



# BOSTON COLLEGE

BOISI CENTER  
FOR RELIGION AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE

## **Symposium on Religion and the Liberal Aims of Higher Education**

### **“Hope and Challenge in the Middle Ground”**

Keynote Address

by

**Nathan Hatch**

President, Wake Forest University

Opening remarks and introduction by **Erik Owens**

Associate Director, Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life, Boston College

Thursday, November 8, 2012, 5:00pm

The Heights Room of Corcoran Commons, Boston College



OWENS: Thank you all. This is a wonderful crowd on a challenging weather evening, and you’ve come to the right place tonight, because we’ve got a lot of great things happening. My name is Erik Owens, and I am the associate director of the Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life here at Boston College, and I’m co-organizer with my colleague Henry Braun of the conference that we’re kicking off this evening.

Dr. Hatch’s lecture this evening is the kickoff to a conference that continues tomorrow with three panel discussions, a lunchtime keynote address, and closing remarks from our president, Father Leahy. We hope each of you tonight will join us tomorrow as the conference continues. We promise better weather and loads of free food, so come join us.

A few items of business before we start tonight. First, I’d like to take a moment to thank a number of the people who have made all this possible: university president Father Leahy; vice president Mary Lou DeLong; Joe Quinn, former dean of arts and sciences and current head of the Sesquicentennial Planning Committee; David Quigley, current dean of arts and sciences. All of these senior leaders at Boston College have come together and

invested enormous amounts of time and energy—and indeed, money as well—to make sure that this conference goes as well as we expect it will. And I want to thank you all personally on behalf of Henry and myself both.

Second, I want to thank the staff members who have been working with Henry and myself for the past two years to make this happen. Conor Kelly, a Ph.D student in theology, just finished his comprehensive exams today (congratulations!), and Courtney Hough and Frank Murtaugh, also on staff here, have done wonderful jobs. Thank you all for your hard work. Finally, I'd like to thank our speakers and our moderators this evening for traveling far and wide to join us on what I expect will be a terrific set of conversations.

A few other items of business. We're recording the events, and we'll be putting the audio, video, and possibly a transcript online at our earliest possibility, so I invite you to visit [bc.edu/150](http://bc.edu/150) or [bc.edu/boisi](http://bc.edu/boisi) to find the recaps and the video, photos, etc. of this event this evening. We are tweeting the event also at the hashtag #BC150, which I invite you to do as well. And one last item of business—I ask that you silence your cell phones before we get started this evening, so that we're not interrupted.

Now, before I introduce our speaker this evening, I'd like to say just a few words about why we're hosting the conference and why we're doing it now. My colleague Henry Braun will have a bit more to say about this tomorrow morning as well, so I'll be very brief. I simply want to highlight the fact that this conference joins a robust and extended conversation at Boston College about religion and the liberal aims of higher education.

Much has changed at Boston College since 1863, both inside of the institution and outside, around us, in the wider culture, of course. But as we've heard from a number of speakers in the past two months—Father Leahy at his convocation address, Father Michael Himes at his Fenway Mass, Harvard President Drew Faust at her sesquicentennial lecture here at BC, and last week from theology professor Shawn Copeland in her dean's address for the School of Theology and Ministry—from these and other distinguished speakers over the past few months, as we've begun the sesquicentennial celebration, we've learned that the BC community has been reflecting on the particular mission of Jesuit Catholic liberal arts education for a long, long time, with no small success, I might add.

And we can see the continued focus on this central mission of religious and humanistic formation today in a number of ways: in the hugely popular programs and retreats for faculty and students to examine and extend their spiritual lives here at Boston College; in BC's faculty seminars and its ongoing efforts to reflect systematically on the Catholic intellectual traditions; in the physical commitment to the humanities manifested in the nearly completed Stokes Hall, which will house my own department of theology along with other humanities departments; and in the newly launched Core Renewal project, led by Mary Crane at the recently established Institute for the Liberal Arts.

As a result, we can say that this conference is both a celebration of Boston College's historical and ongoing successes as a Jesuit Catholic liberal arts university committed to humanistic and religious education and formation, as well as a call for the very best thinkers of our generation to join us, to help us to reflect on our mission today and in the years ahead.

And indeed, it's a chance for all of us at Boston College to think about what we do here collectively and why we do it. I want to invite each and every one of you in the audience tonight, and indeed tomorrow, to join that process by offering your insights and asking your questions during the discussion period that follows every session at this conference, including the lecture that you're about to hear.

