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• Welcome and Self-Introductions

• Ignation Business Chapters Mission Statement
  
  o The Mission of the Ignatian Business Chapters is to establish and lead a national and international network of business executives to explore their respective religious traditions in order to help the individual executives:
    ▪ To integrate faith, family, and professional life,
    ▪ To develop a corporate culture that is reflective of their religious faith and values
    ▪ To exercise a beneficial influence upon society at large.
  o The conference, grounded in the Roman Catholic tradition, welcomes believers who are open to and respectful of one another’s religious tradition. It is committed to the conviction that ethics and values grow out of one’s religious heritage.

• Scripture Reading: Romans 5: 12-21
  Adam and Christ

Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned—sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to
Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.

But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many. And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification. If, because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.

Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all. For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous. But law came in, with the result that the trespass multiplied; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, just as sin exercised dominion in death, so grace might also exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.


• Quiet reflection: five minutes followed by sharing insights

Article: A Tale of Two Adams; Insights for the Integrity of a Catholic University, Michael Naughton

The Second Vatican Council describes the divided life as “the split between the faith which many profess and their daily lives.” This split creates a false opposition between public and private spheres, faith and reason, professional and religious life. The Council explains that this split and divide “deserves to be counted among the more serious errors of our age.”[i] Alasdair Maclntyre calls this split “compartmentalization,” which he argues is an increasing problem in modern life.[ii]

In this essay, I will examine the deep religious roots of this divided life taking a cue from the book The Lonely Man of Faith by the Orthodox Jewish rabbi, Joseph Soloveitchik. The book originated, in part, in a talk to Catholic seminarians.[iii] Soloveitchik draws upon the two creation stories in the Book of Genesis that ground his insights in a theology of creation that is deeply if not entirely congruent with Catholic theology. I will then offer a critique of our
contemporary attempts to solve the divided life syndrome by striving for “balance,” rather than by insisting on a deeper integration of the active and contemplative life. In light of these insights on creation, on the divided life, and on the integrity of the active and contemplative life, I will draw some final insights concerning the Catholic university, which like all institutions suffers from its own form of divided life. The university is a complex institution with many forces and factors influencing its life, and the analysis offered here is limited in scope, not meant to answer every challenge our Catholic universities face. But I think that we will make little headway in dealing with those many challenges unless we address the core concern of this essay, namely that we are increasingly living in a world that discounts and suppresses the contemplative life and that elevates the active life alone. This unfortunate development in the wider society has profoundly affected our universities and the people who inhabit them. Josef Pieper has described the divide I am discussing here as the “total work mentality,” a way of organizing life that creates proletarians whose inner poverty prevents the very conception of a reality outside the realm of activity and work. This “total work” disease has afflicted Catholic universities. Its presence can be seen in certain telltale symptoms, such as how they increasingly express their fundamental purpose, and how they are steadily distancing themselves from a Catholic understanding of the liberal arts, and the humanities in particular.

Adam One and Adam Two: The Active and Contemplative Life and Its Alienation

We were created both to work and to rest, both to be active and to be contemplative. These two dimensions of our lives are meant to inform each other as part of a deeper whole rather than exist as two modes of being that balance each other or effectively cancel each other out. To gain a better grasp of this truth, we need to return to our origins, in particular to the Book of Genesis, where we will find the nature of the created order, and how it becomes disordered.

Joseph Soloveitchik calls our attention to the fact that in Genesis there are not one, but two creation stories. He calls these two accounts “Adam One” and “Adam Two.” For Soloveitchik, the reason we have two creation stories is not simply that there happened to be two alternative traditions kicking around; he suggests rather that each creation story is given to us to highlight an essential dimension of our humanity.[iv] What he provides in his presentation of the “Two Adams” is not a complete exegesis of the texts, but a convenient way to perceive certain important truths about human nature. When taken together the two creation stories represent a profound synthesis of who we were created to be. Unfortunately, as we meet with these “two Adams” in life they tend to be alienated from each other, thus frustrating God’s intention and disordering creation. Soloveitchik describes the tension between them as the great dilemma for the person of faith.
In the first creation story, we encounter Adam One, the active and majestic Adam, homo faber, “man the maker.” Here we see humanity as carrying a creative potency of invention and discovery that mirrors God’s creative nature. Adam One wants to know how the cosmos functions. His goal is mastery over the world, a mastery he achieves by means of work, innovation, ingenuity, industriousness, and courage. Through scientific knowledge and technical application, the entrepreneur, the engineer, the farmer, the manager, the tradesman carry out the command to “fill the earth and subdue it” (Gen 1:28).[v]

