Nº 108, 2012/1

Promotio Iustitiae

JUSTICE FROM AN IGNATIAN PERSPECTIVE

Observations of the social apostolate, justice and decrees of GC 31 to 35
Tom Greene SJ

Faith and justice: an updating
Mary Nolan

Characterising social justice
Franklin Ibáñez

Making justice a reality in the 21st century
Raúl González Fabre SJ

Experiences
Ramiro Pampols SJ, Lara Kadouzian Haddad, Francisco In Don SJ, Roberto Núñez and Silvia Macías, Elias Mokua SJ

Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat

Editor: **Patxi Álvarez SJ**

Consultant Editor: **Suguna Ramanathan**

Publishing Coordinator: **Concetta Negri**

Promotio Iustitiae is published by the Social Justice Secretariat at the General Curia of the Society of Jesus (Rome) in English, French, Italian and Spanish. *Promotio Iustitiae* is available electronically on the World Wide Web at the following address: **www.sjweb.info/sjs/PJ**

If you are struck by an idea in this issue, your brief comment is very welcome. To send a letter to *Promotio Iustitiae* for inclusion in a future issue, please write to the fax or email address shown on the back cover.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial **4**
PATXI ÁLVAREZ & FRANKLIN IBÁÑEZ

Observations of the social apostolate, justice and the decrees of General Congregations 31 to 35 ..... **6**
TOM GREENE SJ

Faith and justice: an updating **14**
MARY NOLAN

Characterising social justice **21**
FRANKLIN IBÁÑEZ

Making justice a reality in the 21st century **28**
RAÚL GONZÁLEZ FABRE, SJ

A year after my return from haiti **36**
RAMIRO PAMPOLS SJ

Our mission: to share an experience with a refugee family **38**
LARA KADOUZIAN HADDAD

Experience of justice **40**
OH IN-DON FRANCISCO, SJ

Six indigenous ethnic groups and the contribution of fair trade **42**
ROBERTO NÚÑEZ & SILVIA MACÍAS

Justice: promotion of a faith that does justice **44**
ELIAS MOKUA SJ

Editorial

Patxi Álvarez, Secretary for Social Justice and Ecology

Franklin Ibáñez, Executive Secretary CLC

In 2011 we celebrated 40 years since the publication of "Justice in the World" – the final document of the Synod of Bishops in 1971. This document asserted that justice is an essential dimension of faith. Never before had any church document affirmed this so clearly. A little later in 1975, the Society of Jesus, in fidelity to the changes of the Second Vatican Council and led by Fr. Arrupe, adopted as the mission of the Society of Jesus "the service of faith of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement" (GC 32, d.4, n.2). This was a commitment that had been growing steadily over the years, incorporating a cultural change that was rooted in the renewal initiated by the Council.

The whole Ignatian family accepted this commitment to work for justice. Ignatian Religious Congregations began living among the poor. The commitment was also seen among the Jesuits themselves, among lay men and women in general and the Christian Life Community (CLC) in particular. It was a special way of proclaiming the compassion of God at a time when the credibility of the Church had suffered many setbacks.

We want to deepen our understanding of justice today within our shared Ignatian perspective. CLC and the Society of Jesus share a common desire to promote justice. This is done through discernment, reflections on the meaning of justice in different circumstances and through concrete initiatives in mission. Hence this issue has been jointly produced and will be released simultaneously by Progressio, the international journal of CLC and by Promotio Iustitiae, the publication of the Jesuit Secretariat for Social Justice and Ecology, Rome.

The first article by Tom Greene (a Jesuit from the United States) shows how the commitment to justice has been developed in successive General Congregations. It thus throws light on the progressive growth of this concept in the Jesuit tradition. Franklin Ibañez (a member of CLC Peru) reflects on the various dimensions of justice. This reflection enables us to discover the scope of the concept and arrive at its ultimate consequences. Raul Gonzalez (a Jesuit from Spain) has written lucidly on the importance of making the term operational and spelling out ways to implement it. This is necessary if justice has to move beyond mere rhetoric and become part of our mission and practice. Finally, Mary Nolan (a member of CLC Australia) has written an account of her long commitment to justice from the personal experience of her family life. Her experiences help to deepen our reflection.

We also wish to add small stories of Jesuits and CLC members who narrate in a fresh and lively manner their personal commitment to justice. They also illuminate these personal experiences with reflections.

We hope that these pages will help us reflect on our mission and commit ourselves daily to the God of Life and to His friends, the poor.

Promotio Iustitiae, n° 108, 2012/1

Observations of the social apostolate, justice and the decrees of General Congregations 31 to 35

Tom Greene SJ

This article provides a brief description of the treatment of justice in GCs 31-35, offers ten observations and reflections related to contemporary efforts of the social apostolate to promote justice, and concludes with a consideration of the parallels between spirituality and justice for CLCs to consider.