So with that, let me now briefly introduce our keynote speaker this evening, Dr. Nathan Hatch, president of Wake Forest University. Dr. Hatch received his undergraduate education at one of our country's most distinguished religious colleges, Wheaton College in Illinois, and he earned his master's and doctoral degrees from Washington University in St. Louis. After a postdoc at Johns Hopkins, he joined the faculty of another of our country's great religious universities, Notre Dame, where he distinguished himself as a first-rate scholar of American religious history.

He's the author of the seminal work *The Democratization of American Christianity*, which described how the rise of religious groups in the early 19th century helped to shape American culture and foster democracy. The author or editor of seven other books on American history, Dr. Hatch is regularly cited as one of the most influential scholars in the study of American religious history.

In 1988, Dr. Hatch began a parallel career as an administrator at Notre Dame, beginning as acting dean of the College of Arts and Letters, then vice president for graduate studies and research, and finally as provost, the chief academic officer of the university.

A Presbyterian, he was the first Protestant to serve as provost at Notre Dame, a fact that gives him special insider/outsider status to examine core questions like the role of Catholic intellectual traditions, the relationship between clerical and lay leadership in Catholic universities, and on the work of ecumenical and interfaith relations in the university context.

As president of Wake Forest, Dr. Hatch has worked to enhance the institution's position as a premier collegiate university, in which an undergraduate liberal arts tradition is integrated with the vitality of a research university. For these reasons and many, many more, Dr. Hatch is an ideal person to open our conference this week on religion and the liberal aims of higher education. His lecture is entitled "Hope and Challenge in the Middle Ground," and it's my great pleasure to welcome him to the stage.

HATCH: Thank you, Erik, and thanks to all of you for your presence this evening. It's a delight to be at Boston College as part of this symposium taking note of 150 years of higher education in this place. Father Leahy, let me extend warmest greetings and congratulations on this occasion to you, to the Jesuit community, which has long found their vocation here, to the students, alumni, and faculty of Boston College.

What you have achieved here is genuinely noteworthy. The strides you've made in the last generation are nothing short of remarkable, something I learned several years ago, when I had the privilege of chairing the accreditation process here. You are building a first-rate Catholic university in Boston, the epicenter of American higher education. Your prospects are indeed bright. And toward that end, I trust this symposium can illuminate a set of issues, questions, opportunities, that will assist you and others—all of us—as we wrestle with fundamental issues of religion and the liberal aims of higher education.

James Madison once suggested that the real luster of our country was religious freedom, the distinctive contribution of the United States to world civilization. I would like to suggest a corollary, that the real luster of our country is private higher education and its creative, independent spirit.

We easily forget how distinctive are the patterns of higher education in America. The founding of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, and the legion of their successors in America today, some 1,600 private institutions educating 3.7 million students, broke decisively with the pattern of universities that were heavily controlled by king and bishop, state and church.

The United States is the only place on earth where education had flowed so decisively from the third or voluntary sector. And that, of course, is not unrelated to the issue of religious liberty. It was the Puritans who started colleges, but then Anglicans, Quakers, Presbyterians, and Catholics. And in time, Baptists, Methodists, disciples of Lutherans, Unitarians, Jews, and Mormons.

Private higher education has done amazing things for the common good. It has provided great leaven for diversity, for innovation, for reform. From antislavery to women rights, to colleges for freed slaves after the Civil War, independent colleges have been great seed beds for regional development, and for our purposes, most importantly, they have been terribly important in keeping alive dissenting religious traditions.

The United States has never had a real system of higher education. Of the roughly 2,500 four-year colleges and universities, two-thirds of them are private. It's not two-thirds of the number of students, but two-thirds of the actual institutions. Today, there are about 250 Catholic schools, 100 evangelical, scores of Presbyterian, Methodist, and Lutheran colleges, 100 historically black colleges and universities, 40 women's colleges, 37 colleges for American Indians.

One can opt for a college with a Great Books curriculum, or one that focuses on sustainability, or one that requires a third world experience, or a gritty urban experience. There is even one college that focuses on students who have been educated at home.

This is a terrific heritage, unlike anything in Europe or even our cousins in Canada, Australia, or Latin America. We would be much poorer as a society if we did not have this dynamic kind of private higher education.