Adam One is about mission. He ventures out into the world and produces change that makes the world a better place. He is committed to the successful production, distribution, and consumption of material and cultural goods. Adam One is a practically-oriented achiever and a problem solver. Adam One is acting in accordance with God’s creative act. He is a co-creator with God, discovering creation’s hidden riches and making them available and useful to others.[vi] Adam One reveals the “creative” endowment of being made in the image of God. His participation in the divine creativity achieves great things.

The second story of creation in Genesis gives us, in Adam Two, a very different picture of humanity.[vii] Soloveitchik speaks of Adam Two as homo receptor, “man the receiver.” Adam Two represents the contemplative dimension of humanity. Here God forms man from the dust of the ground and breathes into him life. He is placed in the garden to till and keep it. God puts Adam to sleep and takes his rib and creates Eve (Genesis 2). All of these actions are done to Adam, where he finds meaning not primarily in his achievements but in his received relationships with God, family and creation.

Like Adam One, Adam Two is intrigued by the cosmos, but the questions he asks are less about how and more about why. They are less immediately practical and functional, and more philosophical and ultimately theological in nature. Adam Two wants to know the purpose of creation, its meaning, and his role within it. He does not reduce the world to a system, but rather, as Soloveitchik puts it, he “looks for the image of God . . . in every beam of light, in every bud and blossom, in the morning breeze and the stillness of a starlit evening.”[viii] When Adam Two looks at a rose, for example, he sees not only its parts, but its whole, where the rose’s essence is captured not through analysis but through awe, wonder, imagination, poetry, and above all praise.

Adam Two is the protector of culture and the guardian of the “covenantal community,” the relationships nurtured in cultural institutions such as marriage and family, religion, and education. Adam Two nurtures and ensures connection to the cultural monuments of language, history, and tradition, realities that engage the fundamental events of our life—birth, death, love, and suffering. At the heart of Adam Two is the religious person. He is a “praying man,” in both personal and liturgical forms.
A simple chart that puts our two Adams side by side can help us to see the qualities of the active and contemplative life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam I</th>
<th>Adam II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Contemplative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The How</td>
<td>The Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Communities</td>
<td>Covenantal Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Politics</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity</td>
<td>Redemption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that Soloveitchik is not suggesting that these two accounts mean that God created two different types of people. Each person is meant by God to be both Adam One and Adam Two; each is meant to possess both the active energy of Homo Faber and the contemplative peace of Homo Receptor. The two Adams are within us, and it is only in their mutual penetration that we can become who we were created to be. But though these two Adams are meant to complement and fulfill each other, our world often puts them in opposition. The cultural commentator, David Brooks, captures the opposition succinctly:

While Adam I wants to conquer the world, Adam II wants to obey a calling to serve the world. While Adam I is creative and savor’s his own accomplishments, Adam II sometimes renounces worldly success and status for the sake of some sacred purpose. While Adam I asks how things work, Adam II ask why things exist, and what ultimately we are here for. While Adam I wants to venture forth, Adam II wants to return to his roots and savor the warmth of a family meal. While Adam I’s motto is “success,” Adam II experiences life as a moral drama. His motto is “Charity, love, and redemption.”[ix]

Lack of integration between the two Adams could theoretically come in various ways, but in our day, the most widespread problem comes from an aggressive Adam One who has repudiated and unhinged himself from Adam Two, thereby marginalizing the qualities of leisure, receptivity, culture, prayer, and religion.[x]
I have found this kind of alienation manifesting itself in my own life in many subtle and not so subtle ways. In one of those difficult but important discussions on the verge of arguments with my wife, she told me that my work often gets the best part of me, and she and the family get a worn-out husband and father. In me, Adam One exhausted Adam Two.

