

“A Hospitable Environment: Teaching the Sexually Intelligent Conversation”

Robert J. Parmach
Fordham University

INTRODUCTION

“Perhaps the greatest of all pedagogical fallacies is the notion that a person learns only the particular thing he is studying at the time.” - John Dewey

John Dewey was keenly aware that the origins and limits of true education are a difficult thing to pinpoint. Though one might be able to determine whether or not a body of empirical content is grasped by a student (by rote memorization, testing, etc.), one cannot ascertain (or underestimate) the breadth and transforming power of genuine education. We learn and teach with our entire beings. The mind, heart, and hands speak to different people at different times, and with different intensities, and for different reasons (Moran 1997; Harris 1989). We do not merely learn *what* we are taught. Consciously and unconsciously, we also learn *how* the process of learning speaks to us and, in turn, invites our counter-response. It is a *three*-way street, so to speak. We learn how to better choreograph and challenge this triadic process of interplay itself, in order to create a more hospitable environment for reciprocal teaching and learning.

Like cartographers, good academic teachers map out the terrain and clarify environmental contours. It is done by a process of disciplined inquiry. The aim is to carefully break open relevant themes with critical constructive scrutiny, and then offer discursive sustainable feedback within a dialectical discussion. In this way, we learn how to better appropriate the tools of our cognitive intelligence by a process of interplay, rather than a static unilateral route alone. It is a profound resistance to idolatry (Moran). No viewpoint is arrogantly claimed absolute above all others. Boundaries are carefully and thoughtfully challenged, not hastily ignored or forced. By engaging in this educational process ourselves, we cognitively teach how to fairly and faithfully tackle the rich content of contemporary experience as viewed through multiple lenses combined

with a life-giving restlessness about ideas. Pedagogy restricted to the *what* is a stifled endeavor. Pedagogy that challenges the *how* can liberate and transform life. We enter into a circle, an interplay of ideas. We temporarily abstract from ourselves in order to return to the concrete self more clarified. Helping to create a more hospitable environment that assertively, yet patiently, works to un-pack the *how* as theory in action is our noble and pragmatic goal.

In alignment with the above approach, this paper will investigate a philosophy of teaching forms and processes that will challenge the sexual wisdom of the whole tradition to be more accessible to the contemporary lived experience of young adult male Roman Catholics. Specifically, it will promote a process and method of creative tension between a triadic set of relations: official teachings, contemporary theology, and young adult male Roman Catholics. Here, the human pedagogue steers the inherent dissonance between young men and the official church in a conversation toward *cognitive sexual intelligence*. This approach employs, in particular, Gabriel Moran's exploration of teaching as an *interplay* of its multiple forms and languages (1997). The aim is to propose a specific form of teaching, namely "teaching the conversation," as appropriate and indispensable to the cultivation of a more hospitable environment of cognitive sexual maturity in contemporary young adult male Roman Catholics.

STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS

The state of the current tripod, for the most part, is non-discursive. Not legitimating the magisterial teachings on sexuality in either theory or practice, the young man finds himself adrift in a palpable *gulf*. The need to help bridge the gulf is evident. Therefore, a particular form of pedagogy, namely the cognitive "teaching of the conversation" will be tackled in the present chapter. Incorporating Moran's framing of teaching as an *interplay* of life forms and languages, the present researcher will privilege a creative tension pedagogy in order to realistically link the

needs of young men in dynamic discursive tension with the Roman Catholic Church and contemporary theological perspectives today.

These young men need realistic, alternative ways to cultivate their sexual intelligence and maturity. In response, there are certain teaching forms that seem very appropriate in tapping into the richest sexual wisdom of the whole tradition. They can help to better bridge the gulf between today's less dialogical, less discursive tripod of young adult male Roman Catholics, the official church, and contemporary theological perspectives. Distinctive educational teaching forms can create better environments for initiating meaningful discourse. These teaching forms can simultaneously and profoundly keep the daily experiences of these young men within a meaningful triadic conversation. To fairly, faithfully, assertively, patiently, and cognitively "teach the conversation" is essential for all three partners today.