Most significantly for our context today is the role of private colleges and universities in sustaining religious traditions and communities. The largest family of religious colleges and university is, of course, Roman Catholic. And central in that is the Jesuit presence—some 28 institutions, among which Boston College is a vital member.

Jesuits have been committed to the importance of the life of the mind. From the days of their founder, to Robert Bellarmine in the 16th century, to the likes of Teilhard de Chardin, Karl Rahner, Bernard Lonergan, John Courtney Murray, and Avery Dulles in the 20th century, Jesuits have believed in the redemptive power of education, and have built schools, colleges, and universities wherever they have gone. Their impulse has been to engage the world with serious thought and reflection.

Boston College, like many of its peers, is indeed a flourishing experiment in Catholic and Jesuit higher education. What I would like to do today is note the tremendous signs of

hope that I see in a place like this, and then also some of the challenges that are to be faced.

I am hopeful about an institution like this for two primary reasons. First, they have carefully set a course that sustains a middle ground where vital religious traditions can engage modern thought in a climate of academic freedom. Critique of this middle course, of course, comes from both sides.

From conservative quarters, some within the church, it is opined that the mission concedes far too much and has sold the Catholic birthright for the pottage of academic prestige. From the larger university still comes the opposite concern, that things may be too parochial, or that academic freedom may be constrained—the old canard of George Bernard Shaw that a Catholic university is somehow a contradiction in terms.

The key to advancing this middle way, I think, has been a wonderful partnership between clerical and lay leadership—a partnership, I might add, that seems far more fruitful than in other sectors of the Roman Catholic Church itself. This partnership has unleashed the energy, resources, and expertise of American lay Catholics upon a wide range of colleges and universities. That generosity has propelled many institutions to a competitive academic level, bolstering endowments, facilities, faculty support, and financial aid. Catholics and non-Catholics alike are attracted to such academic communities, where religion is taken seriously and practiced intelligently.

Protestant higher education in America has had a much harder time constructing anything like this middle ground. In the 20th century, Protestant higher education has become largely a two-party system, with mainline institutions losing much of their religious identity, except in limited cases where there's a divinity school, or in some cases, in some denominational colleges. By contrast, the 100 or so evangelical colleges, which require all faculty to accept a statement of faith, continue a vital tradition and do a superb job of nurturing students, but none of them has a broad enough base financially or theologically to think of building a university of scale.

So it's this distinct middle ground that I think is interesting, and at least in recent years, it's Catholic universities that have been able to occupy it most decidedly.

We do live in a curious age. The world seems to be growing more radically secular and more radically religious at the same time, and our own culture seems more fragmented and divided than ever before, often along secular/religious fault lines. A place like Boston College can readily serve as a crossroads—a place that, in the words of Alan Wolfe, can actually be the salvation of pluralism on American campuses.

Diverse faculty members can actually confront a student with different ways of thinking, some of them grounded in vital religious traditions. Such a crossroads can avoid two extremes—religious homogeneity or the relativism of the modern university.

The second reason I am hopeful about Catholic universities is their role in the formation of the next generation of Catholic leaders. A deeply personal engagement with students has been at the heart of the Jesuit tradition, the cure of souls, and is evident in a place like this—a voluntary community of reflection and engagement.

A campus like this is honeycombed with discussions, retreats, and activities that challenge students to renew their faith, to engage in critical social problems, to consider

professions for reasons other than self-interest. What is evident is a commitment to the holistic nurturing of students' body, mind, and spirit. If the Roman Catholic Church in America is to retain the loyalty of the next generation of educated parishioners, particularly young women, I think one clear reason will be the inviting forms of faith and intellectual exchange they see in a place like this.

Let me now turn to a set of challenges that any institution like Boston College faces. The first is, I think, the tenuous status in America today of a liberal arts education. W.E.B. Du Bois noted that "the true college will ever have one goal—not to earn meat, but to know the end and aim of that life which meat nourishes."

Education in America did begin as an ideal—to nurture the intellect and character of the next generation, to call young people to lives of reflection and virtue, to form leaders of character. The Jesuit tradition of *Ratio Studiorum*, as it evolved, has much the same premise, and is grounded in the liberal arts, in classical ways of knowing, and in theology, and philosophy, and literature.

