Abstract

This is the very first piece I wrote on the subject of “Lasallian.” Its question: What is the relationship between the Lasallian charism and the university? remains central to my thinking because it seeks to synthesize the two fundamental components of Lasallian higher education. I continue to believe that no real progress can be made without satisfactorily thinking through this challenge.
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One of the joys of teaching in Minnesota is that you get to live with lots of Lutherans. I have spent a fair amount of my professional life trying to understand Luther and his theology. His life-story is certainly compelling because it revolved so much around conversion. I refer to Luther’s Tower Experience where his doubts and fears were finally resolved in an excruciating experience of salvific conversion. Being Catholic conversion experiences come much less easily to me; still miracles do occur. My Lasallian conversion experience occurred on August 20, 2003 at of all places our annual faculty/staff workshop. Workshops are almost always excruciating but rarely salvific. This time, though, Brother Stan Sobcyck spoke to us about our Lasallian identity. I’m not sure that he told me much that I hadn’t heard before but for some reason one point, that Lasallian teachers meet students where they are, really hit home. This is what I call a facet of teaching well at a Lasallian institution. What, I thought, if we turned this facet into a principle? Suddenly something Lutheran happened: everything became clear. We have spent quite a bit of time over the past several years talking about our Lasallian identity. I certainly would not say that this has been a waste of time, but I never thought it all came together, for me anyway, and I suspect for most of us. I suddenly realized why. We faculty have not been approached where we are and we are in and of the academy. For the first time I understood
clearly the meaning of the term “Lasallian University.” I understood it to be at the heart of who we are as a faculty and I recognized that it consists of two ideas that are in tension with each other. The explanation for this is historical and easy to grasp. The university and academe, which I associate with it, are creations that can be traced back to the twelfth century and are one of the most important contributions of the Middle Ages to Western civilization. Lasallian, of course, refers to John Baptist de La Salle, to the Brothers of the Christian Schools and therefore to the seventeenth century and the instruction of poor French boys, that is to primary education. This presentation is about defining these two terms, understanding their differences, and suggesting, very tentatively, how they might be reconciled.

Before I attempt this I would like to reveal to you some very personal experiences. This is not a digression but the first step in defining “Lasallian” because it is intrinsically tied to the person and the personal. I refer to the importance of touching the heart of the individual person. Normally this refers to the Lasallian’s connection to the student. I am suggesting that it can also refer to ourselves. Probably the greatest impediment to being a Lasallian teacher is the self. If you can’t make a personal connection to the Lasallian charism then it will never be very relevant to your life and to your teaching. This is why we faculty need to be met where we are by the administration and trustees and also why the process also has to be an active one on our part.

When commenting on an earlier draft of this presentation, Brother Paul Grass pointed out to me that community is also an essential element of Lasallian experience and practice. The Lasallian University as community is a huge and hugely important idea. All I can say at this point is the obvious: that a Lasallian university must be extraordinary in its emphasis on community.

The fact that I was taught by the Christian Brothers makes all of this much easier for me.
In fact I continue to be taught by them. I think it not irrelevant that I could name the names of the brothers who have had a profound effect on me because as I said the charism has something intrinsically personal about it. For example, my formal interest in the Lasallian charism began when Brother Chris Ford sat down with me one summer afternoon as I was having a cup of coffee. I barely knew Brother Chris at the time but through our conversations we organized a Lasallian “teaching circle” and read the *Conduct of the Christian Schools*. Last year I was reviewing an essay by Robert Darnton in a collection entitled *The Great Cat Massacre*. Darnton is a social historian who teaches at Princeton University. I came across a reference to what he calls a bourgeois’ description of the city of Montpellier in southern France in the eighteenth century, and in it a reference to the “Brothers of Charity.” I wrote to Brother Bob Smith asking if this could be a reference to the Christian Brothers and he referred me to Brother Paul Grass. Brother Paul has an amazing grasp of Lasallian history and the two of us had great fun going back and forth about the possibilities. Eventually, Brother Paul concluded from his own research that the Brothers had established a school in Montpellier by the mid eighteenth century and that the reference was likely one to the Christian Brothers. Eventually I shared this information in an email to Professor Darnton and here is first what he wrote in his original essay:

