catholic tradition from a standpoint within that tradition. This aim is the purpose for which trustees hold fiduciary responsibility.

Having studied and discussed the practices of other institutions, together with the logic behind those practices, members of the Commission on Catholic Scholarship concluded that the Board of the IACS should be small in size, with no more than 12 to 15 members. They decided *against* any scheme of representation in microcosm of the various institutional interests of the Catholic community of higher education and research on the Board of Trustees. In doing so they noted that this position on the question of institutional representation is precisely what enabled the secular institutes for advanced study to emerge as differentiated, specialized agencies with respect to the work of the universities, and successfully to take up their duties as secondary institutions along the lines described above. To do good work of this particular kind, a certain degree of flexibility is required.

The job of the Board of Trustees of the IACS is to preside over the strategic growth and development of a new type of institution in the Catholic community. Since the institution will be new and untested, roles of long-term leadership and institutional fostering are necessarily involved for those who will serve on the Board and the staff. With this point in mind Commission members suggested that all those appointed as trustees have a manifest capacity to "think institution-

ally" and that they be prepared to devote substantial time and attention to the needs of the job. While Commission members noted that such individuals might come from a variety of different backgrounds and pursuits, they recommended as a basic criterion in all cases a well established, public reputation for achievement and commitment to the ideals of scholarly research in the Catholic tradition. They determined that trustees are to be selected from among persons of high achievement in three particular areas: scholarly research and writing; the administrative leadership of great affairs in the worlds of education and research; and leadership in strategically oriented philanthropy aimed at achieving long-term results. The institutional duties to be taken up by trustees include long term planning, finance (including investments, budget, fund raising, and development), approval of scholarly appointments and special projects and programs, and nominations for subsequent Board appointments.

## Relations with the Hierarchy

Without healthy, cooperative, mutually supportive relations with the hierarchy of the Church, the Institute cannot possibly succeed in its work, which is to contribute to the common good of the Church by actively fostering the development of knowledge regarding the Catholic tradition for use in its manifold engagements with the problems of the contemporary world. This truth is basic and well understood. But exactly how are healthy, cooperative, mutually supportive relations to be provided for and implemented? How is this necessity best fulfilled?





The Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (AA24) discusses the various ways in which associations of the faithful are related to the hierarchy. The hierarchy may itself choose to promote certain enterprises in which it assumes particular responsibility as, for example, by an official "mandate," which, however, leaves the laity their rightful freedom to act on their own initiative. Secondly, the Council speaks of other activities, more closely connected with the bishops' role, which are undertaken in virtue of a hierarchical "mission" and in which "the laity are fully subject to superior ecclesiastical moderation."

Finally, the Council speaks of "enterprises that are established by the free choice of the laity and are governed by their prudent judgment," the sorts of associations often praised and recommended by the hierarchy. Such enterprises, the Council adds, may not call themselves "Catholic" without the approval of the competent ecclesiastical authority.

The three cases described by the Council are presented here in a descending order of jurisdictional relationship with the hierarchy. The least formal such relationship is the third, and it is this type of association that the IACS exemplifies. Therefore, canonically speaking, the IACS is conceived as an example of one of three kinds of enterprises envisaged by the Second Vatican Council and authorized in the Code of Canon Law.

The right of Catholics to form such associations is also clearly spelled out in the Code of Canon Law: "The Christian faithful are at liberty freely to found and to govern associations for charitable and religious purposes or for the promotion of the Christian vocation in the world; they are free to

hold meetings to pursue these purposes in common." (c.215) A qualification of the right concerning terminology is stated subsequently: "All the Christian faithful, since they participate in the mission of the Church, have the right to promote or to sustain apostolic action by their own undertakings in accord with each one's state and condition; however, no undertaking shall assume the name Catholic unless the consent of competent ecclesiastical authority is given." (c.216) Reflecting both Council and Code, the title of the IACS was chosen to place emphasis on the *subjects whose study it will promote* rather than any claim to more formal jurisdictional relationship as might be implied in a title such as "Catholic Institute for Advanced Study."

Catholic communion, of course, is not exhausted by formal juridical relationships. The IACS wishes to be, and to be seen to be, in the service of the Church, to which it will offer the contribution that only genuine scholarship can bring both for an understanding of the Catholic tradition and for bringing it to bear upon contemporary questions.

A mechanism is necessary to provide for close communication between the institute and the hierarchy, whose role it is as leaders of the Church to supervise the life of the Church and to promote unity among all its members and their initiatives in fidelity to its distinct identity as the Church. The institute acknowledges this role and its purposes. A formal, institutionalized advisory role seems to meet that need. The advisory role entails a distinctive kind of responsibility performed at one remove from the ongoing flow of day-to-day decision making. To be effective, those who perform the role must be familiar with





the aims of the enterprise, appraised of its accumulating results, accomplishments, and problems, and prepared to provide constructive advice and counsel. Thus while the IACS is bound by its own charter and governed by its own Board of Trustees, it will carry out its work in the communion of the Church and will seek enthusiastically the active cooperation of the hierarchy, members of which will serve on an Advisory Council to the Institute.

## The Endowment Principle

**I**nstitutes for advanced study are expensive organizations, and to establish and operate the IACS will require significant financial support. It will not begin its scholarly operations until a minimum endowment, now estimated by the commission at \$60,000,000 for the program, a modest site, and facility, is assured. The Institute, to ensure success, must have its core operations underwritten in considerable depth. It must have time and opportunity to take root, develop experience, and demonstrate its achievements and usefulness for meeting the needs of the Catholic community as a whole. Only a substantial operating endowment can make any of these things possible.

In one of its meanings an endowment is a gift, in another it is stored money invested so as to be self-sustaining. As such, it can be likened to a magazine of energy capable of providing autonomy and powering the most vital operations of an institution through time. For obvious reasons the Institute for Advanced Catholic Studies cannot turn to government agencies for help, and to date no large scale Catholic research-oriented philanthropies have been developed to offer assistance. Yet work of the kind outlined in this prospectus must be begun, and the institutional idea is feasible only if it can draw upon substantial reserves of energy of the kind provided only by a substantial endowment. Officers of the IACS have received assurances of the beginnings of an adequate operating endowment if matching monies in large amounts can be put together. IACS is looking presently for donors who perceive the scale of the institutional idea, understand the long-term importance of links between research institutions and culture, see the need to encourage new works of research within the context of the situation facing the Catholic Church today, and are in a position actively to assist it in moving forward with the job.

*October 1, 1999*

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED CATHOLIC STUDIES



REV. JAMES L. HEPT, S.M.  
*Chairman*

Chancellor, University of Dayton  
300 College Park  
Dayton, OH 45469-1549

937.229.2166 • Fax 937.229.4906 • href@udayton.edu

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED CATHOLIC STUDIES



HUGH M. DEMPSEY, D.Ed., K.M.  
*Vice President for Institutional Advancement*

One Pineview Place, Suite 6  
225 Humphrey Road  
Greensburg, PA 15601-4571

724.830.9760 • Fax 724.830.9762 • iacs@aol.com