Today, such values seem almost quaint amidst the constrained economy in which we live, the drumbeat of whether a college education has economic utility. The most pressing question today seems to be how much does a college cost in relation to what a college graduate can command in salary. Higher education is just one more player in the dominant education market. These themes resonate not just from nervous parents, but from congressional committees, from the Education Department, and from dominant influences like the Gates and the Lumina Foundations.

The first challenge, then, with a religious heritage is to defend the vital importance of a liberal arts education in a time when, in Andrew Delbanco's eloquent rendering, it has become "marginal or merely ornamental." We must not underestimate the danger that humanistic inquiry will wither into irrelevancy. Michael Malone, in a recent article in *The Wall Street Journal* defending the humanities, put it this way. He said for the humanities "to imagine that they have anything like the significance or influence of the sciences smacks of a kind of sad, last-ditch desperation. Science merely nods and says, 'I see your Jane Austen monographs and deconstruction of *The Tempest*, and I raise you stem-cell research and the iPhone,' and then pockets all the chips on the table."

All of us need to redouble our efforts to defend the higher purposes of college, despite our economic woes. A good reminder of that is C.S. Lewis's address during World War II, "Learning in War-Time," where he said that "human life has always been lived on the edge of a precipice. Human culture has had to exist under the shadow of something infinitely more important than itself. If men had postponed the search for knowledge and beauty until they were secure, that search would never have begun."

At the same time, we have to push the liberal arts—learning for its own sake. I think we also have to do a better job linking the liberal arts to the professions, and to what our students will actually be doing. Most of them will not be becoming academics. They'll be in healthcare, and law, and banking, and education, and the not-for-profit sector. Liberal arts colleges in the last generation could assume most college students who had a good degree could find professional employment. That is no longer the case.

So today, I think we must serve our students in two ways. We must argue for learning for its own sake with one hand, and with the other, we must help them think about and negotiate paths to professional leadership. I'm convinced that we must, and can, do both.

A second challenge that we face is the marvelous, almost magical connection in which students live today, and the uphill battle to help them learn to be reflective and deliberative. In short, we need leaders who can focus and concentrate amidst a culture that is wired for distraction. Today, our problem is not a lack of information. I heard one of our parents say in the advertising business—he said, today, a student has a million places in the palm of their hands.

That is true. There are more places in the palm of their hands than the library of Harvard University, just maybe not as good as the library of Harvard University. But they do have a million places in the palm of their hands.

Yet our mystique about digital connection also keeps us in a constant state of anticipation and interruption. Our first obligation becomes to respond when that beep goes off. William Powers has written an interesting book called *Hamlet's BlackBerry: A Practical Philosophy for Building a Good Life in the Digital Age*, and he warns about the problem of a digital consciousness that is the enemy of depth, and the danger of being constantly distracted.

I think more than any other college or university, religious institutions know the value and the practice of deliberation, concentration, meditation, and solitude. The question for the coming generation amidst all the frenzy of our lives is how to structure environments for students that can make these traditions a reality for them in the midst of this connectedness. Given the great Jesuit tradition of being contemplatives in action, I would hope that a place like Boston College could help us revive the virtue of deliberation and reflection in a world of frenzied connection.

Let me now turn to a third issue, possibly the most challenging, because it involves the very structure of the modern academy and the expectations of contemporary faculty. Are we able to provide a curriculum and develop a faculty that addresses larger questions of meaning and purpose, that keeps alive theological and spiritual frameworks as ways of understanding the world?

Sadly, the modern university largely, even in the liberal arts, increasingly ignores the big questions about the meaning of life and the forging of character. We must begin by admitting how difficult it is today for colleges to do that. And on this point, there's healthy debate. Some, like Stanley Fish or John Mearsheimer, have argued that universities have no business trying to make people good. They should aim low and leave this task to churches, synagogues, and mosques.

Many others, however, note ruefully the seeming inability of higher education to answer the question, what is living for? In his book, *Education's End*, Yale's Anthony Kronman notes that he has watched the question of life's meaning lose its status as a subject of organized academic instruction. In a similar cry of the heart, Harry Lewis, the former dean of Harvard College, has written *Excellence Without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education*. The excellence of the modern university, he said, is hollow, because it has forgotten Emerson's conclusion that the honing of the mind is aimless without the development of character.