> Education, like money, had a disruptive effect on social categories. Although our author respected it, it made him uneasy; and he positively condemned its existence in the “Third Estate.” To his horror, the Frères de la Charité maintained two large schools, where they taught reading and writing free of charge to children of the lower orders. He wanted to close the schools and to abolish instruction in reading among the pauper children in the Hôpital Général as well. Artisans should be forbidden to send their sons to secondary school (*collège*). And at the top of the educational system, the university should enforce its rule against admitting anyone who had exercised a “mechanical trade” into the faculties of law and medicine. Only by keeping learned culture closed to the “Third Estate” could society save itself from having to support a population of unemployed intellectuals, who ought to be walking behind plows or laboring beside their fathers in workshops.
This argument was a commonplace in the eighteenth-century debates on education. Voltaire had often hammered away at it. But what really upset our author was not so much that educated common people would become a burden on the economy as that they would disrupt the divisions between estates. “It is repugnant to the rules of propriety that a sedan-chair bearer, a street porter, a vile and abject man, should have the right to send his son to a secondary school . . . and that children of the common people, who have neither upbringing nor sentiments, should mix with sons of good families, providing bad examples and a contagious source of bad behavior.” Robert Darnton, The Great Cat Massacre (New York, 1984), 135

Now here is his conclusion communicated to me in an email.

My memory is dim, but I probably used the word "Charity" because it was in the document. From my own reading in the history of education, I would say the anonymous author probably was referring to the Freres des ecoles chretiennes—that is to your Christian Brothers or followers of Jean-Baptiste de la Salle. The Freres were remarkable people, as you know. They did a great deal to liberate the common people from illiteracy and cultural bondage. For one thing, they taught children to read in French first, rather than in Latin, and their pedagogy, expressed in Conduite des Ecoles is remarkably progressive for its time.

The conclusion I draw from this tidbit of research is that the Lasallian charism has more than a bit of social subversion within it and it may be one of the things that we can connect to the university which, in my opinion, ought to be an agent of intellectual subversion in our world. But I am getting a bit ahead of myself.

Last summer I attended the Lasallian Spirituality Retreat in Glencoe, Missouri, the site of the old Christian Brother novitiate. It was a good experience and I could share much about it with you, but I’ll limit myself to one story. The retreat itself was thoroughly in the hands of lay people. Only one presenter was a Christian Brother. Yet about five Christian Brothers participated in the retreat. The very first evening I was paired with Brother Basil Rothweiler. Brother Basil revealed to me that he has been a Christian Brother for fifty years. He also revealed that he was the seventh president of Saint Mary’s College. Being not particularly sharp
it was not until my drive back home that I began to question why these Brothers were at the retreat. It suddenly occurred to me that Brother Basil probably didn’t need to learn about Lasallian spirituality. I finally figured out that of course the Brothers were not there to learn but to teach. But they did it not by standing in front of the room and telling us what we needed to know, rather they sat in the audience with us, they ate meals with us, and they shared stories from time to time. Of course they taught us, but they did so in such a way that we didn’t realize that we were being taught. And what they did was so full of humility and in so many ways so un-academic. They didn’t share ideas, they shared a way of life. This is the very essence of the Lasallian charism.

One more quick story: the title of this presentation was devised by Brother Bob Smith. I thank Brother Bob for spending hours of his time helping me to think through things and for encouraging me to share my thoughts with you. You can see that in every key instance encountering the Lasallian charism, I have mentioned a Christian Brother. The Lasallian charism is less about ideas, less about organization, and less about abstraction, it’s all about the person. Listen to what Brother Stephen Rusyn wrote in the “Letter Home” on the SMU website: “Lasallian meant that I teach students, not subject matter.” It’s the person and the personable. Now contrast this with my memo of August 21, 2003 to Brother Louis where I responded to Brother Stan’s presentation.

So, Brother, by creating a Lasallian Studies program you simultaneously accomplish two necessary goals. First you “academize” the Lasallian mission by making it part of the curriculum that the faculty teaches; it becomes an academic subject, though not merely one. Second, you establish a basis, an academic basis, for engaging the faculty in the shared mission of the Lasallian charism. In doing both you promote the creation of a more authentic Lasallian university.

