PROMOTIO JUSTITIAE

EXCHANGES ECHANGES INTERCAMBIOS

N° 56, June 1994

IN THIS ISSUE

C.P. 6139 — 00195 ROMA — ITALY
+39-6-687.9283 (fax)

INTRODUCTION

"Justice" as in "service of faith and promotion of justice" surely has differing meanings and nuances — historically, socially, notionally and emotively — in different parts of the world. The article "Philosophical Notes on Justice" (*PJ* n° 53, November 1993) introduced such an inter-cultural inquiry, and in this issue Franz Magnis-Suseno, S.J., applies the idea by articulating what justice concretely means as it is lived in Indonesia. May this also serve as a sincere invitation to any Jesuit who would like to contribute a similar reflection, from within the culture he is living in.[1]

The first essay or tabloid took "the Church, in which we have been baptized, and the Society, in which we have consecrated our lives to God,"[2] as **common ground** for the entire reflection on challenges to our mission. Assuming this our fundamental location within the Church, Peter Fennessy, S.J., and Carlos Sorbi, S.J., draw out some contemporary challenges as we consider the world in which we are immersed as participants, observers, actors and victims, as vowed and many as ordained religious in the Church, and all sent on mission.

The First Jesuits by John O'Malley, S.J., inspired Michael Hurley, S.J., to write about the traditional Jesuit work of reconciling the estranged. On this topic, Fr. O'Malley commented,

> One of my frustrations in writing *The First Jesuits* was that the monographs simply have not been written on which a synthesis like mine should be based. I especially felt it in the section on "Peacemaking" ... I would have liked to make that section longer and more developed.

This reinforces Fr. Hurley's well-documented suggestion that much grace may await the Society in retrieving the tradition of interpersonal reconciliation and social peacemaking.

An address which is recorded, transcribed and edited into an article should be read primarily as "spoken" rather than as written text; this is the case of the talk in November by Michael Buckley, S.J., to the Boston College Jesuit Community, very helpfully situating the great work currently underway to prepare the revision of the Society's proper law, and Urbano Valero, S.J., adds an update on the work in progress. The conference I gave at the *Universidad Pontificia Comillas* in Madrid in April, is also published in the oral style. It makes an educational and institutional application of our faith-justice mission, is followed by an eloquent commentary by José de Pablo, S.J., and concludes with some quotations from Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J., on the mission of the University.

An editor welcomes **every** letter, the critical no less than the laudatory. The following words of praise are so consoling that I could not resist sharing them with you:

---

[1] See Séamus Murphy, S.J., "The Many Ways of Justice," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 26:2 (March 1994).

[2] The preparatory essays are published by the Secretariat for Ignatian Spirituality (Rome) as "The Jesuits: Towards GC 34," *CIS* 25:1 (1994). Essay 1, n° 1.1.5; cf n° 1.2.1.

> Receive our gratitude for your service in publishing *Promotio Justitiae*, a really interesting publication which we receive with pleasure. It's a good sign when in certain communities you hear it talked about, and they ask if the next issue has arrived yet.

The writer's identity is reserved, to protect him from the risk of being contradicted!

If you are struck by the ideas in an article or commentary, or if you have something to contribute to the themes in *The Jesuits: Towards GC 34*, your brief response is very welcome. To send a letter to *PJ* for inclusion in a future issue, please use the address or fax number on the cover, or send it by electronic mail to uucp:czerny@geo2.geonet.de

The Social Justice Secretariat at the General Curia of the Society of Jesus (Rome) publishes *Promotio Justitiae* in English, French and Spanish. If you are interested in receiving *PJ*, you need only make your request to Father Socius of your Province, while non-Jesuits please send your mailing-address (indicating the language of your choice) to the Editor.

Appearing in the season of Pentecost, this issue of *PJ* requests the gifts of the Holy Spirit for all the many efforts going on to prepare the Synod on Consecrated Life and G.C. 34.

PRAYER for RENEWAL

> O Holy Spirit, whose mission is to direct and guide our lives, grant us the breath and fire of a Pentecost in our days.
>
> Please inspire our modest efforts to advance, within us and around us, the Kingdom of God inaugurated by Jesus Christ.
>
> Strengthened by your support, in solidarity with one another, may we dedicate our talents and resources to a renewal serving the needs of our time. Help us to find directions which respond to the deepest aspirations of a people who seek, without realizing, the One who is Truth and Life.
>
> Amen.

The prayer was contributed by Irénée Beaubien, S.J., founder ten years ago of *Sentiers de Foi* (Montreal), a ministry reconciling Catholics with the Church.

Editor: Michael Czerny, S.J.

NOTES on JUSTICE in an INDONESIAN PERSPECTIVE

Franz Magnis-Suseno, S.J.

1. As in other Asian and African countries, Indonesians find their identity, not as atomized individuals watching out for their rights, but as members of a concrete community. Quality of life is measured by whether or not people can live within a community and feel at home, know their place, be their own selves. Thus the focus of their endeavours is on the wellbeing of the felt community they live in. This community is, of course, structured with different intensities and claims to allegiance, and with it one shares the good and bad things life brings. A Javanese proverb says: "It does not matter whether we have something to eat or not, the main thing is, we are together!" In difficulties or when need arises, neighbours gladly help each other.

2. Indonesians are not fighters for "social justice". They have learned not to get excited over generally bad or unjust conditions. They care about their concrete community, not for a "cause". If they encounter suffering, except in the close circle of the family, they do not show compassion so much as concern and sympathy. They also help the stranger who needs help. One does not leave somebody alone who cannot help himself.

3. On the village level, equality is regarded as a very high value. When former villagers who have attained high government positions visit their village, they set a premium on being treated as just one of the villagers. As human beings, villagers are equal, and this is a deeply-felt value.

4. On the other hand feudal relationships of higher and lower positions still play an important role in Indonesian society. Thus differences in wealth, lifestyle and luxury are, by themselves, not offensive to Indonesians. But with these differences there has to go a certain behaviour. While the lower ones show respect, the higher one acknowledges responsibility for the wellbeing of the lower ones by providing social services and, generally speaking, by demonstrating that his or her higher position is also beneficial for the community in general.

5. Thus, wealth and luxury in themselves are not against Indonesian values, but only when they coexist with blatant poverty and destitution. Differences in wealth, in influence, in social status are accepted, but only as long as nobody within the same region falls into subhuman conditions (according to the values of the community) or destitution. Thus, for example, the ongoing expansion of golf courses, while surrounding people have no houses, is felt as unjust and offensive. Disregard by those profiting from a fortunate fate towards the rest of the community, shows a loss of the fundamental feeling of the unity of the community and is therefore unjust and morally wrong. Thus the existence of an upper class of super-rich people, living very visibly in their own world, surrounded by facilities that are completely out of reach of ordinary people, is regarded as an unjust, metaphysically unstable condition, which will come to an end at a destined time.