One would be hard pressed to find a Jesuit unaware of the commitment to the "service of faith and promotion of justice" made in Decree Four of GC 32, which has become part and parcel of our Jesuit response when we are asked to define the contemporary mission of the Society. GC 32 made the implementation of the *Decree* and promotion of justice the responsibility of all apostolic sectors of the Society, not solely the ambit of the Social Apostolate. This has been a great blessing for our corporate mission as all sectors have been tasked with promoting justice, and in general, have enthusiastically embraced it. However, ironically, Decree 4 – "the justice decree" - has also led to a lack of clarity about the justice dimension of the social apostolate and perhaps a diminishment of its mission.

This article is not intended as an "us" versus "them" argument for the social apostolate. It is clear that the majority of our educational institutions, parishes, retreat houses and other apostolic works have embraced the call to promote justice in some form. If one inquires of someone within one of these apostolic sectors, he readily offers an example of how he promotes justice in his ministerial efforts. For some that promotion entails political solidarity wherein the person or institution takes a stance on legislation affecting the poor, while for others it involves teaching students the "justice documents" of the Society. High schools and universities hold up immersion programs as their model for promoting justice, or point to service hour requirements for graduation. A Jesuit at a retreat house offers a monthly Mass at a county jail as his way of promoting justice. Are all of these equally valid ways of promoting justice? Are some ministries truer to the justice ideals of the documents of general congregations? Are different apostolic sectors called to differing expressions of justice? I do not pretend to be the arbiter of these questions, and I believe that there are many valid ways in which justice may be promoted. I see too much evidence of Jesuits and lay collaborators from all sectors doing justice work to argue

for any certain method, and it can be a distraction to quibble over such things. However, I do wish to highlight the specific value which the social apostolate brings to justice efforts of the Society, and urge all apostolic sectors to continually reexamine the authenticity of its efforts to promote justice in light of how they conform to the understanding of justice as articulated in the documents of GCs 31 through 35.

This article provides a brief description of the treatment of justice in GCs 31-35, offers ten observations and reflections related to contemporary efforts of the social apostolate to promote justice, and concludes with a consideration of the parallels between spirituality and justice for CLCs to consider.

Justice in General Congregations 31-35

GC 31 gives the social apostolate a specific justice mission "to strive directly by every endeavor to build a fuller expression of justice and charity into the structures of human life [Decree 32/569)" and dedicates Decree 32 to its implementation. However, no subsequent Congregation explicitly addresses the social apostolate, nor references its particular mandate found in GC 31.

Rather, GC 32 proclaims the promotion of justice is an "absolute requirement," and the "integrating factor" of *all* ministries, which requires our justice efforts to be total, corporate, rooted in faith and multiform (Decree 4/53-57.) The Congregation encourages "social involvement and solidarity with the poor," but the term justice is left ambiguous and undefined, which, I believe, has important implications for the social apostolate.

Perhaps as a result of the ambiguity, GC 33 desired confirmation and clarification of Decree 4, and admits the interpretation of the Decree has at times been "incomplete, slanted and unbalanced" (Jesuit Life and Mission Today, 414.) The documents of the Congregation remind Jesuits that the promotion of justice is not expressed by a "disincarnate spiritualism nor merely secular activism" and the minutes of the Congregation reveal "a wish for a quite brief statement that would contain directive guidelines, criteria… and some evaluation of the application of Decree 4… (Jesuit Life and Mission Today, p. 430.)" It is debatable as to whether the social apostolate receives directive guidelines in the documents. The decrees do contain a general exhortation for pastoral and spiritual ministries "to strengthen the faith that does justice (Decree 1/46)" and stress the importance of the educational and intellectual apostolates in the promotion of justice (47.) However, there is no equivalent statement regarding the social apostolate, nor is there an acknowledgment of its role in the promotion of justice.

GC 34 reaffirms the *struggle* for justice as "wise and good" (Decree 1/3) and "renews the commitment" to a vision of justice that is "deeply rooted" in the Christian faith and which "transcends notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements (Decree 3/52- 53.)" The Congregation introduces "new dimensions" of justice such as human rights, globalization, human life, environment and communities of solidarity (54-59) and highlights the "urgent situations" of Africa, Eastern Europe, indigenous peoples, excluded poor, and refugees and displaced persons (60-65.) The Congregation also recommends implementation via continuing personal conversion, formation experiences, creation of solidarity communities, forming men and women for others, institutional evaluations, and apostolic planning (66-74,) and relates justice to the emerging priorities of inculturation and dialog. Consequently, the promotion of justice is linked with "communicating faith, transforming cultures, and collaborating with other traditions" (Decree 2/47.)