Here I am speaking not as a Lasallian but as an academic. I’m suggesting that as an academic I
am concerned with the opposite of what Brother Stephen identified as Lasallian, not students but subject matter, the curriculum, what we teach. The Lasallian teacher is much more interested in who we teach and how we teach them. To which I would add the most well-known quality of the Lasallian charism, its practicality. Ask any Christian Brother what he has taught and you will likely hear: some high school, some college, some English, some Math, some religion. It’s the student not the subject matter. And what was the consistently most substantive complaint by the faculty about the old Core program? It was teaching outside of one’s discipline. It was all about subject matter. That sentiment is not Lasallian; it is academic and so you see that there is real tension in the idea of the Lasallian University.

The university was a response to need. That need was organization and its cause was the twelfth-century renaissance. The renaissance of the twelfth century was an explosion of knowledge. The most important philosopher of the time was Aristotle and with him came a new empiricism, a new logical methodology, a debate about universals. The renaissance excelled in philosophy and theology synonymous with names like Anselm, Abelard, and Peter Lombard. A close second was Roman and then canon law centered on the rediscovery of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* proclaimed by the emperor Justinian in the sixth century. Finally, was the recovery of science from the Greeks, for example the *Almagest* of Ptolemy, as the title suggests through an Arabic translation. Indeed the Arabs made a huge contribution to this western renaissance through the most influential commentator on Aristotle, Ibn Rushd, also known as Averroes, Al-Khwarizimi’s work on algebra, and a whole bevy of Arab authorities on science such as Al-Razi.

What did the university contribute to this process that the cathedral and monastic schools, the madrasas, synagogues, and classical academies never did? Organization. The university
standardized curricula. It required it to be taught by organized bodies of professors called
universitates, hence the term “university.” In turn the faculty bestowed formal degrees upon
students who successfully completed the curricula. It was all about uniform standards and the
rationalization of education. This is altogether different from the Lasallian charism. Students
were not met where they were but had to conform to the standards of the university, most
obviously they had to learn in Latin and not their native tongue. The curriculum was not flexible
but fixed. It focused not on the student but on the text. And that text was literally in the hands of
the teacher and not the students. The emphasis was sometimes quite practical as in the granting
of vocational degrees in law and medicine, but the overall spirit was one of theoretical inquiry
and often quite wild speculation. It touched minds. The university demanded money and lots of
time and this almost totally excluded the poor. In short the university was the very antithesis of
the Lasallian school except that this is an anachronism: the Lasallian school was a rejection of
the university, its formality, rigidity, its elitism, its Latinity.

Having demonstrated how different the university and the Lasallian charism are we are left with
a choice. We can admit their differences and go on our way, or we can attempt to reconcile
them. The latter is certainly the more difficult path, but if we are going to use the term
“Lasallian University” in anything beyond the crassest and most cynical way, we have no choice
but to find ways to make them not only work together but to enrich each other. As a start I am
going to suggest three ways to reconcile “Lasallian” with “university.” The first is to establish
that the Lasallian charism like the university has its own intellectual tradition. Second, I am
going to establish that that tradition is part of a broader historical process, and third I am going to
show that Lasallian spirituality is far more complex than it is usually treated on this campus.

I had a colleague, himself the product of a Lasallian education, who once said to me that the Christian Brothers have no intellectual tradition. This seemed plausible enough to me since I attended a Lasallian college for four years and nobody ever provided me with any information to suggest otherwise. We Lasallians have learned that at meetings, for example, we begin by saying “Let us remember that we are in the holy presence of God” and “Live Jesus in our hearts. Forever!” Have you ever wondered why we do this? This is not the place to attempt a history of Lasallian spirituality but I would like to demonstrate a sort of intellectual history of these Lasallian traditions.

It is commonplace to establish de La Salle as part of the French school of spirituality. Some of the names associated with this school are Pierre de Bérulle (1575-1629), Charles de Condren (1588-1641), Jean Eudes (1601-1680), and Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657). If you recall that de La Salle was born in 1651 you can see that he entered the world in the midst of the thought of these men. You can trace their thinking back a step further to a remarkable woman named Barbe Avrillot Acarie who was born in 1566. She presided over a salon in Paris where men who are commonly associated with the “Abstract School” of French spirituality gathered to discuss religious topics. You don’t need to go beyond the name “abstract” and the context of the salon to understand that theirs was not a spirituality for the average person. There was a greater thinker, one who attended the salon of Madame Acarie for a time, and one who was connected to a greater movement than the Abstract School, who provides an even better link to de La Salle. This is Saint Francis de Sales (1567-1622).