An “Adam One-only” life is often painfully manifested with great force in retirement. Lee Iaccoca famously engineered one of the most significant turnarounds in American business when he took the Chrysler Corporation out of bankruptcy in the 1980s. In the early 90s, Iaccoca retired. Three years later, he was on the cover of the Fortune magazine with the caption, “How I Flunked Retirement.”[xi] This icon of American industry explained that his three years of retirement were more stressful than his forty-seven years in the auto business. He was an economic giant at work, but he was a spiritual dwarf in retirement. He was confident as Adam One, but he had forgotten Adam Two, and outside of his corporation he was simply at sea. One can only admire Iacocca for being so honest about it to the public.

A culture in which Adam Two is neglected results in the over-valuation of “achievement” resulting in the dominance of the logic of the market, fixation on metrics and measurement and the devaluation of “receivement” and the logic of gift and culture. A market logic holds precepts such as: “Input leads to output. Effort leads to reward. Practice makes perfect. Pursue self-interest. Maximize your utility. Impress the world.”[xii] When Adam One becomes unhinged from Adam Two, these precepts, which have their place in a rightly ordered soul, give rise to a soul-destructing utilitarianism and pragmatism. Work then completely dominates life, progress is pursued for its own sake, and the result is a technologically sophisticated but spiritually small person whose humanity has been disfigured.

On his own, Adam One starts to believe that his unaided efforts are sufficient; that his talents and his sense of morality are enough to solve the problems that arise and to see him through to success. But in taking this posture he becomes blind to his moral and ethical indebtedness to Adam Two. Without that influence his mode of reasoning becomes more instrumental and technical, and his moral sense is severed from its deep spiritual roots. His focus is increasingly career-oriented and ambitious. He becomes more externally focused—"the resumé Adam” as Brooks calls him,[xiii] and more internally impoverished. His inner life shrinks and he can no longer act significantly outside the arena of his work. He comes to discount faith, religion, prayer, and sacred doctrine and instead fixates on career, technique, action and ethics. He unrealistically believes that he can maintain his moral bearings even as he moves away from the contemplative dimensions of Adam II. He fails to recognize that as he becomes less receptive, he is undergoing a corruptive change; he is losing his relational and ethical sensibilities even while he thinks he is emphasizing them. And the tragedy is he often does not know what is happening to himself until he finds himself in a crisis.
Apart from the integrated presence of Adam II, Adam I has no roots. He still talks about the importance of ethics and values, but they are increasingly becoming only instruments of his own achievement, a means to an end rather than a way of being. His ethical principles are more like cut flowers than like a tree with roots. They look pretty and have a pleasant aroma for a little while, and they may draw admiring compliments from onlookers; but cut off from their transcendent sources, they soon wilt and begin to rot, and their pleasing aspect disappears. There will be a lot of talk about treating one’s employees justly, or protecting the environment, or giving to the community, not because such actions are good in themselves, but because they will make a difference for the bottom line, or because embracing the slogan or fad of the day will make a good appearance. If once they are found to be unprofitable, or if the going fad is actually unjust or coercive, deeper moral concerns will be thrown overboard.

Whatever Adam One’s often considerable and impressive talents and contributions may be, the Adam One in us is always in desperate need of Adam Two if we are not to go seriously astray. Adam One needs more than the logic of the market or contract to live a truly human life; he needs Adam Two’s logic of the gift, a contemplative outlook that understands the reality of the world as a gift given him by another, to be received with gratitude, not as something grasped and earned by him that it is his right to possess. The logic of gift is rooted in marriage and family, the place where life is given and received. Above all, it is rooted in the Church, where grace is given and received through faith. It is planted deeply in those human institutions that connect people to one another far beyond the present, into our origins in creation and our destiny in eternity.

**Beyond Balance to Integrity**

This divide or alienation between Adam One and Adam Two has been a serious problem throughout history. So thorny is the problem that Soloveitchik does not see how the two can be reintegrated.[xiv] In one sense he is right; we cannot reconcile Adam One and Adam Two. Christ can, however, through His grace, teaching, Word, and Sacraments. Since the Fall, the two Adams, which originally meant to represent one integrated personality, have become fragmented. Christ, the new Adam, restores us to our original integrity. Through His Incarnation, Christ redeems us from our fallen fragmentation and brings forth a new day, the Eighth Day, Sunday, which brings together heaven and earth. The Incarnation and the sacramental life that follows from it invite us into a deep unity of life, a unity that we can begin to experience even now before our final renewal in the eternal presence of God.