GC 35 again reassures that the service of faith and promotion of justice are "indissolubly united" and "remain at the heart of our mission" (Decree 2/32,) but the Congregation introduces the

language of reconciliation and the demands of relationship as constitutive elements of the promotion of justice. The documents recall our Jesuit heritage as reconcilers and insist on reconciliation via the establishment of right relationships with God, one another, and creation as pivotal for an authentic vision of justice. (Decree 3/56-80.)

This is a brief, very brief, summation of the documents, but I believe the language of the Decrees cited above will serve well in considering the following reflections and observations about the promotion of justice in the social apostolate.

Ten Observations and Reflections about Justice and the Social Apostolate

1. The term justice is ambiguous

As previously noted, Decree 4 does not offer a precise definition of justice and instead leaves the meaning ambiguous. Fr. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach states, "I think it is good to say that the word justice is ambiguous… I have the impression that GC 32 voted unanimously for the term 'promotion of justice' because of the ambiguity inherent in the word 'justice.' Thanks to a sort of linguistic ambiguity… the term justice was approved (*Promotio Iustitiae* 96, 2007/3, p. 14.)"

This ambiguity provides latitude and creativity for apostolic sectors to incorporate justice work into its ministries, however, it also permits a "leave me alone" response when individuals or apostolic sectors challenge each other on justice commitments. Consequently, individuals and sectors can claim personal or institutionally based interpretations of justice, which they deem unassailable given the ambiguity of the term justice. Thus, the ambiguity of the term enhances the promotion of justice, but also hinders critical analysis of the ways in which it is promoted.

2. Abstract justice is easier to promote!

Jesuits, by and large, are sensitive to justice issues, however, they are often sensitive to justice in the abstract, and as Pedro Arrupe reminds us, "social justice poses no threat while it remains on the level of abstract theory (*Men and Women for Others*, Foreword.)"

Jesuits can agree that promotion of justice accords with our documents, and standing with the poor and marginalized is part of our mission. However, many communities and individual Jesuits are reticent to engage in advocacy or take a public stance on a justice issue (immigration, military budgets, land reform, e.g.) because they view it as too controversial, contentious, or political.

Part of the problem stems from the language of GC 33, Decree 3 which holds that our justice efforts should transcend notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements. The move from abstract to concrete means getting involved with ideologies, philosophies and political movements. The social apostolate is generally involved in conflicted areas – geographic, cultural, or political. The State may be denying a right to a marginalized person or group, and we are trying to advocate a solution and resolve the conflict. In conflict resolution there is often a need for both parties to detach from their subjective argument and point to independent evidence that supports their position. For us, the subjective sources are the teachings of our faith and our Jesuit documents; however, these may not be convincing sources for the non-believer. For example, in the immigration debate in the U.S. we are motivated by our faith commitments, but we cannot simply cite Leviticus or the Parable of the Good Samaritan to a legislator in a secular democracy to persuade her to adopt our platform. Thus, we often take on economic, political or philosophical stances that align with our faith commitments.

We also engage in coalitions and partnerships with other organizations, which derive their platforms from a particular philosophy or political belief. We are motivated by our faith commitments and our partners are motivated by a different source of commitment. The difficulty is that others may then perceive only the political or philosophical underpinnings of our work, which we have embraced as independent criteria for our position, and not the faith commitments that undergird them because we have suppressed them to meet the demands of the political process and to resolve a contested issue. Admittedly, this situation cuts both ways and the social apostolate must remain vigilant that its agenda remains grounded in the principles of our faith, Catholic Social Thought, and Jesuit mission.

In sum, justice in the abstract is endorsed broadly as a religious ideal and part of the Jesuit mission, but loses support and can be perceived as a secular issue when it takes concrete form in the public arena. This can be a challenge for the social apostolate, when it attempts to makes a call for action from the abstract language of the decrees to address a concrete instance of injustice.

3. The promotion of justice is an opportunity rather than obligation

Discussions with social justice advocates can often appear to make the promotion of justice an obligation rather than an opportunity. Clearly, our Jesuit documents and Christian faith oblige us to work for justice, however, the opportunity to encounter God in the poor and the transformative experience that can result should be the primary motivation, and this gets glossed over when justice is promoted as a duty or obligation. The beatitudes tell us that we are blessed when we strive for peace or encounter the poor, and we need to embrace our justice work as a blessed opportunity. I know that in my ministry there are moments of interaction with the poor that remain with me years later and which have most clearly revealed Christ to me, and I often return often to these moments to sustain my spiritual life.