6. The strongest feelings of injustice are elicited when the procuring of facilities for the wealthy and powerful is achieved by destroying the livelihood of common people. For example, when people lose their huts — and very often also their livelihood, because they used to find it in the neighbourhood from which they are ousted — in order to make room for big projects, or when

their agricultural land is taken over, all with quite insufficient compensation, such experiences result in deep, ongoing feelings of being treated unjustly. Such a state of affairs should, in the opinion of common people, not go on. Maybe their deepest feeling can be expressed in this way: "We, the people, have always treated you with respect, we have not envied you for your wealth and fortunate conditions, we have acknowledged that you are important for society, and now you treat us as garbage, you have no regard for our very modest needs, you kick us out, you destroy us: this is not right, this cries out to heaven!"

Franz Magnis-Suseno, S.J.
STF Driyarkara
Kotak Pos 1397
Jakarta 10013
INDONESIA

+ + + + +

CHURCH QUESTIONS before G.C. 34

There is a great deal of **polarization** in the Church today. Beginning perhaps with *Humanae Vitae* and the judgment that this encyclical contains erroneous teaching, some priests, theologians and laity have increasingly disassociated themselves from the authentic teaching of the Holy Father and from authoritative statements of the Vatican congregations. The controversy centred first on birth control and other issues of sexuality and gender, and subsequently on the question of legitimate dissent from the ordinary magisterium of the Church. The Vatican has increasingly acted to reiterate its traditional teaching on sexual issues, reassert its authority, suppress dissent and insure conformity of doctrine and belief. These acts, however, have been perceived as intransigent and coercive, and such observations are regarded as insubordinate and insolent, and so the situation has become worse rather than better. Some individuals are critical of and hostile to any Vatican teaching; some live in anger at coercion and in fear of reprisals by Church authorities. Some fear the liberalism of theologians will shatter Church unity and make chaos of Church teaching; others fear that suppression of critical thought will destroy Church theology and turn Catholicism into a cult. Each side tends to feel it is absolutely right and the other side is absolutely wrong.

This polarization is an **obstacle** to the apostolic work of Jesuits and others. The debate over ordinances for Catholic universities in the U.S.A., for example, shows a serious division of attitudes between the hierarchy and universities that cannot be good for Catholic education. Preachers and teachers must choose on some topics whether to endanger their own credibility by proclaiming official Church teaching, to be regarded as disloyal to the Church by speaking otherwise, or to avoid controversy by remaining silent at a time when people cry out for moral guidance. Our apostolic works and those of others suffer from this division in the Church.

Can we do something about this? Can Jesuits behave in such a way ourselves as to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. And while this is a very delicate matter open to be easily misunderstood, can the Society of Jesus undertake a mission of reconciliation to promote dialogue in which both sides truly listen and in which both sides move toward greater mutual

trust and harmony? It would seem that this is a foundational issue that should be addressed first as we look to our service of the Church in our various apostolates.

Peter Fennessy, S.J.
John Carroll University
University Heights, OH 44118-4581
U. S. A.

The next General Congregation should, in my opinion, (i) redefine the framework of our mission today, rereading Decree 4 in the light of new settings; (ii) specify the meaning, both in this new context as well as in the light of the new Universal Catechism, of the challenge of the "New Evangelization"; and (iii) specify what it means today for the Society to practice the preferential option for the poor.

I. With respect to the first point, our new frame of reference today: the "time" of "the crucial struggle of our time"[1] was 1975, that of G.C. 32, and that of Vatican II: preparation, celebration, application. That time was characterized by the predominance of Enlightenment culture among the middle classes, and of a culture derived from a Marxist model among the working classes. The beginnings of this culture go back to that fateful year of 1789. In the Church the crucial problem was the relationship with the modern world, opened up by the "dialogue" initiated by Leo XIII, especially in *Rerum Novarum*, and continued by his successors.

Today, the frame of reference is the post-modern world:
- the universalistic myths of totalitarian ideologies have fallen;
- fragmentation and nationalistic and ethnocentric-regionalistic movements have increased;
- the more or less affluent societies are sensing that not even they can be self-sufficiently independent; the South is knocking at the door, and there is need for cooperation at all levels.

Thus both particular identities on the one hand, and a universal spirit of openness on the other, are required at the same time.

That is why Decree 4 should be reread within the framework of fragmentation as well as of universal needs. There is no longer **one single** battle against Marxist atheism or, more generally, against the Enlightenment spirit of modernity. Rather, there are battles against particular forms of selfishness and against general heresies; against the unstoppable power of economic processes, of consumerism, of financial head-offices, of political powers and of the cultural power of the mass-media. In order for the dignity and identity of individuals and groups — especially the less protected, less developed, less fortunate — to be respected, there is a global need for fraternity and peace.

II. The challenge of the "New Evangelization" tends to free the Catholic Church from a situation of doubt, uncertainty, fear and stalemate produced by a misguided dialogue which had been so open that it made the Church lose its specificity, especially its ecclesiological specificity.

III. The challenge of the "preferential option for the poor" is no longer, if it ever was, a choice influenced largely by ideological premises which were either solely or mainly socio-economic and

[1] Cf. G.C. 32, D.4, n° 2.

cultural. Rather, it is a renewed apostolic-missionary enthusiasm cognizant of the urgency of carrying Truth and Salvation, whole and entire, as the Catholic Church, to all peoples, in all dimensions of their lives, that is, all dimensions in the Pauline sense of *soma*, *psychè* and *pneuma*.

The history and tradition of the Society of Jesus has always been characterized by such challenges. The identity of the Society is irrevocably linked to the person and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. The theology which the Society has chosen and defended cannot weaken the Thomistic theological anthropology which, over the centuries, has marked the controversies which Jesuits have had with various powers that from time to time sought to reduce and limit the role of the Church and of the Pope to something semi-private or at least to a question of "personal conscience" without any influence at all on society, politics or law.

These seem to me to be a few challenges which the Society is facing, and to which G.C. 34 must respond, keeping in mind that even on the historical level we cannot ignore the orientation sprung from the current pontificate and its great effects, both those which have only begun and those already accomplished — really and truly prophetic outcomes, fruit of a great faith in the leading role of Providence in History which both undercuts and surpasses the ambitions of the powers of this world.

Carlos Sorbi, S.J.
"Centro Astalli"
Via degli Astalli 14A
00186 Roma
ITALY

+ + + + +

RECONCILIATION and G.C. 34

Michael Hurley, S.J.