A PARADIGMATIC SHIFT IN PEDAGOGY

In learning how to better teach the conversation, it is first noteworthy to articulate the paradigmatic shift that occurred from a pre-conciliar to post-conciliar Vatican II mindset in the way the magisterium understood the *pedagogical* place and role of the church. Unfortunately, many scholars and members of the faithful themselves restrict the impact of Vatican II as a council of *what* alone, without carefully unpacking its meaningful *how* as well. That is, the significance of the council is viewed through a confined pedagogical lens of prescribed issues void of its vibrant stylistic paradigm. In the pre-Vatican II model, the magisterium was held as sole authoritative body. It was responsible for content instruction and did so in a very ordered and airtight manner with little, if any, import from the voices of the faithful themselves. Pedagogical dissension among the ranks was understood as a major administrative and ecclesiastical blunder, and thought to ultimately weaken both the content and spirit of the church.

Church historian John W. O'Malley S.J. identifies the confined approach above as one that overlooks the new *style* and *how* of Vatican II's best significance. O'Malley holds that ever since the Council of Trent, the Church's ecumenical bodies operated in "a closed, top-down, and prescriptive style, which by and large is the style employed by every other ecumenical council—except Vatican II" (2001, pg. 17). The old static paradigm of the *what* was, in essence, synonymous with its *how*. It was undifferentiated since one and the same. As a result, any emergence of new pedagogical voices was stifled in that model. Yet, the style of Vatican II had a different focus. Rather than prescriptive and juridical in tone, it operated in a more collaborative and ecumenical approach. O'Malley maintains that this spirit "means no aspect of the council can be understood without taking a broader reality and meaning into account" (pg. 20). Catechetical instructional idolatry was called into critical question, and for good pedagogical reasons. The conversation now called for new and exciting paths. It welcomed fresh insights, sparked critical consciousness, and challenged our minds and hearts amid a changing world. The new style called for a grappling with 'the signs of the times.' But, why the pedagogical shift?

The pre-Vatican II church was a teaching church, not a learning one. As a result, pedagogical reciprocity was not often embraced in either the pulpit or in the academic classroom. Such give and take was viewed as heretical to the overall magisterial authority and deemed in bad ecclesiastical taste. Instead, a pedagogical "banking" model of education steeped in fortified absolutism became the standard rule of thumb for teaching. In the end, the effectiveness of such traditional pedagogical approaches collapsed, no longer worked, and remain no longer *workable* for today's generation of young men. Vatican II, O'Malley writes, "hit the church like a great meteor from outer space. For a decade or so, the meteor seemed to wreak havoc. How could it

have been otherwise? A radical change had been called for. Immediate implementation was the battle cry, but it was a battle cry without a battle plan” (pg. 21). The *what* had been challenged by a new *how*, but its implementation was and is not in sufficient dialogical effect yet. (For instance, consider the recent pedagogical approach for young adults taken by the 2005 USCCB *National Directory for Catechesis*. While admitting that some progressive pedagogical methods are necessary and relevant in response to a changing church paradigm, the *how* of the document remains steadfast in the same telos – “teaching with an end in view” (Moran 1997). The *how* is homiletic and even therapeutic at times, but not academically focused on a creative tension dialectic that embraces the current dissonance within a triadic discourse – the very process young adults need to reconnect to a relevant church. The raw material for such a process is there, but it needs to be wrestled with more critically, fairly, and faithfully, in order to tap into the potential for reciprocal transformative teaching and learning of a church that not only speaks and teaches, but also listens and learns).

The pre-conciliar pedagogical paradigm viewed the church in more rigid parameters. In true metaphysical terminology, it was a church of the “one and the many.” However, the many were judged from a *good* and *bad* dualism alone. No variations were permitted. The metaphysical principles of the one, good, true, and beautiful mirrored the Platonic ideal (εἶδος) in a triumphalistic model. Its magisterial characteristics were in the following vein: self-defining head in a pyramidal structure, asserting a monopoly in teaching authority, heavily defensive (apologetic), pronouncing unambiguous instruction, academic superiority of clergy over laity, adversarial tone, and scholastic based teaching style (McCormick, pgs. 18-9; Viladesau 2000, pgs. 111-4).