For most of his priestly life de Sales served as bishop of Geneva (1599-1622). This title
was more honorific than real because a half century earlier Geneva had become the capital of the most militant brand of Protestantism and the domain of John Calvin. De Sales spirituality, therefore, was a direct response to the Protestant Reformation. On this very complex subject I can only say that it was not only a direct response to the abuses in the church but also to the clericalism of the day, and the very complex and esoteric theology of the time, which connects us back directly to the university and late medieval scholasticism. What de Sales attempted to do was to create a spirituality that could compete with Calvin’s. While the theological Reformation was all about faith, good works, Scripture, the sacraments, and justification, the popular Reformation was all about how to be a Christian in the world.

De Sales’ spirituality is best found in his most influential work *The Introduction to the Devout Life* written not in Latin but in French and published in 1608. Here are a few short quotations from this work. The first is from the preface: “Almost all those who have hitherto written about devotion have been concerned with instructing persons wholly withdrawn from the world or have at least taught a kind of devotion that leads to such complete retirement. My purpose is to instruct those who live in town, within families, or at court, and by their state of life are obliged to live an ordinary life as to outward appearances.” (Preface, p.28) And “Devotion must be exercised in different ways by the gentleman, the worker, the servant, the prince, the widow, the young girl, and the married woman.... It is an error, or rather a heresy, to wish to banish the devout life from the regiment of soldiers, the mechanic’s shop, the court of princes, or the home of married people.” (1.3, p. 37) It was the genius of de La Salle to apply Salesian spirituality to the vocation of teaching. Finally, “[b]egin all your prayers, whether mental or vocal, in the presence of God. Keep to this rule without any exception and you will quickly see
how helpful it will be.” (Part two, chap. 1 p. 68) Clearly de La Salle set himself in the context of the Salesian intellectual tradition and its dedication to creating a spirituality accessible to ordinary people: the Brothers of the Christian Schools and their pupils.

Here is one more quick example, this time taken from the thought of Jean Eudes. In his essay on the “Religious Life in France During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries” Brother Jean-Guy Rodrigue writes of Eudes: “The most original aspect of his spirituality is his choosing the theme of the heart in order to unify almost all the other aspects of his teaching. Eudes is the first theologian to explain the proper object of devotion to the heart of Jesus. He taught that “the heart, the interior, of Jesus is given to us in order to be what is most interior and personal in us.” (51) When de la Salle admonishes the brothers to touch the hearts of their students he is clearly placing himself in the context of the Eudean theology of the heart. And in his Explanation of the Method of Interior Prayer de La Salle connects up these two most basic traits of Lasallian spirituality when he writes: “For this reason we must begin by being attentive to the presence of God. Throughout their duration the acts of the first part serve to support and to occupy the mind with the presence of God. In this way the first part disposes us for interior prayer, inasmuch as the attention to the presence of God to which we apply ourselves, which the acts of the first part help keep before the mind, withdraws it from exterior things only to occupy it with what alone can keep the mind within itself and thus render it interior.” (The Spirituality of Christian Education, 215).

Clearly the things we do as Lasallians are rooted in an intellectual tradition, albeit one considerably different from that of the academy. I believe that these two intellectual traditions of the Lasallian university are reconcilable, but they shall not be harmonized easily or accidentally.
There must be a commitment on the part of the Lasallian university itself and its constituent members to first know the traditions and then to synchronize them in ways that relate to both the whole and the individual members of the faculty.

I have linked de la Salle to Francis de Sales, and him to Calvin, thus connecting the Lasallian charism to the Reformation as a whole. It is one of the peculiarities of the scholarship as I know it that de La Salle’s ideas are not connected beyond the French school of spirituality. Perhaps this is a French characteristic, a reluctance to go beyond French things. But it shields us from an even deeper way to reconcile the Lasallian charism to the university and the academy. If we go back to the founders of the French school we notice that their lives span the seventeenth century. Since Martin Luther was born in 1483 and died in 1546 we can see that the French Reformation took place a full century after the Lutheran one. There is a good historical explanation for this. For most of the last half of the sixteenth century France was convulsed by a series of civil wars. These were, for the most part, religious wars between Catholics and Protestants, but they were also wars between royal authority and that of the nobility and the provinces. In addition with the premature death of Henry II (1559), the succession of a series of his very young sons, the assassinations of Henry III (1588) and Henry IV (1610), you can see that the French church was in no condition to launch a major effort to reform the church. (This is putting aside other issues such as Gallicanism). And so John Baptist de La Salle was born in 1651 into what was the high tide of the French Reformation and the Brothers of the Christian Schools are a Reformation phenomenon par excellence.