Reading John O'Malley's *The First Jesuits*,[1] I discovered to my surprise that **reconciling the estranged** (*dissidentium reconciliatio*) is included in the list of ministries given in the *Formula of the Institute* — a document which for Jesuits is supremely important, spiritually as well as juridically. G.C. 32 had referred to this section of the *Formula* in Decree 4,[2] but 'reconciliation' did not enter into current Jesuit jargon. It is not one of the words or phrases (e.g. service of faith and promotion of justice, our way of proceeding, discernment) which have become familiar in recent decades. For that reason I asked myself if the reference to reconciliation in the *Formula* could be helpful in the forthcoming Congregation.

[1] Harvard University Press, 1993.

[2] "Reconciliation with God demands the reconciliation of people with one another" (§ 2), while § 17 quotes extensively from the *Formula* and concludes, "This primordial statement remains for us a normative one."

What does 'reconciling the estranged' mean in the *Formula* itself? According to O'Malley, it is a particular ministry, but the reconciliation intended is not the sacramental hearing of confessions and giving of absolution, although this might be included. The dissidents in question are feuding groups or factions, and the reconciliation intended is bringing the feuds to an end. O'Malley devotes a three-page section to this special ministry and, very significantly, entitles it "**Peacemaking.**"[3]

The first version of the *Formula* in 1540 simply mentioned 'works of charity' without being specific, remembering that 'pardoning offenses and injuries' was one of the seven recognized spiritual works of mercy. In the second version of 1550, however, 'reconciling the estranged' is given specific mention and put in first place. 'Assisting and serving those found in prisons and hospitals' is also mentioned.

The followers of Luther or other Protestants were not to be the particular focus of the Jesuit ministry of reconciliation. It is all the more significant that another addition to the *Formula* in 1550 shows a definite concern about the Reformation: the purpose of the Society is expanded to include 'the defence' as well as 'the propagation of the faith'.

"Although religious peacemaking figured in the ministry of the mendicants in the late Middle Ages and played a role in some confraternities," O'Malley writes, "we do not know much about it either in detail or as a general phenomenon. It is therefore impossible to make a comparative assessment of Jesuit peacemaking." He gives a number of examples, all involving preaching to feuding factions, but notes that reconciliation "sometimes extended beyond the elimination of brutal vendettas." One example of such an extension is the reconciliation of an estranged married couple. Nadal is quoted to the effect that all the Society's other ministries were at the service of the ministry of reconciliation.

What use do the two tabloids preparing for G.C. 34 make of the *Formula*'s reference to the ministry of reconciliation? The *Composition of Place* describes the 'world in shadows' and duly notes some of the conflicts which are presently leading to estrangement and alienation:

> Fundamentalisms of all stripes fuel intolerance and violent fragmentation along ethnic, national, racial, religious or tribal lines.... The Church in some parts of the world seems ever more turned in on itself, many members at loggerheads politically and theologically, many women and young people alienated.

Evangelization and Culture has a section on pluralism at the end of which it asks by way of reflection: "How can we facilitate reconciliation and communion in local and global situations where strong divisive forces give rise to conflicts?"

Good News and the Promotion of Justice states in a reflection: "We stand before Jesus crucified present in the crucified of history, we ask His forgiveness and seek reconciliation with them." Later, a significant paragraph quotes the reference to 'reconciling the estranged' in the *Formula of the Institute* and broadens its scope:

> We opt for justice wherever people are victimized or excluded **and** wherever, for their crimes and mistakes towards others, the victimizers are excluded.... Addressing the divisions, hatreds and resentment which fester deeply in the hearts of victims and

---

[3] Pp. 168-71.

victimizers, "this Society should show itself no less useful in reconciling the estranged" (*Formula*, 1). The *magis* moves us to seek the more effective path: to touch the root of sin, to reconcile the persons most divided.

Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue confesses that:

> Dialogue [between religions] has sometimes been employed to conceal basic problems of poverty and injustice and to reinforce the *status quo* — evidence for the claim that it is a luxury which distracts Christians from more pressing apostolates.

It goes on to state that "we must prayerfully seek reconciliation and search for ways to heal collective memories."

According to Working Group 3, "Many Jesuits and colleagues would like to see our spirituality provide stronger bases for the service of faith that does justice and the preferential option for the poor." Additional, if not stronger, bases are certainly desirable as options to help people with different theologies and tastes. For myself I find a spirituality of reconciliation the most congenial. This presumably is a result of my work in the School of Ecumenics and my life in the Columbanus Community in Belfast.

What are the weaknesses and strengths of such a spirituality? The main weakness to my knowledge is that a stigma attaches to it. It has a bad press in certain quarters. It allegedly is too accepting of the *status quo*, sits too lightly to the demands of justice. This criticism will be familiar to many from the *Kairos Document* issued by a number of South African theologians. It is echoed in what Working Group 4 says about interreligious dialogue, and this same criticism is also made of interchurch dialogue and in general of the ministry of reconciliation. In the second place, a spirituality of reconciliation does leave itself open, especially in practice, to this misinterpretation and misunderstanding. It does so because, although concerned both about people and about problems, it puts people first and a change of heart before a change of mind and of structure. A third weakness is that Jews generally find it unacceptable; in their eyes to forgive an offender who has not repented is to condone the offence. A fourth weakness is that the word 'reconciliation' has become increasingly secularized in usage, has largely lost its deep religious meaning and indeed seems to have little or no precise meaning left any longer.

For me the strengths of a spirituality of reconciliation nevertheless far outweigh the above weaknesses. In the first place it takes very seriously the unchristian nature of a state of estrangement or alienation between people, individuals or groups, who have fallen out, are no longer talking to each other but rather fighting against each other. In the second place reconciliation focuses both on people and on problems but primarily on people: the primary aim is 'to help souls', to bring about a change of heart. In the third place a spirituality of reconciliation emphasizes and promotes forgiveness, which is the supreme Christian value and virtue, but of course without condoning the offence, the bone of contention whatever that be. It is the unilateral, unconditional expression of forgiveness by one party, the offended, which breaks the logjam, which facilitates a change of heart and mind and behaviour on the part of the offender.

In the fourth place reconciliation is radical, for it goes to the root cause of the estrangement. There can be no reconciliation (which, unlike forgiveness, is of its nature mutual) without repentance, without change, without a remedy for the cause of the estrangement or breakdown

of the relationship, without what Essay 3 calls a 'metanoia of individuals and of structures'; but this metanoia is more an effect than a condition of forgiveness.

In the fifth place, while the demands of justice are duly met by this stress on repentance and the making of amends, the main emphasis in a spirituality of reconciliation is not on justice which of itself (at least according to what I picked up in moral theology in Eegenhoven in the 50s) may only divide and alienate; it is not a virtue unless animated by charity. In the sixth place reconciliation is profoundly religious and scriptural, an essentially Christian and New Testament and evangelical spirituality. It makes clear that the service of faith (preaching and practicing forgiveness and peacemaking) and the promotion of justice (preaching and practicing repentance and the righting of wrongs) need each other and belong together in what G.C. 33 called 'the integral Gospel message' (§ 36). Finally it is formally and explicitly, and not just implicitly, Ignatian and Jesuit.