Yet while Christianity brings genuine hope for deeper integration, the danger for many Christians is a kind of naïve optimism about the therapeutic self. Too many Christians, lay and clergy alike, make glib claims such as, “I have integrity,” and parrot the trite slogans of the culture, “I do what I say and say what I do,” thinking that they have thereby solved the problem
of Original Sin. The Jewish realism of Soloveitchik is a helpful reminder to our temptation toward cheap integrity. Tending to be smug and self-righteous of our own achievements as Adam One personalities, we are often about as deep as a puddle. We may want a simple resolution, but what we really need is a rescue.

We prefer to take the easy route to dealing with the problem of the divided life, so we use phrases such as “work/life balance” as though some sort of planned program will be able to solve this fundamental problem of the human condition. “Balance” has become one of those overused words in the workplace vocabulary. While it has its place, the “balance of work and faith” will often perpetuate, rather than confront and overcome, the divided life.

Balance is an attempt to manage matters in a calculative way by weighing options and adjusting things by putting more on one side or the other of the scale. It is a typical Adam One response. But our true task is different and more difficult. It involves attaining integration, by which each element informs, corrects, complements and penetrates the other.

Let’s be clear. Integrating Adam One and Adam Two does not mean devaluing the importance of Adam One and relegating work to a second-class status. Work is central to the practical life of goal-setting and decision-making and of personal and interpersonal achievement, from which springs our well-being as creatures who are by nature doers. This is why we speak so often of principled action, of the virtues, and of the common good, all of which point to the importance of the active life—the life of Adam One.

But our culture has tended to entirely discount Adam Two. It has been seduced by the idea—usually unexamined—that the achievements of Adam One alone can lead to deep satisfaction, happiness, and integrity. This is a serious error. We think we can get work and the active life right without getting leisure and the contemplative life right, but we can’t. If we have no place for Adam Two, we will find that Adam One has become disfigured and dangerous. If we do not learn how to rightly integrate into our active lives the posture of receiving—of keeping Sunday as a day of worship and rest, of praying, of engaging an authentic liberal arts education, of living in covenanted relationship—then we will be wounded in our efforts at achievement, whether in work, leadership, business, or education. Unless we confront this serious error of the divided life, we will have little chance to resist the instrumental, technocratic and dehumanizing forces so present in the workplace and in our educational institutions.

Our way out of the divided life will only come from the reception of a kind of grace, one that moves us beyond balance toward integrity. This is why at the heart of an integrated life is the theological virtue of charity, which Benedict XVI defines as “love received and given.”[xv] As gift, as grace, charity is first received. Charity begins the healing of the divided life by revealing the truth that the contemplative life of prayer and worship provides the context for rightly
receiving reality, and that what we there receive can be given to others in profound ways in our active and work lives. This is why Benedict identifies charity as the key virtue for Catholic social teachings, since it connects the active life, especially in the professional, economic and political fields, with the contemplative expressions found in prayer and worship. It is precisely at this intersection of the contemplative and the active that integrity can be fostered.

It is important here to explain what we mean by integrity. The two etymological meanings of the word “integrity” can help us see what is at stake. In the first meaning, integrity comes from the Latin integritas, from which the word “integer,” or whole number, is derived. The second meaning of integrity relates to being untouched, innocent, or pure. It is derived from the negating prefix in- combined with the verb tangere (to touch), conveying the idea that a person of integrity is someone who is un-touched, un-impaired, or un-blemished.[xvi] Each of these meanings points toward what it means to be a person of integrity. Because of our fallen state, we are internally divided and need to become whole; we are blemished and corrupted and need to be purified. If we are to become whole and purified, to be restored to a condition that we have lost, we need to receive a grace that is given and not earned; and we then need to give to others according to the same manner by which we first received. This is why to speak of “having” or “achieving” integrity suffers from a certain distortion; it fails to comprehend the condition necessary for true integrity, that it needs to be first received before it can be passed on.

Learning to receive and to give according to the integrated relationship of the contemplative and active lives is a tall order. Our Adam One-dominated world of hyperactivity, self-creation, careerism, and technocracy has left us divided, exhausted, blemished, and small. As Augustine wrote in his Confessions, “The house of my soul is too small for you to come to it. May it be enlarged by you.”[xvii] Our souls are enlarged when we assume the receptive stance of Adam Two who knows that he does not have integrity, but knows also that he can receive it as a grace through a posture of humility.