Juxtaposed with the above litany, the post-conciliar church experienced a dynamic shift. The features were: more fellowship oriented, more receptive to contemporary academic scholarship from clergy and laity, more collegial, theological study and debate more available to laity, increased ecumenical dialogue, and encouragement of student input and creativity (McCormick, pgs. 19-20). It soon became clear to Catholics of the need to incorporate critical consciousness in their pedagogical approaches to remain relevant. For McCormick, this critical consciousness calls for a genuine grappling with creative dissent as a much needed and useful pedagogical tool of both inquiry and growth. There was a need to refine the state of paradigmatic inquiry in order to substantiate the new data. *Ecclesia semper reformandum*. A contemporary re-fashioning of the traditional Roman Church paradigm was now an audible aim.

Although there was a great and refreshing wind blowing into Rome at the time of Vatican II, the fact remained that many church officials were not really sure how to steer the tumultuous current. Clearly, the previous rubric could not be followed in the same way. If for no other reason, modernity would simply not allow it. Caught smack between some rough oncoming waves, O'Malley writes, "rather than maintain the siege style that rejected everything in the modern world, the council wanted to open the church to what was valid and helpful in it" (pg. 21). What would be most helpful, yet challenging, to it would be a new form of pedagogy.

Now, embracing the presence and need of change was, and remains today, one of the chief challenges of the church's moral teaching, especially as it pertains to young adult male Roman Catholics. The need for an updated *workable* pedagogical paradigm is clearly visible for those who wish to meaningfully engage the realistic 'writing on the wall.' The process of working through it is the real challenge. The tools are available. But, they need careful, patient, and faithful re-fashioning, while holding the genuine lifeblood of the church's vitality in mind.

Derailment is not a sustainable act. In the realistic discursive tension and dissonance comes the promise of renewal and hope. Without open critical dialectical pathways, we breed stagnation and shame. We must remember that ours is a resurrected church, grounded in an incarnational theology whose lifeblood is a church of relevance yesterday, today, and tomorrow (McCormick 1998, pgs. 15-7; Viladesau 2000, pgs. 110-1; Dewey 1944, pgs. 79-80). Let us now focus our attention to *unpack* these critical dialectical pathways in order to better teach the conversation. The work of Gabriel Moran and other thinkers on teaching languages and forms will be explored.

TEACHING THE CONVERSATION

A. Teaching the Conversation: Moran's Teaching Languages and Forms

Like the interaction between three brothers in a family, teaching is a reciprocal endeavor of lived interactions that we learn daily. For Moran, teaching is showing someone how to do something, how to choreograph the mind and body (Harris & Moran 1998, pg. 32-3). Moran distinguishes between what he calls three related 'families of languages.' The first two families have intentionally contrary effects, while drawing meaning from their connections to bodily surroundings. The third family gets its meaning from a deliberate, yet careful, reflexive *unpeeling* of itself and the other two families (pg. 34). In the best sense of the word, it is the 'black sheep' of the family who challenges presuppositions while intending expanded meaning and growth. Though often unwelcome and misunderstood for good reasons, this family guest is not attempting to disrupt matters simply out of boredom or for destructive purposes. Rather, vigilance to the *process* of intentional subversion and dissonance for constructive dialectical purposes is the authentic pedagogical aim for this interlocutor. It is the genuine teacher who calls you to temporary disbelief, so that you might decide for yourself *how* and *why* you believe *what* you believe. For Moran, the true educational process is one of lifelong maturation within

an emergent revelatory context (2002, pg. 188). It is an interplay of contraries, in order to bring forth a critical *faithfilled* belief and way of life. Let us now draw our particular attention to Moran's three families of teaching languages, each of which shows us *how* to choreograph our mind and body to do something in particular.