4. Justice is rooted in friendship and people's lives

GC 33 adopting the language of *Gaudium et Spes* tells us that we "need deeper involvement in the lives of people around us in order to hear 'the joys and hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the people of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted (Decree 1/44.)" Anyone with experience in relationships knows that these are things told to friends. Rarely, do we find people willing to share their deepest desires, joys, hopes and grief with strangers or those with whom they have little contact. These things are usually shared once a relationship of trust has been established, and when people are confident that the other person genuinely cares for them. Traditionally, this has been the strong suit of the social apostolate, which is primarily composed of Jesuits and companions who live and work among the poor. Friendship flows naturally from living in community with and proximity to the poor.

Friendship has important consequences for how we view and evaluate justice. In an era of globalization and rapid growth of institutions, corporate and academic, there is a subtle shift to focus on whether the right set of institutions is in place. However, "justice is ultimately connected with the way people's lives go, and not merely with the nature of the institutions surrounding them (*The Idea of Justice*, Amartya Sen, Preface x.)"

David Hollenbach, SJ makes a similar point in stating, "the demands of justice are thus not primarily the conclusions drawn from a general philosophical principle expressed in propositional form. They arise from claims or call which the dignity of persons makes on the freedoms of others (*The Faith That Does Justice*, 211.)" As our justice work moves increasingly into universities and institutions, there can be an almost imperceptible drift away from an

understanding of justice that looks first to the lives of the poor. Clearly, the proper institutions (courts, schools, etc.) are a critical component of justice, but their presence does not signify that justice is at hand.

5. Justice is relational as opposed to contractual

Closely related to the concept of justice as friendship is the notion that justice flows from relationship and is not a contracted obligation. GC 35 reminds us that justice is best understood as fidelity to the demands of a covenantal relationship, and that the mission of the Society is to be in right relationship with God, our neighbor, and creation. This understanding of justice, therefore, calls forth commitments that may not be present in secular, or professionalized and contractual notions of justice. A university professor studies urban poverty because she has received a grant to research it. Undoubtedly, the professor is motivated by her concern for the poor; however, fundamentally, the professor is engaging in the justice work of social analysis because of a contractual obligation to do so. When the research grant expires will the professor remain with the population being studied? Furthermore, there is no expectation under the contract that the professor will live among the poor, eat with them, worship with them, share their hopes, joys and fears, etc. In fact, doing so may violate the ethics of their profession or the stipulations of the grant.

A covenantal understanding of justice differs because it is relational. For the social apostolate, the obligation to defend the migrant, to stand with the marginalized, or to study unjust social structures is not premised upon a contract or financial remuneration. It is not conceived of as part of a job requirement, but rather that which flows naturally from our Jesuit vocation and mission. This is not meant to denigrate the great research our committed and dedicated faculties perform on behalf of the poor, but rather to illustrate the unique value that a covenantal relationship has for the promotion of justice. It must also be acknowledged that the social apostolate is not immune from contractual understandings of justice, particularly as some of our social centers become increasingly reliant on grants that have contractual requirements.

6. Requires sense of humor!

Our efforts to promote justice must lived out with joy, and maintain a sense of humor and the ability to laugh at ourselves and the situations in which we find ourselves. Too often, we encounter the angry advocate who is passionately committed to justice, but who rants rather than converses about the issues in which he is engaged. This behavior repels rather than encourages others to become engaged in the important justice issue he promotes. The irony is that the poor generally have a much better sense of humor about their lives than we do.

It has also been my experience that I have laughed hardest in Jesuit communities in the poorest places. At times the exigencies of living in poverty and war torn areas bring a sense of perspective and allow for more enjoyment of the simple things of God. In some ways the social apostolate has not conveyed well, nor invited others to share in the joy and humor that can accompany our work with the poor.

7. Includes a component of reconciliation

Decree 4 of GC 32 reminds us, "there can be no promotion of justice in the full and Christian sense unless we also preach Jesus Christ and the mystery of reconciliation He brings." Twenty years later GC 34 acknowledges, "the promotion of justice has sometimes been separated from its wellspring of faith (Decree 3.)" These concerns are still present and will probably always be an ongoing tension for justice work in the social apostolate.

In 2000, the U.S. secondary education apostolate published a pamphlet entitled, "What Makes a Jesuit School Jesuit?" which outlines the defining characteristics of a Jesuit school and what makes one separate and distinct from a public school or other private school. Visits to Jesuit social centers in the U.S. and abroad prompt the same question for me – "What makes a Jesuit social center Jesuit?" What distinguishes a Jesuit social center from Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, or other NGO? How is the justice we promote different from theirs? How is Jesus reconciling spirit at work in our advocacy?