Insights for the Integrity of a Catholic University

The dominance of an Adam One attitude is not simply a problem for business and the so-called secular world. It is increasingly also a problem for the Church and her institutions. As a friend put it to me once, in every age the Church catches the diseases of the culture. Our age is no different, and is unfortunately currently suffering from the same Adam One-dominated outlook that has afflicted the wider society. I want to briefly touch on how this manifests itself in Catholic higher education.

Catholic universities increasingly see their principal purpose in terms of the active life: preparation for an economically successful career, attaining technical mastery, changing the physical and social world through energetic human effort—all Adam One attitudes. As Catholic
universities adopt the mission of social and technical change as its main and increasingly exclusive purpose, they undermine the Adam Two contemplative roots of their liberal arts and Catholic character. While the university’s hope of being a “changemaker,” of promoting social justice and diversity, as well as providing tools for building a successful career, has genuine importance, such goals will inevitably be coopted by our age of hyper-activity and technocratic orientation unless they are firmly grounded in the Catholic university’s contemplative roots: namely the study of the liberal arts informed by the Catholic faith, a mode of understanding that is oriented to receiving reality rather that constructing it. The heart of the Catholic university’s life is not a choice, but an encounter; not an achievement, but a gift.

The integrity of a Catholic university is principally found in the Adam Two quality of contemplation, one that is expressed both metaphysically and theologically; namely, that all knowledge is a unified whole, and that faith and reason are necessary and complementary modes of attaining an accurate vision of reality. In his many writings about university education, J. H. Newman regularly recurred to these foundational principles. Without them he feared that university study would tend to move in one of two directions: either toward the utilitarian pursuit of power divorced from ethical norms, or toward a descent into a sentimental and self-absorbed aestheticism. It seems that both tendencies are currently present in modern universities.[xviii]

In terms of utility and power, universities are increasingly dominated by professional schools and in particular by Business and the STEM disciplines. Such disciplines are worthy, but are narrow without a comprehensive intellectual tradition within which they can be situated. They tend toward assuming a monopoly on knowledge and life, and come to believe that they can explain everything. And thus they often foster careerist, materialistic and consumeristic views of the world that attack the receptive soul of the university.

In terms of aesthetic taste, modern humanities departments have tended toward a strange hybrid of hyper-romanticism and fierce political correctness. This hybrid fails to give a convincing account of reality and has gutted the humanities of their explanatory power. In terms of hyper-romanticism, humanities department have tended toward capitulating to the post-modern belief that there is no objective truth to be discovered, but that everything is socially constructed, including gender, family, and religion. They have abandoned the world as a created order. Instead of a unity of knowledge that nurtures wonder at the being of things, the best we can do is to organize a hodge-podge of courses that we call “general education,” a prescribed number of units in a prescribed distribution of disciplines that provides a multicultural tourism of discrete and specialized forms of knowledge unconnected to one other.[xix] What is ironic as well as disconcerting, however, is that just as one gives up on a created reality, some humanities departments have become fierce on mandating politically correct views of what should be socially constructed on gender, marriage, race, and religion.
Newman’s concerns of the university falling into either the ditch of a utilitarian pursuit of power or a sentimental aestheticism are the result from an Adam One approach to life alienated from a receptive, contemplative Adam Two. If Catholic universities are not to be overtaken by the same set of pathologies, we would do well to heed two insights from the Catholic philosopher, Josef Pieper, concerning the road back to integrity: 1) to enlarge and widen one’s scope beyond work and activity, and 2) to widen the notion of work and activity to the advantage of the liberal arts and contemplation.[xx]

**Enlarge One’s Scope Beyond Work and Activity:** Catholic universities should resist the temptation to describe their purpose simply in Adam One terms of utility and self-creation. First things first. The deepest purpose of university studies entails receiving a vision of the world that brings wisdom, founded in the principles of the unity of knowledge and complementarity of faith and reason.[xxi] Articulating the purpose of the university in these terms will help toward reclaiming for the humanities the power to ground students in a world whose meaning transcends their own arbitrary will as well as their own individual action. If we are to order and change the world for the good, we first have to receive it, and begin to know world as it truly is.