If, as G.C. 34 approaches, we remind ourselves and are convinced that 'reconciling the estranged' is a privileged ministry of the Society, it will clearly apply, without much if any broadening of its original scope, to Northern Ireland, to Bosnia, to every place where there is "violent fragmentation along ethnic, national, racial, religious or tribal lines." We may go about it differently from the early Jesuits, but the reconciliation of feuding, warring factions anywhere must remain a priority for us. If, in addition, we take the liberty, as Working Group 3 seems to do, of expanding the scope of the Society's ministry of reconciliation as understood originally in the *Formula*, then the estranged or dissident to be reconciled will of course vary from place to place and from time to time, but must surely include couples facing marital breakdown, Orthodox and Catholics, Protestants and Catholics, the employed (including management) and unemployed, women and men, mother earth and her children, Jews and Christians, and very many others.

For me it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished that G.C. 34 put an emphasis on reconciliation. We can't of course all be occupied in all these areas of concern, but a spirituality of reconciliation would give an inclusive overview, a general interest such that the marriage counsellors among us wouldn't say to the ecologists, "we have no need of you" (cf 1 Cor 12:21), nor the promoters of ecumenism to the promoters of justice and vice versa. Neither would it be appropriate that all who happen to be engaged in one particular area of concern should work in the same way, along the same lines. Apart from the similar contribution we would all make by our prayer, our work contributions would rightly vary, but a common spirituality of reconciliation would deepen our union of minds and hearts.

Karl Rahner once wrote an article entitled, "Forgotten Truths about the Sacrament of Penance." For me, if not for many others, it is a forgotten truth about the Society of Jesus that **reconciling the estranged** is listed as a Jesuit apostolate or ministry in the *Formula of the Institute*. I am grateful to John O'Malley for reminding me of this important fact.

Michael Hurley, S.J.
Milltown Park
Sandford Road
Dublin 6
IRELAND

+ + + + +

REVISION of our LAW — and of our LIFE

Michael Buckley, S.J.

I want to speak about the purpose of the General Congregation in terms of the restoration of the *Constitutions* of the Society — so after all that grace we come to law! And I want to get at the problem Father General is trying to address. I thought I could do this by means of a question: "What document in the tradition of the Society or in the mind of Ignatius specifies and defines Jesuit life?" Most people would spontaneously speak of the *Spiritual Exercises*, and there is some truth in that. It is not just a silly answer. So much of our ministry and life is caught up in the *Exercises*. But they are for the whole Church. We minister the *Exercises*, but they are not just for the Society of Jesus. And in this sense, they don't specifically define or delimit or denote the Jesuit.

If you ask what is the document that is just for the Society, that defines the Jesuit, that specifies what a Jesuit is and what a Jesuit life is insofar as that can be done by a classic document, you would talk about the *Constitutions* — and by the *Constitutions* I mean the *Formula of the Institute*, the *General Examen* and the *Constitutions* properly so called. That is the way in which Ignatius specified the Gospel for the Society of Jesus. Ignatius *de facto* spent much more time writing the *Constitutions* than writing the *Spiritual Exercises*. At least six times in the *Constitutions* he asked Jesuits to look out for their faithful observance. He makes this one of the principal foci of the General, of the Provincial and of the Rector, to see to the faithful observance of the *Constitutions*.

Ignatius did not see the *Constitutions* as law in an intrinsic way or in the way that religious orders in the 19th century were determined. He saw them basically as a spirituality, as the objectification of the life and development of a Jesuit and of the entire Society. In the *Formula of the Institute*, he said of this, "*via est quaedam ad illum.*" It is our way of moving towards God. And so he says, after that first massive sentence of the *Formula of the Institute* in which he defines the ministry of the Society, therefore "Let every Jesuit keep before his mind first God and then this Institute, which is a way of moving towards God." He saw the Institute as articulated in the *Constitutions* as a way, a pattern, an embodiment, as an incarnation, if you will, of the Gospel.

Now the problem Father General is looking at is that, by and large, this document is dead in the lives of most Jesuits. It is not something they know much about. They might read it in a wild fit of guilt. But they don't know much about it; they don't pray about it; and they don't see themselves mirrored in it or challenged by it. There are exceptions obviously, possibly massive exceptions, possibly more now than previously, but by and large I think that this is an accurate assessment. And it has all been dismissed as law in its rather sterile sense, with all the dullness and externality and abstract, out-of-it discussion — abstract rules that are superimposed — instead of seeing it like the Benedictine rule as the articulation of a way of life, that is, a spirituality. And so *de facto* early in the Society the *Constitutions* were supplanted by the *Epitome*, which was an amalgam of statements from the Society and from canon law. In my early life as a Jesuit what we had was neither of those particularly, until you became a priest. What you had was a *Summary of the Constitutions*, but most of the summary was taken from the third part, which is for novices, and from the fourth part of the *General Examen*, which was given to those in first probation preparing to enter the novitiate.

And what is very bad about both of these extremes and almost all the stuff that is written about Jesuit spirituality is that they lack the developmental sense that you find in the *Constitutions*. The *Constitutions* are a genius document, in my opinion. They map the life of a Jesuit like a pilgrim's progress moving towards God. You can chart the gradual evolution of the Jesuit as you move through the *Constitutions*. That's why you don't have a section on poverty or a section on abnegation or a section on obedience. These depend very much upon where the Jesuit is. That's especially true vis-à-vis poverty. Also there is the sense of the Incarnation in almost every one of the sections of the *Constitutions*: each begins on a level of high, even abstract spirituality and gradually moves more and more into matter. For example, if you look at the sixth part, it starts off with that brief remark on chastity. Why? Because we are to imitate, not the chastity of the angels — angels aren't chaste — but the purity of the angels, that is, their single-minded and sincere devotion to God. Then comes obedience, which is taking the highest things that are human and giving them to God. Then you move to poverty and material things. Then gradually to the occupations of Jesuits. And finally what you hit in the very last part is death. That is typically Ignatius: a progressive descent into matter. You can find the same sort of movement in the Incarnation. There is a gradual movement, not of ascent up but of descent down into matter; you discover the meaning of the Incarnation by going to it and doing it and seeing it.

That two-fold dynamic was pretty well closed for generation after generation of Jesuits. And because this objectification of our life was absent, so many things that were subtle and critical about the Society were left out. For example, the business of Brothers. Is it at all significant that in the *Constitutions*, the Society is not divided, as the monastic orders are, between priests and brothers? *De facto* it has become that way because we've taken on monastic forms, but the actual division is between the professed and the coadjutors — those who carry the finality of the Society and those who help — and these divisions are done functionally, presuming that they can be changed as the functions change. But you are not going to solve them by superimposing upon them either the monastic distinction or the sense of excluding the Brothers from what is radical conjunction with a priestly mission. That's only one example; you could take so many others.