1. Homiletic

The first family of languages is used to show someone the anticipated goal or finish line. This language is clearly motivated by an 'end-in-view' approach. It is a 'teaching the way' language. Its forms are rhetorical, catechetical, and homiletic in nature. This is the language we hear in sermons, catechetical directories, lectures, and during storytelling. Its purpose is to summon people to action beyond the church pew. It works to keep the vision alive after words have been spoken, to tell a story of inspiration and imagination, and to inform and persuade people to move from words to deeds. There is nothing inherently wrong about this group in and of itself. It is a very important, worthwhile, and sound form of pedagogy when used appropriately. However, it must not be idolized as the sole language employed or argued from. The possibility of such an idolatrous triumphalistic arsenal can breed stagnation, exclusivity, shame and fear tactics, rather than integrative growth and fellowship amid dissonance. When used inappropriately, it can manipulate and cloud people, rather than enlighten and challenge them. The biggest strength of this family of languages lies in its ability to team up with the other two languages in a healthy sibling rivalry, if you will. Let us not forget that a family of one is limited, both in scope and promise. In the best sense, it is to be used as part of a *healthy tension construction* language (Harris & Moran 1998, pg. 34; Scott 2001, pgs. 151-3).

2. Therapeutic

The second family of languages is used to show someone the possibility of healing, renewed strength, and a return to wholeness (*integritas*). This teaching language is clearly

motivated by a ‘no-end-in-view’ approach. It is a ‘teaching to remove obstacles’ language that is grounded in counseling, spiritual direction, and therapeutic models. Its discursive tone centers on a litany of praise, thanksgiving, welcoming, confession, forgiveness, mourning, comforting, and input/output emotional assessment. The aim is to remove debilitating obstacles “for the purpose of healing the individual within the community” (Scott, pg. 153). It is the language of the *now*, a psycho-social presencing of the self, in order to “calm, soothe, and heal” (Moran 1997, pg. 104). In this context, the teacher works to help recuperate the person back to wholeness. According to Moran, “...in those situations where people need healing words, the therapeutic is appropriate. One uses speech to soothe, to relieve feelings of anger, guilt, or sorrow...in therapeutic speech we temporarily suspend some of the intellectual, aesthetic, and moral standards for the sake of reconciliation...the aim is not achieving an object of choice but reestablishing the ability to choose...” (pgs. 74-5). In the best sense, it is a *restorative* language that builds up and encourages one to step back into the community refreshed and with renewed trust and more wisdom than before.

3. Academic

The third family of languages is used to show someone how to reflect upon the other two families and thus, reflexively upon itself. It is ‘speech about speech’ for the purpose of an engaged pedagogy of dialectical discourse. This ‘teaching the conversation’ language is clearly motivated by a ‘with end and without end’ paradoxical interplay. It is a language that is grounded in a reflective, reflexive, and dialectical nature, in order to facilitate the conversation of discursive pathways. It proceeds by way of a deliberate yet careful hermeneutics of suspicion approach. Cultivated life forms are meaningfully challenged to help bring out and critique the reasons how and why we think and act the way we do. The focus of this family is to help facilitate the point of critical intellectual engagement, while offering sustainable feedback to

evaluate the bedrock and nuances (both strong and weak) of our viewpoints. Academic speech is not swayed by party politics. Its true mission is disinterested in the *what* per se, and focuses more on the *how* and *why*. It works to investigate assumptions, biases, meanings, and contexts. It intentionally yanks the carpet from under itself for the purpose of exploring multiple pathways of thought (Scott, pg. 155). But, it does so in small dosages and for the right reasons. Eradication is not sustainable for anyone.

The emphasis lies in the tentativeness of a given text. Academic speech attempts to intentionally present multiple conflicting perspectives. Its aim is to promote a certain level of monitored suspicion, a careful vigilance to test theories in the hope of developing better and fuller understandings, images, and metaphors of learning. Academic speech is *revisionary* by nature. No understanding is final. All can be improved upon. None should assume idolatrous status. If it does, then genuine academic speech is not present. It claims allegiance to nothing other than its own self-reflexive way of proceeding. The hope is to motivate us to perpetually recognize *that* dialectical discourse matters, rather than *what* specific path to choose. It is a language that teaches how to better engage the conversation as a process oriented and ‘towards which’ approach, rather than a fixed endpoint alone. In the best sense, it is both a constructive and deconstructive language, for the purpose of growth amid needed welcomed (and even unwelcomed) constructive criticism. Its point is not merely to explain, but rather to help us *understand* and sustain our views and those of others. We learn to teach the conversation by genuinely engaging in this *interplay* itself at a rigorous level.