These questions will be answered in different ways in different cultures, but it seems that having an aspect of reconciliation would be one defining characteristic. Many groups are adept at denouncing injustice and reporting human rights violations, but fail to set forth comprehensive plans for reconciliation. The documents of GC 32 are very challenging in this regard when they state that justice ministry "demands an openness and generosity to anyone in need, even a stranger or an enemy. It demands towards those who have injured us, pardon; toward those with whom we are at odds, a spirit of reconciliation." When was the last time we wrote an article about a group we pardoned? The reconciliation aspect of justice work is a vital aspect of the social apostolate and should be one of our defining characteristics.

8. Needs to respect people and their justice journey

We recognize the spiritual life as a journey and we ought to do the same in the area of justice. Each of us is on a justice journey, a pilgrimage of sorts wherein we are trying to determine the *just* thing to do or the *just* stance to take. There is always a fine line between challenging and encouraging another person's social justice efforts, and extinguishing that desire. This is particularly true when it comes to youth who are beginning to engage in efforts to promote justice. It saddens me to watch someone squelch the flame that was ignited by an experience of the poor. A young person returns from a high school immersion trip and feels moved by the experience and "good" about himself because of the work that he performed. Subsequently, a veteran social justice advocate encounters him and critiques his experience as superficial charity and not one that attacks the social structures that hold the community down. Although I might agree with the stance of the advocate, I have difficulty with his approach.

It is akin to an ophthalmologist berating a patient who cannot read the smaller letters of the eye chart. This would be absurd. The patient is not at fault, nor is he incapable of reading the letters. He simply needs the right lenses to help him see. This should be the goal of the social apostolate – helping others receive the lenses so that they can see the injustices around them.

9. Recognizes and tolerates differing roles and strategies for achieving justice

There are many tools in the advocacy toolbox and all are needed to do the work of justice. At times we need the delicate torque of a small screwdriver when reading through legal documents or negotiated settlements, while at other times we require a sledgehammer in the form of social protest to express righteous anger at an unjust situation. We become distracted as individuals and groups when we criticize each other's approaches to justice and fail to recognize the diversity of advocacy gifts necessary to bring about change. A group that uses a sledgehammer approach rails against another group they perceive to be silent in the face of injustice, unaware that the other group has made real strides by engaging in face-to-face dialog. The task of the social apostolate is to coordinate more, to network more, and to understand the unique roles, gifts and talents that each institution and individual brings to social justice advocacy.

10. Acknowledges the spiritual base of injustice and its implications for policy

In 2010 I had the opportunity to visit with a Jesuit, formerly the director of a social center, who had been deeply involved in the peace and reconciliation process in Colombia. I listened intently as he described the founding of the project and laid out the history of violence and armed conflict that has displaced millions of Colombians. The conversation proceeded as I expected with a thorough and cogent socio-political analysis of the conflict until he suddenly paused and said, "But, Tom the problem is at root a spiritual problem." It may not sound like much when read, but the conviction with which he made the statement struck me profoundly and continues to do so. Here was a person who had been engaged in the gritty realities of war and displacement, who had first-hand experience with the practicalities of peacemaking, and yet he was summing up the key to resolving the conflict as spiritual in nature.

Justice is often viewed as a legal, philosophical or political issue that requires a policy response. However, the spiritual aspect of justice (and injustice) does not receive adequate treatment from the social apostolate, nor does the policy or advocacy aspect of justice obtain appropriate attention from the spirituality sector.

GC 32 reminds us, "that our efforts to promote justice and human freedom on the social and structural level, necessary though they are, are not sufficient of themselves. Injustice must be attacked at its roots which are in the human heart by transforming those attitudes and habits which beget injustice and foster the structures of oppression (Decree 4/32.)" There is a learning experience for both the social apostolate and the pastoral in this. Namely, that our justice advocacy needs to recognize and address the spiritual roots of injustice, while our retreat houses and spiritual ministries can do great justice work by illustrating how spiritual problems have political implications.

Spirituality, Justice and CLC

So what does justice have to do with CLC? In "Oscar Romero, Religion and Spirituality" J. Matthew Ashley lists four features[1] that define a mature spirituality, which I believe apply evenly to an examination of whether one has a mature sense of justice (The Way, 44/2 [April 2005] 113-133.) The four factors of a mature spirituality are:

1. It is focused on **personal experience**.
2. It requires a **conscious involvement in a project**.
3. It is a **life-integrative** principle.
4. It is oriented towards a transcendent **source of ultimate meaning and value**.

I suggest that CLCs might reflect on these components individually and communally as a gauge of their commitment to justice.