**Widen the Notion of Work to the Liberal Arts:** When priority and space are given at the university to a contemplative outlook, the conditions are created for the integration of the active and contemplative dimensions of the university’s task. The vision of the world opened up by a proper study of liberal arts should animate, for example, our understanding of work, wages, property, and economic and political life in general. An important contribution of universities is forming professional leaders. When Newman founded his university in Dublin, he set up a school of commerce, a school of law, and a school of medicine. He held that these programs were best studied in a broader liberal arts context, within which the professions could come to their proper shape and activity. The Catholic tradition of social thought is a testament to the potency of the integration this article has been arguing for; a sophisticated two thousand-year-old reflection on the role of faith and reason informing economic and political life.

Soloveitchik’s tale of two Adams points to an anthropological principle that should inform any Catholic university serious about integrating the fragmented educational practice of our time. By their possession of a rich intellectual and spiritual tradition, Catholic universities are in a unique position to provide an education that can deeply integrate Adam One and Adam Two, the active and contemplative life as expressed in professional and liberal education. But for that to happen they will need to re-engage a more comprehensive vision than the social and careerist categories they are now typically using. If they do so, they will make a serious contribution to the educational world and to the wider society far beyond their own doors. If they fail to do so, if they continue to turn their back on their rich integrative heritage, they can expect their universities to go the way of the divided and diseased institutions that surround them.
This article was published in Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture, Volume 23, Issue 1, Winter 2020. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

[i] Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World Gaudium et spes, December 7, 1965, §43. Part of this essay is adapted from Chapter 1 of my most recent book Getting Work Right: Labor and Leisure in a Fragmented World (Emmaus Road Publishing, 2019).

[ii] "By compartmentalization I mean that division of contemporary social life into distinct spheres, each with its own highly specific standards of success and failure, each presenting to those initiated into its particular activities its own highly specific normative expectations, each requiring the inculcation of habits designed to make one effective in satisfying those particular expectations and conforming to those particular standards. So what is accounted effectiveness in the roles of the home is not at all the same as what is so accounted in the roles of the workplace. What is accounted effectiveness in the role of a consumer is not so accounted in the role of a citizen. The detailed specificity in the multiplicity of roles is matched by the lack of anything remotely like adequate prescriptions for the self which is required to inhabit each of these roles in turn, but which is itself to be fully identified with none of them. Yet it is this now attenuated core self, which in the compartmentalization of the distinctively modern self has become a ghost." Alasdair MacIntyre, “Moral Philosophy and Contemporary Social Practice: What Holds Them Apart?” In The Tasks of Philosophy. Selected Essays, Vol. 1, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006): 117.


[v] Soloveitchik, The Lonely Man of Faith, see Chapter I.


[vii] Soloveitchik, The Lonely Man of Faith, Chapter II.


[x] While the contemporary principal expression of the divided life is largely found in an Adam One alienating Adam Two, Soloveitchik also speaks of the alienation of Adam Two from Adam One. This alienation has multiple expressions but it is particularly found in the Church when it discounts the lay vocation and relegates this state of life to simply obeying commandments. See Catholic Encyclopedia (1908) entry on Evangelical Counsels, http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04435a.htm. See also Servais Pinckaers, (The Sources of Christian Ethics Washington D.C.): The Catholic University Press of America, 1995. 136-137.


[xii] Brooks, The Road to Character, xii.

[xiii] Brooks, The Road to Character, xii.
Be Attentive: In the spirit of the Ignatian motto “Contemplatives in Action,” which of the Two Adams, homo faber or homo receptor do you identify with or over identify with, and why?

Be Intelligent: How are you being affected by this “divided life syndrome? What are you missing or failing to see?

Be Reasonable: What are your challenges today in attending to the task of integration and particularly the development of your homo receptor identity?

Be Responsible: Given the start of a new year, what key values or points of view surfaced in today’s discussion? Any action steps? What are the implications for you at work, in your community and at home? Leverage the conversation for good!

Closing Prayer: Suscipe, St. Ignatius

Take Lord, and receive all my liberty, my memory, my understanding, and my entire will, all I have and call my own. To you Lord, I return it. Everything is yours; do with it what you will. Give me only your love and your grace, that is enough for me.

Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen
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