For Moran, this third family of languages involves dialogical forms of speech. These forms serve as “paradoxical reminders that the truth is possessed by no one, but that a search for the truth is the human vocation” as a vigilant and profound resistance to idolatry (Moran 2002,

pg. 211; Scott, pgs. 155-6). Examples such as dramatic performance and artistic narratives also work to engage and test our ability to abstract for purposes of maintaining a *critical distance* to the issue(s) at hand. They can be helpful exercises for the discerning mind and evaluative tongue. Academic speech helps us re-evaluate, and possibly redesign, our pedagogical environments once we see how truly hospitable or not our linguistic patterns are, should, or should not be (Scott, pgs. 151, 155).

Genuine dialectical discussion only commences when its conversants subscribe to a level playing field, so to speak. That is, where a common base of knowledge and mutual respect is reached and maintained throughout. Its roots are medieval. In such disputations long ago, a speaker was not allowed to proceed with his own point or argument until he adequately understood and explained his opponent's viewpoint to his opponent's satisfaction. A good pedagogical lesson to inherit today (though much to the chagrin of contemporary and popular trashy TV talk shows), genuine dialectical discussion can help avoid the debilitating habit and frequency of misunderstanding one another. Avoiding this unnecessary problem, we can get on to the more profitable business of challenging one another's views and paradigms, while, in turn, challenging our own. This way, we can benefit from the richest traditions of collective wisdom. We 'teach the conversation' by engaging in and modeling the very reciprocal process ourselves (Moran 1989, pgs. 78-9). Having spent some space *unpacking* these critical dialectical pathways and languages, hallmarked by Moran and other thinkers, it is now time to put the theory into dialectical action. It is time to *show how* a teaching of the conversation is relevant to the sexually intelligent conversation for young adult male Roman Catholics today.

THEORY IN ACTION: TEACHING THE SEXUALLY INTELLIGENT CONVERSATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

The need for an updated *workable* pedagogical paradigm is clearly visible for those who wish to meaningfully engage the ‘writing on the wall.’ Following Moran’s understanding that all genuine teaching is about *showing how* to do something in corporal and mindful ways, the paper now applies this theory in action as a workable paradigm. Specifically, the following attempts to show how to ‘teach the conversation’ with respect to the contemporary issue of homosexuality confronting young men today.

To fairly, faithfully, assertively, patiently, and cognitively “teach the conversation” is essential for all three partners today, in order for the young man’s sexuality to remain relevant while being challenged to mature. The need for an emergent interlocutor, in the form of a critical though sustainable teacher, is needed. A teacher smack in the middle of the discussion: one who models a dialogue of respect and dignity while facilitating intellectual and moral rigor. There is no substitute for open critical pathways if our genuine intention is to benefit from collected narratives of human wisdom. As such, there are three guiding principles that the emergent interlocutor vigilantly keeps in a healthy creative tension.

(1) Teach clearly and faithfully the official church teachings on the issue; (2) Teach clearly and faithfully other viewpoints, origins and strands of wisdom of the issue, the historical genesis and contemporary developments of the respective positions; (3) Facilitate a creative *interplay*, a tension amongst all sides. The hope is that both student and teacher will emerge with deeper, richer understandings of the whole conversation, while, in the end, being better able to choose one’s own convictions intelligently. As a result, this process will better show the young adult *how to think* in a mature religious way. It will endorse ownership and vulnerability interlaced. It will endorse a meaningful Hegelian *tri*-alectic of thesis and antithesis, for the purpose of enriched synthesis. The aim of the interlocutor is to disrupt, break into, speak among,

and intentionally rupture the intellectual environment, in order to make room for growth and the possibility of transformation. This will welcome the meeting point of a triadic creative tension dialogue. Let us now employ these three guiding principles for the issue of homosexuality as an example of how to teach the conversation. In a certain sense, one might think of what follows as a three-part outlined syllabus approach.