The Teagle Foundation, under the leadership of Robert Connor, has been engaged in initiatives to engage college and faculty in posing for students the big questions of meaning and value. What they have found, also using the higher education research surveys from UCLA, is that students are hungry to address such questions, but actually find fewer and fewer faculty willing to engage them on such questions.

Robert Connor is clear about the reasons for these differing expectations. Faculty are hired and promoted for their sectoral knowledge and understandably resist suggestions that they should be involved in the moral development of students. In fact, many see it as dangerous to their professional identity and reputation, particularly since so much talk of morality has come from the far right. Harry Lewis agrees that this deep tension will exist as long as faculty are hired primarily on the basis of their scholarly distinction, even as students come to college seeking, among other things, a framework for meaning and purpose.

A second reality in the modern academy compounds this issue. Academic disciplines themselves have become more diffuse, and many, such as English departments, have become cockpits of conflicting values. The dominant intellectual forces are towards fragmentations, the limits of reason, the breakdown of received tradition, and the big question is what kind of character are we trying to teach students?

This is true not only in literature. Even in history, it's become far more contested. What is the meaning of history, for instance? Is the meaning of history the advance of liberty, opportunity, and prosperity, or is it more a history of those who have been left out? And so as we look, say, at the past in America, is that something to identify with, or is it something to escape from?

In a recent article, "The Decline of the English Department," William Chace, the former president of Emory, notes the significant decline in the number of students who prefer to study English literature. It's dropped from about 8% to about 3.5% in the last 25 years. But he suggests that the demise of English is partly within the discipline itself.

He suggests that English has become less and less a coherent discipline and no longer has a way of understanding the world. Scholars cannot agree on which texts constitute a common curriculum, what kind of writing, popular or learned, constitute a field of study, and what kind of methodological approaches should guide students of literature.

He notes as an example what's happened to the English department at Harvard, which recently agreed to remove the survey of English literature for undergraduates, replacing it with affinity groups dependent upon literature that individual faculty members select. There will be no one book, or family of books, that every English major would read. Within these broadened horizons, it is left to undergraduates to cobble together intellectual coherence for themselves. As one Harvard professor put it, students should craft their own literary journeys.

The key question when it comes to the formation of young people is that most students enter college already inclined to see moral conviction as little more than personal preference. Sociologist Christian Smith, who has undertaken a major study of the religious and spiritual lives of teenagers and young adults, concludes that the dominant belief today is that everyone should decide for themselves.



The absolute authority is the sovereign self. Individuals are autonomous agents who have to deal with each other, but do so as self-directing choosers. The words duty, responsibility, and obligation feel somehow vaguely coercive or puritanical. Moral reasoning is largely based on subjective feeling of right and wrong, or as one young adult said, morality is how I feel, because in my heart, I could feel it. Who am I to judge? Whatever floats her boat.

How, then, does one get beyond this deep gulf between our aspirations for our campuses and what Dennis O'Brien has called the disappearing moral curriculum? How does one begin to address the reality behind David Brooks's stark assessment that on the whole, college students are articulate on every subject save morality? Those are hard questions.

But let me conclude with five sets of issues or questions that I think we have to address. A generation ago, leaders like Father Donald Monan, or Father Theodore Hesburgh, or Father Timothy Healy felt the need to ensure that Catholic universities could excel as universities—robust players in the mainstream of higher education. They worked valiantly to build academic quality and ensure academic freedom, a mission I think they were enormously successful in achieving. Today, I believe the larger challenge is whether, as full citizens of the establishment, such institutions can also succeed in clarifying a distinct mission and focus.

So the five issues. Leadership is critical. To develop anything like a distinct identity will take formidable leaders and great creativity. It will not be a natural evolution. It will not just happen. It will be more difficult for Catholic universities, where the traditional standard-bearers are priests and women religious, and they will be in short supply.

These missions are complicated even in concept, but in their execution, they require nothing less than Solomonic wisdom. Finding such leaders and developing them should be the highest priority for all institutions. For the board of trustees, I think it is absolutely job number one. I think this also extends not only to senior leaders, it also extends to those who are going to be department chairs. They are the gatekeepers of academic departments. They are the vision-shapers for academic life. So how do you recruit the kind of department chairs that are going to embody the full mission of a place like this?

The second point is faculty hiring and development. How does one find faculty who excel in the modern academy, in teaching, research, and service, but who share in the broader institutional mission—missions such as a commitment to the moral development of students? There is no greater challenge or opportunity, but conventional methods simply won't work.