1. Personal experience

There is no substitute for personal experience. Assuredly, one can hold positions on matters of justice without personal experience, however, our deepest commitments evolve from personal encounter. Just as a personal encounter with Jesus impels us to labor with Him, direct contact with people treated unjustly helps sustain a lifelong commitment to justice. Therefore, each of us ought to be able to point to one situation of injustice wherein one has direct personal experience.

Question for reflection: Where do I have direct personal experience of injustice?

[1] These four features were originally developed by Sr. Sandra Schneiders, IHM.

2. A conscious involvement in a project

This signifies that one's prayer life **and** commitment to promote justice is not episodic or sporadic, but rather entails a consistent and extended commitment to a certain set of practices. None of us is able to maintain the same level of commitment to numerous justice issues. Justice issues demand that we make choices about where we spend our time. This does not mean that we cannot hold positions on a variety of justice issues. We can and should do so. However, each of us will be drawn naturally to certain issues, just as we are drawn to certain forms of prayer. Banning landmines will be important for some, while others might feel a stronger call to work with victims of domestic violence. The goal of conscious involvement is depth of engagement in one cause rather than shallow, or even superficial, engagement in a number of justice issues.

Question(s) for reflection: Do I have a conscious involvement in one justice issue? Or, am I involved in many issues without giving myself fully to any particular cause? When I consider justice issues, which ones draw forth the deepest affective response in me?

3. A Life integrating principle

A Christ-centered spirituality is a life-integrating principle that defines in large measure how one relates to oneself, to other persons, and to the world in general. Similarly, when we make a commitment to justice and begin to consider the sinful social structures and systems that oppress people, it changes how we relate to our neighbors, the environment, and ourselves. We become more sensitive to our consumption of resources (oil, water, electricity) or aware of the people in our midst (migrants.)

Question for reflection: Is my commitment to justice a life-integrating principle? When I have taken a stance on a justice issue, how has it changed the way I relate to myself? Others? Our world?

4. Oriented towards a transcendent source of ultimate meaning and value

This dictates that our spirituality is oriented toward someone or something that is foundational to all that *is*. For Jesuits and our Ignatian colleagues, Jesus is our transcendent source of meaning and value. As the spiritual writer Ronald Rohlheiser writes, "We have a God with skin!" to Whom we dedicate our lives and in Whom we find meaning and value. Similarly, a commitment to justice should give one meaning and value.

Question for reflection: Are my justice commitments directed towards God or myself? Do my justice commitments help me find meaning and value?

Faith and justice: an updating

Mary Nolan

In this article, the author describes how faith and justice are inseparable in authentic Christian and Ignatian living and focuses on four questions and turning points that have profoundly influenced her life.

On Australia Day 26th January 2011, I was made a Member of the Order of Australia General Division (A.M.) '*For service to people with acquired brain injuries, particularly as an advocate for age appropriate accommodation*'. In July, at the Australian Jesuits Province Assembly, I was one of five lay people who received the Companions Medal.[2] In 2002 I received a Human Rights Award for my '*Ground breaking and pioneering work to bring the issue of young people in nursing homes to public attention*'. And in 2005, a radio documentary '*Locked in with friends*' [3] featuring our son Christopher and friends won the Human Rights Media Award. '*Despite the difficulties Chris's friends have learnt that strong friendships weather even the worst storms and that a conversation doesn't always require the ability to speak*'.

Like Mary, our model of mission in Christian Life Community (CLC), I ask how can this be and ponder all these things in my heart. I give thanks for the grace that has brought us thus far and *His power working in us which can do infinitely more than we can ask or imagine*[4].

Faith and justice are inseparable in authentic Christian and Ignatian living. In the words of Micah, we are called "to live justly, to love tenderly and to walk humbly with our God".

After a story, I will describe four turning points and questions in my life and faith and justice story which have profoundly influenced who I am and all I do. I shall then give examples of our ways of proceeding and reflections on them Justice in General Congregations 31-35.

I begin with a story. A few years ago, on 25 March, Feast of the Annunciation and World CLC day, I took Christopher for a walk. As we walked, I explained it was the feast of Mary's yes in faith to the Father. She did not know what the future would hold or how the Father would

[2] Australian Jesuit Province Assembly citation
http://www.clcaustralia.org.au/downloads/Citations_Mary_Nolan_2011.pdf
[3] http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2010/12/09/3089347.htm to listen to the audio click on 'Locked in with Friends'
[4] Ephesians 3:2

shape the world through her Yes. That morning I told him in my prayer that I had a deep sense of something more at work in the awfulness and pain of his situation. Chris was very attentive. Then I added, Chris, if ever God lets me near those pearly gates, I'm going to have a damn lot of questions to ask! At this Chris burst out laughing – the thought of God having to deal with me in full questioning mode was so amusing.