A. Teaching the Conversation of *Homosexuality*

(1) Teach clearly and faithfully the official church teachings on the issue.

The first step is to articulate the important distinction between *being* and *doing* for the magisterium's understanding of homosexuality. Being a metaphysically rooted one, the church acknowledges so-called homosexual 'inclinations' or attitudes (*being*), yet forbids any and all homosexual *genital* acts (*doing*). The fair and faithful interlocutor explains that, according to official church teaching, one can *be* homosexual, but not allowed to *do* homosexual genital acts. At this juncture, she also mentions that many thinkers do not agree with a metaphysically rooted distinction when it comes to everyday living. Careful unpacking of related USCCB documents, particularly the 2006 one, *Ministry to Persons with a Homosexual Inclination*, can be made. If the teacher does a thorough job in explaining the church's stance on contraception, she will have an easier time explaining the church's stance on homosexuality. Magisterial understandings of both issues center on the permitting of genital acts only with the heterosexual marriage bond alone, with no exceptions. At this point, the interlocutor can make this important connection and encourage a further *internal* dialectic between the church's theological arguments regarding contraception and those regarding homosexuality. Items such as internal consistency can be studied, among others, by teacher and student.

Another significant topic to address is the marked shift in the classification and understanding of homosexuality made by the contemporary medical and psychological community. The magisterial view of homosexuality as a sort of human deficiency requiring psychological and spiritual rehabilitation, or, at least, as a disorder that needs a carefully prescribed sacrificial gameplan in order to still live a Christian life though gay (*being*, not *doing*) need to be surfaced by the skilled teacher. Discussions about same-sex unions and marriages also need to emerge, as well as ones that accurately highlight the church's insistence that homosexual men are to be treated with pastoral sensitivity. This latter point can then be immediately juxtaposed with the progressive theological perspectives that question so-called weakness of will and weakness of character arguments, while encouraging the church to extend its bona fide mission of pastoral sensitivity throughout what homosexual men articulate as involving their orientation, and not only as a *response* to their so-called *errant* homosexuality. USCCB documents such as *Always our Children* and related magisterial teachings can be explored.

(2) Teach clearly and faithfully other viewpoints, origins and strands of wisdom of the issue, the historical genesis and contemporary developments of the respective positions.

As was the case for tackling the issue of contraception, the skilled interlocutor starts to articulate a voice by emerging from the magisterial foundation itself. Outlining how the church makes use of a Thomistic based understanding when it comes to categorizing the topics of virtue and vice regarding homosexuality would be a good place to start the conversation. Heavy diction that centers on sin, vice, and unnatural tendencies can be a great way to explore the potency of language and implications for teacher and student alike. Discussions about historical consciousness and updated biological frameworks and paradigms can also prove very helpful at this point. In addition, Kosnik's intentionally conflicting presentation of homosexual acts as

“intrinsically evil,” “essentially imperfect,” having relational significance over procreative significance, and as essentially whole and holy acts, could be fruitful perspectives to introduce.

Careful attention to language is so very crucial when addressing the topic of homosexuality, since commonly used diction is laden with socio-cultural and power based implications. Arguments that assert a moral evaluation of homosexual genital activity as “intrinsically evil” argued on the basis of an incorrect biologically rooted and flawed rubric is a seminal one to surface for the fair and faithful interlocutor. Unpacking arguments for abstinence and sublimation of sexual tendencies and urges should also follow.

(3) Facilitate a creative interplay, a tension amongst all sides.