I simply want to suggest that there is an enormous depth to the *Constitutions*, that it has been excised from the life of Jesuits because we don't live by them, we don't hear them. We don't live by them in the sense of constantly turning them back and forth in our minds. Now there are many things that do minister to our lives, to the intensity and focus that goes with Jesuit life. There is a massive amount from General Congregations, and it has a profound influence on the Society. There is no question that G.C.32 radically changed the direction of the Society for the foreseeable future, but the difficulty is that these documents and letters become so scattered, one wonders how it all fits together. Is there any way that a busy Jesuit can simplify his life in terms of understanding the Society and himself? Being called constantly to greater vision and depth — that's the problem.

Now it is in this context that Father General has taken as a project — possibly the major project, according to his writings, of the coming Congregation — the restoration of the *Constitutions* as the central and unifying document that specifies our lives. He wants to restore a vitality to the *Constitutions* comparable to what has happened in the *Spiritual Exercises* over the last thirty years, as we have retrieved individual direction, as we have retrieved the long retreats in a much more personalized eremitical form. What he has determined to do is to take that and then all the other legislation of the Society, all the other precepts, letters, etc. — and organize them as commentary upon the *Constitutions*. So you would have the *Constitutions*; then after each article you would have a note saying whether or not this has been abrogated or changed, or whether it

has been instantiated in a particular way. And you would have an Appendix of some size (the *Notae Complementariae*) indicating how the Society is doing this now. In this way the *Constitutions* become a unifying focus and everything else is gathered together around them.

Concretely, what Father General did was to form a committee under Fr. Urbano Valero, which collected all the legislation and published it as *Notae Complementariae*. As a first step it seems quite good; as a final step it seems to me still very deficient. For example, the orientation towards justice, which is so strong in Decree 4 of G.C.32, seems to me significantly attenuated by this procedure. But as an initial step, the *Notae Complementariae* have begun us well. I think the Society has a way of correcting what differences there are during the Congregation. We are gradually moving towards a much simpler objectification of our lives.

Michael Buckley, S.J.
Jesuit Institute at Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167-3802
U. S. A.

UPDATE

Fr. Michael Buckley has really grasped the essence of the "Revision of the Society's Proper Law", which G.C. 33 entrusted to Father General, and has articulated the manner in which the revision was planned and carried forward.

Between the talk at Boston College in November and today, several things have happened in this area. Fortunately, the Society proved to be very alert — far more than some expected — to the project of revising our proper law. Nearly all the Provinces treated it in their Congregations, took it up in a constructive spirit, and urged that it continue and culminate in G.C. 34. Moreover they made numerous and, in some cases, truly important observations, sending them either as postulates or informally as the Provincials were asked to.

And so the Society has translated its interest in the project of revising its proper law into an important contribution and improvement. Father General set up a Commission of Delegates to the General Congregation, together with a few other Jesuits, to rework the draft revision in the light of the observations and desires expressed by the Society. This Commission has been working since the beginning of May and will meet in Rome in mid-July, during the meeting of the *coetus praevius* of G.C. 34, to put the finishing touches on the proposed revision to be given to the Delegates and treated at the General Congregation. Thus the project which "as a first step seems quite good" has been and will be much improved. Far more than before, it will be the fruit of the whole Society's involvement. And it will certainly echo and reflect how much the recent General Congregations have said to the Society, in an expression of our charism updated for the contemporary world and faithful to the original inspiration of the Constitutions.

Urbano Valero, S.J.
C.P. 6139
00195 Roma
ITALY

+ + + + +

The UNIVERSITY and SOCIAL JUSTICE

Michael Czerny, S.J.

Thank you for your kind welcome. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to explore together the promising theme you have assigned me: "The University and Social Justice." My approach will not be theoretical or historical or even sociological, but rather begins with the commitment of the Central American University in San Salvador and the event of the eight martyrs of UCA. I presume that you are well acquainted with the details of the case. We were all deeply moved, indeed overwhelmed, by the martyrdoms and, in this sense, our reaction was very appropriate because their terrible deaths really produced an enormous and far-reaching impact.

Leaving these human and spiritual feelings in the background, though, we may undertake to answer a simple question: What can we learn from the UCA in San Salvador? What can we learn from a very modest University? — assuming that it is small compared to this one and even smaller compared to any State university, in a rather obscure country in a forgotten part of the world which has sporadic relations at best with Spain and other countries of the North — what can we learn from the UCA? I am using the word "learn" because I do not mean "imitate". There is no question of imitating the UCA as the only model. Rather I believe that the ways in which the UCA has attempted to meet its contemporary challenges, encourages and challenges us to formulate our own questions. By asking such questions we touch upon what a University ought to be and what a University ought to do.

We must keep in mind that the UCA, just like this *Universidad Pontificia Comillas*, is a Jesuit University. Yesterday I had the good fortune to visit the places in Alcalá de Henares where St. Ignatius of Loyola resumed his formal education. I was struck by the stature and the influence of Cardinal Francisco Cisneros who, I believe, together with St. Ignatius, symbolizes the innovations that took place in the early years of the 16th century — perhaps a little hard for us to grasp now — how the civilization of the day incorporated humanism into what was considered the total body of knowledge. Today it seems perfectly obvious that a University must teach the humanities, the professions and the sciences. It was not always so. This change, this opening of academic doors not only to an additional subject, but to a new way of thinking and, indeed, a new way of being University, is one of the most revolutionary changes that can occur in any culture. For that reason, Cardinal Cisneros and St. Ignatius of Loyola are protagonists of a revolutionary change in what knowledge and wisdom mean, and also faith and theology, in our civilization. I think that what the UCA has tried to do is finally also a new approach to grasping and integrating new ways of thinking, with all their far-reaching consequences for new methods of learning, of believing and of putting faith into practice. This last, I trust, forms an integral part of the task we all share.

So, how are we to understand how a new way of thinking is assimilated or integrated? Let's skip to our own times and ask: What is the new which we perhaps still find hard to assimilate into our way thinking, of learning and of acting? I dare say that the new, or at least an essential part of the new, is precisely the social. The "social" is an abstract word for a whole constellation of realities. "This is nothing new," you may object, "since the time of Adam and Eve we have always had society." In one sense that's true, because neither human life nor human beings can exist without society. But on the other hand, until very recently we used to consider society —

this complex reality of humans living together — as a natural fact of divine creation. Perhaps we can compare it to any specific language. One's native tongue, until one studies it, is something assimilated unconsciously, not something one has to think about. Until recently society was something similar, existing naturally, always there, that one could look at from without, a basic factor of life within our field of vision but outside our knowledge and our control. Now in the last 150 years, to simplify a little, we have been learning that society is not something that comes from God or from Nature, something always there like the horizon, something like the language or the environment in which we were born. No, society is something we make.