A journalist used that story in an article in a daily newspaper, and told me many people commented on it. Years later, people have spoken to me of their surprise and their attraction to a God who is open to questions, who can meet us even in mess. I suspect that image of God has led me to formulate questions rather than presume too much. And some people are drawn to that.

Turning points, key questions, faith and justice

I was born in 1943 during world war two, the eldest of 5 children who lived simply on a small family farm in Victoria in a close Catholic parish and community. Catholics and 'non-Catholics' had little contact and bigotry was widespread. Music, laughter and hospitality and sharing what we had were part of life.

My parent's marriage had family and financial pressures. The relationship began to falter when I was about ten. I was a bright, devout child, attentive to signs of discord. I tried to keep the peace, praying that we could be like 'good Catholics' who seemed perfect.

First Turning Point

The first turning point came at Christmas 1957 when I was 16, and my mother left my father – something unknown in that era, and a scandal in Catholic circles. My mother gave us the choice to stay or to go with her. We moved to the nearest city, Ballarat. The dislocation was hard enough. But many from the previous parish crossed to the other side of the street rather than meet us. I experienced profound rejection and dislocation. To this day, the good spirit uses this to lead and teach me, and the evil one to bring fear and discouragement.

Mum and Dad lived apart for the rest of their lives, but loved one another until death. It took me years to realise that the presumptions and judgements made by those outside the family did more damage than what happened within it. And Those who judged believed they were right. But they were misguided people of the law rather than spirit.

A key question arose for me, what does it mean to be Catholic and Christian and do I want to be part of it?

Although many presumed I would enter religious life, I knew in my heart that was not my call.

I became a radiographer and married my husband John in 1965. We moved to his family farm at Meredith where Catholics were a minority. There I took part in my first inter-church group, and my Protestant neighbour introduced me to praying with scripture. We had two children, Mary Louise and Christopher. John and I were active in the wider community and parish through liturgy, music and religious education of children. I worked in hospitals, read widely, participated in adult faith education courses, theology and scripture in these post Vatican 2 years. I sought understanding and belonging in the church.

Second Turning point: seeking God, finding CLC

In my mid thirties, I was restless and felt beckoned to 'more' in life and prayer. At that time the parish situation was difficult, with people leaving parish and church. John and I gathered a small group which met to pray and seek the way ahead. I became leader and after a year sought to connect with the wider church. We tried other Catholic movements, but I somehow knew that my call was not there. I found *You* by Jesuit Mark Links. For several months I prayed with this program of Ignatian prayer.

My question became, what does it mean to be Catholic married lay woman in church today (post Vatican 2) and how can I live fully?

In 1982, in the Jesuit magazine *Madonna* I read about and was attracted to the 1st CLC Retreat and Course in Sydney. John encouraged me to go to Sydney in 1983, and I made my first 8 day silent directed retreat and the 5 day CLC Course.

I had never met a Jesuit before or made a silent directed retreat, and I was the first lay person my director, Gerald Coleman sj, had directed. Early in the retreat, I asked, Lord what have you got me into? But the retreat was a profound experience of God, of 'coming home', of belonging, and finding the common stream of Christian life to which I was called.

Over the years, I returned to Gerald for annual 8 day retreats and the Spiritual Exercises and we became very good friends in the Lord. Gerald had grown up in a Jesuit parish and school and then entered the Society. He was immersed in Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit life. I knew that I had *been led in this Ignatian way* for many years, without knowing, and was engaging with a language, framework and structure which was centuries old about which I knew little. With my simple lay way of relating and conversing and Gerald's very structured religious manner, we persevered in conversation until hidden treasures began to be revealed to each of us as we 'broke open' Ignatian language and practice from our own lived experience. This was my first experience of dialogue in difference between lay CLC members and Jesuits.

I also met Josee Gsell then Executive Secretary World CLC Rome, at that first meeting. She spoke of her small CLC group during the riots in Paris in 1968, with CLC members belonging to both sides of the conflict. They were able to listen and, despite difficulty, dialogue in difference. That simple but profound truth still inspires and motivates me. Josee and I became good friends.

Christian Life Community (CLC): After my return from Sydney, our local group agreed to try CLC, and we began our CLC journey meeting fortnightly with me as guide/leader. I went to annual meeting and retreats, mainly to Sydney, which was a 12 hour bus journey away. I wanted to enter CLC more deeply and sought to clarify the language, which remained both a block and opportunity for me and others. I often sought clarification and asked questions to ensure I heard and understood what the other was saying.