One lesson I've learned—and this is true for a variety of hirings—is that the best way to do it is to have broader, rather than narrower, searches. If you're looking for someone, say, in 17th century French history, the idea that you're going to have other sort of values, whether it's diversity, whether it's religious identity, whether it's interest in someone in character, are going to be much less than if you have broader searches, where you can look at a variety of competencies and interests in a given faculty.

I won't go into it tonight, but I think the other thing is how, with young faculty, you develop them in a tradition of a given institution. I know Boston College has done a lot with that. Programs like *Collegium* have been terrific to say, how do young people who

aren't necessarily trained in certain issues in graduate school, how are they acclimated to an institution which has a broader set of values?

Thirdly, the issue of new resources. The most effective way to make substantial change, I think, is to use the raising of new resources to underscore institutional identity. Institutions can use new resources to define institutes and centers which are aligned with their distinct mission and whose faculty and administrative appointments will bring people of a certain interest and commitment. I know a variety of Catholic universities have done this effectively.

The question is, if Boston College is going to raise \$1.5 billion in its Light the World campaign, why shouldn't a healthy amount of that go to fund the kind of institutional distinctives that would not be addressed at Harvard, Boston University, or Tufts?

A fourth issue—real diversity. Religious institutions have prospered in America because as a society we have privileged this third sector for providing education for our students. This has meant that diversity in education has flourished in far greater measure than any other society in the world. I would also encourage a further dimension of diversity, given the polarized society in which we live—genuine diversity on any given campus.

There is no mantra as prevalent today in our institutions than that of diversity inclusion. But I am surprised that unfortunately, most of our campuses tend to be blandly progressive and are less welcoming than one would hope of voices that are really out of the mainstream.

Some of the sharpest divisions in our society involve things in which American Catholics have a heavy stake—the rights of women and the rights of the unborn, the nature of marriage, the priority of free enterprise and of individual rights, and the priority of solidarity and the common good. Policies on immigration, on primary and secondary education, on poverty, on religious freedom around the world, on foreign aid—a campus such as this should pulsate with diverse points of view on these subjects, many of them strong arguments—many of them diverse arguments flowing out of the Catholic tradition.

On a campus like this, students should be exposed to a variety of compelling voices, from that of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker movement to that of Mary Ann Glendon and Robby George. It is too bad if students here—particularly Catholics—do not read Alasdair MacIntyre as well as Gustavo Gutiérrez, that they do not engage perspectives like journalist E.J. Dionne as well as those of Ross Douthat. If our students are to be leavened in a divided world, I think our campuses must teach them those kinds of conflicts and help them to resolve them in these spaces.

My final point is give students something to believe in. Studies of the current generation of students, the so-called Y Generation, conclude that there are soaring volunteer rates, but that students are unlikely to stay connected to any one cause. They flutter from one interest to another. Their levels of mistrust of institutions, political and religious, is unprecedented, and their civic engagement, despite the last two elections, is perilously low. Less than 20% of students today say they have a personal stake in the major national issues of our country. For the most part, they come to college to find a good job, to maximize opportunity.

We as a culture have not provided them many leaders of character, or causes for which

one would give a life. And popular culture today exalts few heroes for young people to emulate. Instead, it pulsates with the antics of the infamous characters—very interesting, sort of the opposite meaning of a leader of character. Characters. So many television shows today focus every week on dark and dysfunctional figures—*Breaking Bad*, *The Tudors*, *The Borgias*, *Weeds*, *Dexter*, *Boardwalk Empire*, all follow in the tradition of Tony Soprano, week after week beckoning audiences to root for the flawed leader.

A university such as this needs to provide counterexamples to these narratives. In a world that is cynical about political leadership, we need to show models of lively and compelling civic engagement. In a world that is cynical about the church and its leadership, we need to show patterns of worship and service that are winsome and life-giving. In a world that preaches that the self is the center of life, we need to show compelling examples that the purpose of life is not to find yourself, but to lose yourself in education, in health reform, in third world development, in building businesses and professions that are genuinely for the common good, and in a myriad of other ways that a creative campus as this can devise.

If this is a community called to light the world, as I believe it is, let it begin in these halls. In your research, teaching, and service, continue to build a vital community that will inspire a generation of students to lead lives that matter. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]