The easiest way to demonstrate this last point is to quote from Robert Bireley’s book on the Catholic reform:
Few historical movements have taken education as seriously as the Catholic Reform or the Protestant Reformation. Both Catholics and Protestants saw the school as a principal instrument of inculcating the Christian message, and both realized the need to win over youth. Schooling was to become an essential part of the process of confessionalism; education was the most prominent instrument of the Catholic Reform. (Bireley *The Refashioning of Catholicism*, p.121)

Here are a few quick facts to back up Bireley’s judgment. In 1529 Luther published his *Large Catechism* and *Small Catechism*, the first for adults, the second for children. 1535 Angela Merici received episcopal approval for what became the foundation of the Ursulines, a teaching order for girls. By the 1670s, when de la Salle was just beginning to think about establishing a school for boys they had more then three-hundred houses established in France. In 1536 a priest in Milan, Castellino da Castello founded the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. In 1563 the Council of Trent decreed that each diocese had to have its own seminary in order to better educate priests. And in 1547 the Jesuits founded their first college in Messina, Sicily.

If we keep on moving backwards we eventually get to the very beginning of the Reformation, to the Ninety-Five Theses and Luther’s attack on indulgences. At the very heart of the Reformation was the debate of the relationship between faith and good works.

An examination of Reformation theology is beyond the scope of this presentation. Let me just make a few quick points. In his zeal to combat the abuse of the sale of indulgences Luther attacked the very notion of the efficacy of good works. With typical clarity he writes in his *Treatise of Christian Liberty*: “It is clear, then, that a Christian has all that he needs in faith and needs no works to justify him; and if he has no need of works, he has no need of the law; and if he has no need of the law, surely he is free from the law.... This is that Christian liberty, our faith, which does not induce us to live in idleness or wickedness but makes the law and works
unnecessary for any man’s righteousness and salvation.” (Christian Liberty, trans. W.A. Lambert, rev. Harold J. Grimm, Philadelphia, 1957, 12-13) With equal clarity the Council of Trent dismissed Luther’s ideas and wrote in Canon XXIV of the Canons on Justification: “If any one says, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of Justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof; let him be anathema.”

What does this have to do with us? We have demonstrated that de La Salle’s thought was embedded in the French school of spirituality which in turn was part of the greater Catholic Reformation. Lasallian spirituality is in its essence a Reformation one. The dichotomy of faith and good works is preserved in de La Salle’s thought in a number of ways, most obviously through the interior life and the exterior one. (Note the dyadic constructs in the quotation below.) Here he changes the terms a bit and speaks of truths that are purely doctrinal and those that are practical, but he clearly connects them through the Epistle of James to faith and good works.

In order to bring the children whom you instruct to take on the Christian spirit, you must teach them the practical truths of faith in Jesus Christ and the maxims of the holy Gospel with at least as much care as you teach the truths that are purely doctrinal.

It is true that there are a number of doctrines which are absolutely necessary for us to know in order to be saved. But what would it serve to know them, if we did not take the trouble to practice the good to which we are bound.

Faith, Saint James says, without good works is dead. Saint Paul also says, if I knew all the mysteries and had full knowledge and all the faith, such that I moved mountains from one place to another, but have not charity, (that is, sanctifying grace), I am nothing.

Is your main care, then, to instruct your disciples in the maxims of the holy Gospel and the practice of the Christian virtues? Have you anything more at heart than helping them find their happiness in these practices? Do you look upon the good that you are trying to achieve in them as the foundation of all the good that they will practice for the rest of their lives? The habits of virtue that are
cultivated in oneself during youth encounter less resistance in corrupt nature and form the deepest roots in the hearts of those in whom they have been formed.