Once again, the *dissonance* grows louder and more profound for the young adult man and how he understands the fullness of his emergent sexuality. But, in the continued *steered* dissonance we make room for expanded tolerance of views, purpose, strength, vision, and practicality. We make room for new variables and paradigms that better speak to the present human condition. We make room for new emergent dialectical discussions that not only critique and challenge, but also sustain and enrich. Like a metal chain, there is tension *in* the link because tension *is* the link itself. The genuine interlocutor makes room for the dissonance, without allowing it to dominate and fracture the progress of enlightenment. At the center of true education is freedom. In this case, it is the freedom of the student to take intellectual ownership and intellectually choose the most meaningful perspectives on homophile relations. The centrality of choice emerges for the young adult male and enables him *to think* in a mature religious way. It is not relativism, but rather *relative* in the best sense of the word. It is the emergence of a critical and sustaining voice for the young man, having carefully surveyed

multiple perspectives and ways of thinking, in order to better solidify the ground upon which his choice genuinely stands.

CONCLUSION

Good academic teachers map out the pedagogical terrain and clarify environmental contours. It is done by a process of disciplined inquiry. The aim is to carefully break open relevant themes with critical constructive scrutiny, and then offer discursive sustainable feedback within a dialectical discussion. In this way, we learn how to better appropriate the tools of our cognitive intelligence by a process of interplay, rather than a static unilateral route alone. It is a profound resistance to idolatry (Moran). No viewpoint is arrogantly claimed absolute above all others. Boundaries are carefully and thoughtfully challenged, not hastily ignored or forced. By engaging in this educational process ourselves, we cognitively teach how to fairly and faithfully tackle the rich content of contemporary experience as viewed through multiple lenses combined with a life-giving restlessness about ideas. Pedagogy restricted to the *what* is a stifled endeavor. Pedagogy that challenges the *how* can liberate and transform life. We enter into a circle, an interplay of ideas. We temporarily abstract from ourselves in order to return to the concrete self more clarified. Helping to create a more hospitable environment that assertively, yet patiently, works to un-pack the *how* as theory in action is our noble and pragmatic goal.

In this paper, the author aimed to investigate a philosophy of teaching forms and processes that challenge the sexual wisdom of the whole tradition to be more accessible to the contemporary lived experience of young adult male Roman Catholics. Specifically, this paper promoted a process and method of creative tension between a triadic set of relations: official teachings, contemporary theology, and young adult male Roman Catholics. As such, the human pedagogue, as *interlocutor*, steers the inherent dissonance between young men and the official

Church in a conversation toward *cognitive sexual intelligence*. This approach employed, in particular, Gabriel Moran's exploration of teaching as an *interplay* of its multiple forms and languages (1997). The aim was to propose a specific form of teaching, namely "teaching the conversation," as appropriate and indispensable to the cultivation of a more hospitable environment of cognitive sexual maturity in contemporary young adult male Roman Catholics.

WORKS CITED

- Dewey, J. 1944. *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Harris, M. and G. Moran. 1998. *Reshaping religious education: conversations on contemporary practice*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Harris, M. 1989. *Fashion me a people: curriculum in the Church*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- McCormick, R. 1998. The Church and dissent: how Vatican II ushered in a new way of thinking. *Commonweal* CXXX, 4, Feb. 27: 15-8.
- Moran, G. 2007. *Fashioning a people today: the educational insights of Maria Harris*. New London, CT: _____.
- _____. 2002. *Both sides: the story of revelation*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- _____. 1997. *Showing how: the act of teaching*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- O'Malley, J.W. 2001. Version two: a break from the past. *Commonweal* CXXVIII, 5, Mar. 9: 17-22.
- Scott, K. 2001. To teach religion or not to teach religion: is that the dilemma? In *Religious Education as practical theology: essays in honour of Professor Herman Lombaerts*. Bert Roebben & Michael Warren (eds.), Leuven, Peeters: 145-73.
- USCCB, 1997. *Always our children: a pastoral message to parents of homosexual children and suggestions for pastoral ministers*, by Committee on Marriage and Family.
- Viladesau, R. 2000. *Theology and the arts: encountering God through music, art, and rhetoric*. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1968. *Philosophical investigations*. Anscombe, G.E.M. (trans.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.