This human influence on society involves at least two aspects. First, an idealistic aspect, that is to say: What we make, we can re-make and change. If we make our society, we can also change it radically. But if you do not wish to get involved in the ideal, in the revolutionary, at least you have to agree with the second aspect, the ethical: What we make, we are responsible for. We are responsible for the structures, the dynamics and the effects of the society in which we find ourselves.

You may say to me that this is nothing new, and for this I needn't have come to give a talk. Perhaps. However, I am not introducing the first chapter of an introduction to sociology, I am speaking with you as friends and companions in faith and, for this reason, I ask you to think a bit about what I am saying when I state, "We are responsible for society not only in Madrid, not only in Spain, not only in Europe, but indeed in the world." We are responsible in many senses and various ways for the society in which men and women live.

I am aware that I am talking about a knowledge and a consciousness that are very new. It is true that we understand a little, but in fact we don't understand much. Moreover, perhaps today we understand even less than we did five or ten years ago. On many fronts science progresses, but in the social area we are stuck in a winter in which anyone with a bit of humility admits to seeing less clearly than we did a decade ago. If this is true, if you grant me this, then ask yourselves: What effect does the social have in our University? Or, to put it in more graphic terms: What difference is there between the University headed by Cisneros — to whose classrooms St. Ignatius returned as an adult to learn with the young people and where the Jesuit tradition in education was born which Ignatius himself initiated — and this Comillas University? If you reply that the fundamental difference between the two universities is that today there are more subject matters than there used to be, this is as much as to say that nothing has changed. In other words, if basically our way of proceeding, our way of thinking, our way of conceiving what we mean by knowledge, learning, formation, profession, success, failure ... if these have not changed, if there are simply more subjects, more departments, more headaches for the Rector, then welcome to the sixteenth century! This is the fundamental question: What difference is there in a University which today takes seriously this new reality which we call "social"?

The social sciences teach us that an institution like a University exists within a society **dynamically**, not like a rock in a desert or a fixed object in a totally static context. A University, in any society, is a living element in a much more complex system. Although it may be complex, we must responsibly attempt to understand it. Moreover, through such study we will come to see that it is a living cell of a much larger organism.

In choosing a place for their campuses, it is true that many Universities seem to seek the privilege of a certain distance from society. This apartness allows them some freedom from all

the pressures and imbroglios of daily political and economic life. It seems that a University needs a certain protection from the ups and downs of society and yet, I insist, it must try to understand society in order to fulfil its mission.

Every University has an impact on society and, if we withdraw it, the society in question should suffer from the loss. Is this true? If you reply in the negative, is it because the impact is not always beneficial? The University, as an institution within a society, inevitably affects and modifies that society. It is the duty of the University to try to have a positive impact and to transform the society which it serves.

What has the UCA done in San Salvador? Here we come to the central point of the example and, if you permit me to exaggerate, of the revolution. The UCA has consciously taken up its social role. That is, the UCA has accepted what I have said up to now and has added its own conviction. If it is true that, in any case, every University has an effect on its society by the mere fact of existing and functioning, the UCA decided to take this inevitable role and make of it something conscious, wished for, deliberate, and carried forward — in other words, something human involving responsibility, dreams, plans, action, mistakes and successes. The UCA tried to become conscious of, and to shape, what would have been so in any case: that it is part of a society, of a very specific society, very poor, involved in a civil war — but first and finally part of a society. I think that this central point is also applicable here in a society very different from that of Central America.

To my mind, something very concrete which symbolizes how the UCA has tried to take responsibility for its society, may be found in its formal university structure. During the last 25 years, the UCA has had a Rector and three Vice-Rectors with equal rank and responsibilities. If I propose a University with three Vice-Rectors, can you guess what would be the portfolio of each one? Or, if you prefer, the three most important parts of the University? An Academic Vice-Rector is obvious. Next, a Vice-Rector for Research, since you cannot teach, cannot form students, simply by repeating what you have received. But the third? In a North American setting, without doubt, the third would be the Vice-Rector for Development — a euphemism for fund-raising, the financial vice-rector. This answer — teaching, research, finance — is a normal basic structure. However, in the UCA of San Salvador, the third is the Vice-Rector for Social Outreach.[1] Not of social justice and much less of sociology or social work, nor of volunteers or social action. All that will follow. Symbolically, the three portfolios express the three essential aspects of our Christian university vocation. The definition and identity of today's University, according to UCA, lie in teaching, research and social outreach.

If I have succeeded in getting across what is revolutionary about the UCA, you see that it lies in this: in the structures and functions remodelled in service of a clear awareness of its own social responsibility. If we speak of the essential life of the modern University, its social role forms an integral part of its own life and so changes what it teaches and what it researches. We are speaking of a new University, not the one of Cisneros. Different, in other words, from the University we have always considered normal, which is dedicated to teaching and research and which basically hopes (as one can read in the preface to any university catalogue) that its

---

[1] *Proyección social*: the word *proyección* means at least two things. If one thinks of "a project," the word means something that one does or undertakes. But "to project" suggests something that one puts forward or tries to get across. Both of these ideas are contained in *proyección social*, translated "social outreach".

graduates, emerging from this protected environment, will have a positive effect on society. The social dimension is limited, in other words, to the hope that all this teaching and research activity will obtain its good effect indirectly. And of course it will. Spanish society will be better because you and your peers are better persons, better prepared, than if you all remained barbarians and savages. This is true, I hope it is true! Yet it did not seem sufficient to the UCA of San Salvador which, as a University, deliberately took up its social role.

It would be very interesting to trace the implications of structuring a University in this way. What are the risks, the advantages, the disadvantages, the possible consequences of conducting a really new University? I find this way of thinking enormously suggestive and promising. It helps us greatly to enrich the daily, essential and typical activities of any University. I will mention only three aspects.

Firstly, there is the matter of **formation**, a service which the University renders to society. When you got into this Comillas University, you all considered yourselves fortunate to be able to study here. The fact that you study here, is it reason to congratulate society as a whole? Yes, if you fulfill your objective. But what is this objective? There is tremendous pressure on the University basically to train professionals. Following the thinking of the market, which today is the predominant ideology, the important thing is for a person to fulfill a role in the market economy. From the point of view of the individual, it is extremely important to prepare oneself to be able to obtain one of the scarce jobs available. Of course, there are other considerations. Yet, being a little uncompromising and perhaps even a little cynical, we can see that the University finds itself hard pressed to do anything but prepare its students for a profession.