If you want the instructions you give those whom you have to instruct to be effective in drawing them to the practice of good, you must practice these truths yourselves, and you must be full of zeal, so that your students may be able to receive a share in the grace which is in you for doing good, and that your zeal draw upon you the Spirit of God to animate your students in the same way. (de La Salle’s Meditations for the Time of Retreat, 194.3. Italics are mine for emphasis)

It is time to stop and to bring down what has been admittedly an esoteric argument to everyday experience. Brother George Van Grieken in his book Touching the Hearts of Students, Characteristics of Lasallian Schools writes of “Ten Operative Lasallian Committments.” Here is what he says about them:

The first set of five commitments are more directly related to the spirit of faith; they speak of inner dynamics of Lasallian pedagogical spirituality. The second set of five commitments are more directly related to the spirit of zeal; they speak of exterior dynamics of Lasallian pedagogical spirituality, ones that effectively color the mission flowing from Lasallian identity. (127)

Clearly Van Grieken preserves the dyadic nature of de La Salles’s thought which in turn was very much a Reformation construct. A few pages earlier Van Grieken writes that “(t)here is no separation between the professional journey and the spiritual journey. Both are aspects of a single vocation and commitment to education.” (123)

It is my contention that we have done a much better job instilling in ourselves the spirit of zeal than the spirit of faith. In part Van Grieken defines the former in terms of a practical orientation, a devotion to accessible education, that is, meeting students where they are, and a commitment to the poor, all of which have become familiar to us. But the latter, which Van Grieken defines, in part, as centered in and nurtured by the life of faith, is, I think, something we have avoided, and in contradiction to his warning, have separated from a single vocation.

Let me conclude with a brief summary and some really big questions. We began by
recalling that we have over the past few years taken to calling ourselves a Lasallian University.

From this we proceeded to examine the meaning of these two terms and found that they conjured up very different ideas. “Lasallian” has traditionally been associated with ideas such as flexible, practical, student-centered and not usually with the intellectual life. The fact that the Brothers began with primary and what we may term continuing education helps to explain this as opposed to, say, the Jesuits who focused more on college and university teaching, scholastic philosophy, and considerable scientific achievements. On the other hand, the university has always been about the organization, definition, and certification of intellectual activity at its highest level.

While initially revolutionary, fairly quickly the university became rather rigid and compartmentalized. Next we asked how it may be possible to reconcile these two very different traditions. We did this by demonstrating that the Lasallian charism has its own long and rich intellectual tradition. The most obvious is the French school of spirituality, especially the thought of Francis de Sales. But then we discovered that de Sales was himself responding in the context of an even larger intellectual tradition, namely the Catholic Reformation. In this way we came to understand that Lasallian spirituality is embedded in an intellectual tradition of considerable complexity and sophistication.

From this we conclude that “Lasallian University” is not about trying to reconcile apples with oranges but the combination of two intellectual traditions, incidentally two which are part of a still larger Catholic intellectual tradition. But if we are to be honest with ourselves, we must admit that we have not succeeded, I would argue that we haven’t even tried, to understand the Lasallian intellectual tradition. It is with all respect that I suggest that, with some notable exceptions, the Christian Brothers themselves have not been all that interested in passing on their
own intellectual tradition. If we are to speak of a “Shared Mission” then perhaps we faculty, we academics, we intellectuals can play both a congenial and a useful role in that mission by championing that intellectual tradition. Consequently, this university has taken into consideration only a part of the Lasallian intellectual tradition. The task of being a truly Lasallian university is very difficult. We must be everything that Winona State University is, that is a true university. In addition we must understand another quite different intellectual tradition and integrate it with the academy. Do we really want to do this? This task surely falls most directly on the faculty as teachers but it needs to be shared by the administration, trustees, and staff as well, particularly the first two. How has the administration and trustees facilitated the faculty’s burden of integrating these two traditions, which those in public education need not be concerned with? One answer is the devaluing of scholarship. We are a teaching institution which does not emphasize scholarship, yet scholarship is essential to the academy, and to devalue it is to devalue the university itself. You can see the tension and the problem we need to face.

And now the really big question. We have had many discussions about whether one can be Lasallian and not Catholic. This may be a question mal posé, a badly-put question. The real question may be can one be Lasallian and not be a person of faith? Who among us wishes to take that one on?
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