But is this why you came here? Is this what you hope for from the University? Twenty or thirty years from now, are you going to be content with having received a good preparation for the labour market? Or will you then say, "We would have liked to receive something more, we would have liked to receive something different"? If this is what students reply, and I think it is — that, besides what is needed to survive in the world of work, you would like to receive a more complete formation —, then you must now ask yourselves: How can the University prepare us for something different if it is not different itself? Where is the University going to find the thinking, the values, the sensitivity that differ from those of the market? This is not invented, or found only in books. It comes from an experience, a way of being in the world, a way of responding to the challenges of the world. Therefore if you, if your parents, think along such lines; if the saner parts of society — the Church, volunteer groups, solidarity movements — think like this; then you'll arrive at the University and request a different preparation, a formation that is not limited either to the professional view of things or to the short-term values of the market. Then, if the University wishes to respond constructively and creatively to this desire of yours to be formed in another way, it itself will have to be different, submit itself to different experiences and even programme them. The students will ask the Rector to name a Vice-Rector for Social Outreach. Not because we want to do Samaritan work in this society of so much misery, although we do not exclude that reason. Our motivation is a more conscious one. If we want the University to provide us with a contemporary formation, a different way of thinking, a series of different values, a developed awareness — then the University itself has to be in the world in a different way. That's why I tell you that social outreach is a revolution in the very nature of a University. It is not another department, another programme.

This, to my mind, is what you, the students, ought to ask of a Jesuit University. Ask, ask, ask those in authority for a different formation. "Please, let us not turn out the way they do at other

universities!" Ask this, with tears in your eyes, because it is so important for the life of each one of you and for the future of this society. If I am mistaken, please tell me where the agents of a different society are going to come from. From where will come people willing to shoulder responsibility for this society — this world — so unjust, so complex, so hard to understand and so hard to change? Where will they come from if not from here? If I am proposing this with a certain urgency, it is because my first concern is not to salvage the identity of Jesuit universities, but to confront the injustices of this world and its future. I do not see, within the market system, where we will find persons sufficiently and seriously prepared to take up responsibility for our world. This is the challenge! For this reason I feel that, if the University is to form you, it must change the way in which it carries out its mission.

Secondly, I will speak about **research**. Research is the pride and joy of every University. Although the professors and the administrators are happy with you as students, they find even greater fulfilment in their own research projects. Research is a vital ingredient of any University which seeks to fulfill its calling. But research means to seek the truth. Research means to develop a critical capacity capable of distinguishing the truth which is truth from the many truths that are only apparent or even lies ... the many, multiplied and sophisticated lies which pass for the truth in this complex society and culture of ours. How to develop this critical sense? Where will we find the wisdom, the capacity to distinguish truth — human truth in the tradition of Cisneros — from all the so-called truths that are lies? If you tell me that one learns this in other universities and practises it here, I will go away dejected. I won't be able to convince you, because you are already convinced. But if you allow me one word without argument, I tell you: this is not true! It's not true! The academic associations in themselves do not have sufficient elements to maintain and develop that critical sense which a University needs. It is not enough. The interchange merely among intellectuals will, I am convinced, only perpetuate the repetition of the same deceptions (with their element of truth, of course, I am not here to attack and destroy but to save). I am saying that, if the intellectuals do not recognize their need of other input, other ingredients that are not purely intellectual but come from that same society from which they cannot isolate themselves — if they do not recognize this —, I have grave doubts that the truth, which today by definition is social, can come to light in your University. Therefore, once again, I ask you to go to the university authorities and request that the professors-researchers develop their critical sense and not be tolerant of what's going on around them. "Father Rector, our professors are too segregated, they are too tolerant toward what is happening in our milieu. Let them be more critical, please!" The structure of the University must reflect the tireless search for truth and the tireless battle against lies. With the essential help, for example, of a Vice-Rector for Social Outreach, whose appointment you yourselves can request.

Finally, I believe that you should ask your University for an excellent and deep **spiritual development**. Perhaps this is not very fashionable in the universities of the world nor in Spain either. However, everything that I have been talking about is impossible to accomplish by will power alone, or mere wishing, or even strong resolve. As I see it, all this requires vision, faith, humility, the grace of God and the help of our Saviour. And if you, as I said before, want to leave here prepared to assume responsibility toward this world, as children of God, created by Him, to make this society better, you are also going to need a formation that is Christian, mystical, and imbued with the Holy Spirit. Ask your University for the best possible spiritual training! Please!

Well, this is what I wanted to say. I have tried to get across a bit of the vision of the UCA in San Salvador and what's new about it. If I have succeeded in communicating what I hoped to,

you have no more need to ask me, "Why did they kill the Jesuits?" It is obvious and evident. They had to kill them! It was a death foretold. You need no further details. Not that I wish the same fate for Father Rector and five professors at Comillas. I do not promise you that it will happen here, but I cannot assure you that it will not happen either.

To conclude, I think that everything I have tried to say, all that I have suggested you ask of your University, can be summed up in this totally mad idea: "I would like to attend — I would rather be trained at — a University that runs the risk of martyrdom."

ONE STEP FORWARD

José de Pablo, S.J.

On the sixth of April last, I attended Father Michael Czerny's conference entitled, "The University and Social Justice." I cannot say that chance led me to the lecture hall. On the contrary, I went there secretly hoping to hear something new. Something that would rise above the sadly routine appeals for solidarity, the 1960s pacifist meetings, or the intellectually-loaded lectures referring only to themselves. I was not disappointed.

I value and defend every such initiative which sees the light of day in our University. But I always lacked a canvas on which to arrange all the colourful brush strokes of solidarity; or I lacked switchboard on which to sort out the competing calls from different groups demanding my attention. To discover this was the prize I found in Czerny's talk. He fixed his eyes directly on us, the foot soldiers of the University, and spoke to us from within our own academic and cultural context. Instead of the weary verbiage guiding one through the world museum of disasters and injustices, his reflection offered a new way of thinking, believing and acting, one that we can and must introduce into university life.

According to Czerny, the modern University is like a child grown strong in knowledge and equipped with faculties — but conceived four centuries ago. The University of the 16th century, thanks to Cardinal Cisneros, interspersed new humanistic and scientific disciplines amongst traditional theological studies. Since that time, we have done little more than annex new schools, new departments and new courses to the same academic structure. Every generation faces challenges which have to be assimilated and incorporated into the University; ours today are the social ones. In recent decades, we have been discovering that social reality is not a created universe that one assimilates by osmosis, but rather something that we build. What has been made, can be changed, and for what has been made, all of us have a responsibility. Here is the novelty which it's up to us to face. Whoever cannot envision this, welcome to the 16th century!

Precisely because we students constitute living cells of the university organism, the University cannot set itself up in an ivory tower sealed off from society. Every University has a role in society which does not depend solely on its organizational flow chart. Every graduate contributes to society equipped with whatever he or she has sought at the University. If we are attracted to the University for professional training alone, at the end of the course we will climb down from our protective tower with the blinkered vision of the labour market. On the other hand, if our sensitivies are educated by an academic freedom which tussles with the whole world, not just the job world; if our research awakens our critical capacity to discover the truth of our culture; if

we realize that, if we do not change our society, no one will; if finally we "plead with tears in our eyes" to take hold of the social realities from our university base: then indeed we will not be isolated from the truth of what is occurring around us, we will see a University that is different, and we will realize that to transform society is our own responsibility.

There is no better time than now to stop juggling a squash racket or tossing one's cap. We have a goal to struggle for. Simple questions in class can link our courses with social reality. In evaluating our professors we can include as a criterion their teaching ability in social research and reflection, as well as their method of introducing it to students in each of their subject matters. Now is the time to take the good intentions that have been hibernating in the fervent words of brochures, prayers, and statutes, and make them real.

I doubt this initiative will be possible if we rely only on good will. So there is need for a spiritual formation that offers us a global vision of our world. Everything said here involves serious problems, failures, and confrontations with the way things are. For this reason, I conclude with a phrase of Michael Czerny's that recalls the response we might learn from the Central American University of San Salvador: "I would rather be educated at a University that runs the risk of martyrdom."

José de Pablo, S.J.
«Diego Laynez»
La Bañeza 43, portal 3
28035 Madrid
SPAIN

Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J.

On the Mission of the University

It is absolutely self-evident that a University is a social reality and, because it is, it is conditioned by the structure of that reality, which is society. The attempt to understand itself as something apart from society, as something immune from the appeals and the pressures of society, is an ideological attempt and, all things considered, counterproductive for really reaching a certain detachment from what society is at a given moment.[2]

Social outreach (*proyección social*) means that university commitment which places the whole institution, acting in all its parts, in direct relationship with social forces and processes. So understood, it must not be mistaken for the Extension Department, which tries to offer packages of culture to groups who cannot attend university, nor with university Social Services, that is, the volunteer work of professors and students helping certain disadvantaged social groups. The University makes contact with society in many ways: in training professionals, in university members acting spontaneously without formally or virtually representing it, and so forth. But when we speak of social outreach, we refer to something quite different: the direct repercussion of the whole University upon society as a whole or upon some forces that are strictly social.[3]

---

[2] "Ten Years Afterwards: Is a Distinctive University Possible?" *Estudios Centroamericanos* (ECA) 30:324-25 (1975), 605-28.

[3] "The University and Politics," *ECA* 35:383 (1980), 807-24.

The starting point of our conception of what a University should be, comes from a double consideration. The first and most obvious is that the University has to do with culture, knowledge, a particular exercise of intellectual reason. The second, which is not so obvious and commonplace, is that the University is a social reality and a social force, historically marked by what the society is like in which it lives, and destined as a social force to enlighten and transform that reality in which it lives and for which it should live.[4]

This University ought not to seek finally its own fulfilment, unless we consider that its own fulfilment lies outside itself in serving the majority poor.[5]

+ + + + +

[4] "The Task of a Christian University," Convocation address at the University of Santa Clara, June 12, 1982; «Una universidad para el pueblo»; *Diakonía* 6:23 (1982), 41-57.

[5] "The UCA and the Doctorate granted to Archbishop Romero," *ECA* 40:437 (1985), 167-76.

LETTERS and COMMENTARY

The recent *Promotiones Justitiae* represent a lot of work on the part of a good number of people. It is hard to believe that the Society will not do much more than survive with such serious and talented people looking into our future.

What I note in your stuff is a new (?) and sensitive awareness of the importance of the living blanket of culture, in which we live and move and have our being. We sociologists and anthropologists do not meet it often — or at we least haven't over past years — in those who are children of other disciplines.

We pray every day for G.C. 34 and those preparing it.

Gordon George, S.J.
"La Storta"
P.O. Box 38
Pickering, Ontario
CANADA L1V 2R2

+ + + + +

"The Promotion of Justice: A Challenge for the Whole Society" by Pierre Martinot-Lagarde, S.J., (*PJ* n° 53, November 1993) is a reflection based on exchanges with a certain number of Parisian Jesuits. As Pierre himself says in the introduction, he is not speaking only of his own experience. I believe that his article clearly reflects concerns of the French Province, which are expressed especially in the orientations given in formation (novitiate experiments, apostolic activities during undergraduate studies), and the experience of a significant number of scholastics and young priests in the Province. Besides, a certain number of them had entered the novitiate after already having an experience of working as a cooperant mission in a Third World country.

My own experience fits partly into the description of Martinot-Lagarde: during my undergraduate studies in Paris, I worked for two and a half years, at 1/3 time, in a halfway house for young people just coming out of prison, then in literacy training for Southeast Asian refugees. For four years in Bordeaux, I directed AFEPT, a vocational training centre for high school drop-outs and long-term job-seekers who had been unemployed for at least a year. Fairly soon, I began to notice the limitations of local action.

When I arrived at OCIPE,[1] I was hoping to take these local concerns which I had pursued earlier and expand them to a European level. But the tasks of administration and institution at OCIPE absorbed most of my time and energy. Administrative tasks are very important of course, but they weigh so heavily that one risks becoming stuck fast in them!

[1] Catholic European Study and Information Centre.

Even apart from these institutional obligations, it is difficult to meet the demands of justice at a macroeconomic level. The consolidation of the European Union is deviating more and more from the initial aim of the founders. Instead of economic integration at the service of people and of society, the European Union is increasingly promoting an economic prosperity whose goal is no other than itself. The struggle for justice must confront, not only the "structures of sin" in the sense of the encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, but also the global drift of the organizing principles which condition our society. Could a handful of Jesuits contribute to taking up the challenge of an injustice which is so deeply and so broadly inscribed into the liberal organization of European society dominated by economics? This is the heart of the question of the apostolic relevance of an organization such as OCIPE.

Hugues Delétraz, S.J.
OCIPE
6, rue Wencker
67000 Strasbourg
FRANCE

+ + + + +

Thank you for sending me *Promotio Justitiae* (n° 54, February 1994). I treasure the "reading" of the world in all its geographical extent, in all the diversity of mission experiences of your Society.

I was touched by the following points: first of all, by the Human Development Index (HDI) as an analytical instrument; then by the concern to root missionary involvement once again in a mysticism of union; finally, by the difficulties experienced by your brothers in rich countries to avoid adopting as their criterion the level of development of the enlightened middle class. This last constitutes a real problem: to harmonize the theme of the poor, as a privileged reference point, with even the expanded terms of reference of the HDI. This is a perverse effect which the North-South / rich-poor divisions have upon our own criteria of evaluation for interhuman relationships.

It is good that the Society is one of the rare places where a global vision can prevail and therefore where intense — because invalid — contradictions to this vision can be clarified.

Prof. Paul Ricoeur
Chatenay Malabry
FRANCE

+ + + + +