Fr Noel Bradford SJ, then coordinator of CLC, asked me to help organise CLC Courses in Melbourne and in 1984 I met Australian, Fr Patrick O'Sullivan SJ, then World CLC Vice Ecclesial Assistant in Rome, for the first time.

In 1986, after our first National CLC Assembly we discerned, Do we feel called to become a National Community? There was a unanimous yes. We set up a Victorian team and a year later the Assembly elected a National EXCO. I was elected the first President of Nat CLC EXCO and served 3 terms before finishing in 2000.

In 1990, I was elected as an Australian delegate to WCLC Assembly in Guadalajara (when our CLC General Principles were accepted). I was re-elected in 1994, and elected Vice President of the WCLC Executive Council in 1998.

My years on World CLC EXCO were wonderful, rich and challenging. Listening to national communities with their differences of culture, language and CLC experience and discerning the way ahead brought much dialogue in difference. Many found my Aussie accent amusing and disconcerting!

In 1997, I began two younger CLC groups in Melbourne and am still guide. The light and dark in society and church have deeply affected us. The honesty and trust in our meetings has been gift.

Third Turning Point

The third turning point began on the feast of the Visitation 31 May 1988, when our daughter Mary Louise died in a car accident aged 21. Silence best surrounds the death of one's child. I wondered if I would survive and if our marriage would survive – John and I simply could not be there for one another in the same way. Thank God, family and good friends supported us. 23 years later, the rawness remains. My prayer was simply coming to God as I was filled with anger and grief. God met me there.

Lou's death affected each of us and as a family. She had a great gift for *living fully the moment she had, and she changed our attitudes to life and death*. John, Chris and I were close and listened, gave honest feedback to each other and respected the other's point of view. Christopher finished his third year of law/economics at university and took a year's break in 1989 – living and working at the Jesuit Boys Hope in Cincinnati and backpacking in Central America.

In 1991, Chris who was a high achiever and with a great capacity for diverse friendships, brought the loves of his life – people, music and the land – together. With two friends h started a music festival in a natural amphitheatre on our family farm for 250 people. Meredith Music Festival (MMF) www.mmf.com.au has now become one of Australia's best festivals and will gather about 14,000 people together for its 21st birthday in December.

Fourth turning point: dislocation, catastrophe and coma. A different world with no road map

In May 1996 Chris suffered a multi-organ collapse and a very severe acquired brain injury (ABI) in Hanoi. John and I set up a group of 4 with two close friends of Chris to make decisions for him. After a medical roller coaster and 6 months in a coma, Chris `woke up' laughing at a joke indicating he was hearing and understanding. Few believed us. Aged 28 he went to live in an aged care nursing home with funding for rehabilitation therapies. This plunged us into a new world with no road map. In changes of context and of neuroscience discoveries of the capacity of the brain to recover, we have journeyed with him. He is `locked in' without vision, speech, or movement, but communicates non-verbally and desires so much to live life fully as he is. Advocating for Chris and others unable to speak for themselves has led me to previously unimagined places. I pray, Lord, love and lead me.

Faith and Justice – discovering a way

Friends and family continue to journey with him and us. Severe ABI in 1996 was regarded as hopeless. In 1999, while reflecting and writing a case study about Chris, I realised (with others) that the partnership model we had developed with Chris was unique. *That is, what we were doing and the way we were together, how we proceeded and communicated were unique and special, and Chris*

was much better. I realised that instinctively I was adapting a CLC way of proceeding and discerning, and it was working for both Chris at centre and for those in the team/network. Relating was at its core. Listen/attend, interpret, share and tell Chris what I/we observed and understood, discern response, send and then evaluate. After feeling voiceless and mute, I found my and our voice to express our way of proceeding in that writing, and for the first time gave some 'voice' to Chris and us.

Since then, seeking the way has often involved working with others who seek justice. I have been co-founder of three groups that have advocated successfully for major change, all close to the people they serve. All live social justice. Many are lapsed or non-practicing Catholics. As people of faith they reveal much in conversation.

The first group was Inability Possibility 2001-2011 www.inabilitypossability.org.au. It began in response to Chris's long eye blink of his eyes for Yes. Young (mainly CLC) volunteers and Chris came together to plan and build a float in May 2001 to highlight the plight of young people in nursing homes (YPINH) with severe acquired brain injury (ABI). *These volunteers were so moved by the isolation and marginalisation of people like Chris that they continued and formed an incorporated body which has persevered for over 10 years.*

In 2001, too, some of us concerned for YPINH asked, *how can we work better together?* That conversation led to the formation of YPINH Consortium. Its National Conference was attended by over 400 people from all levels of NGOs, government, media and families from every state and territory in Australia. We then formed a National YPINH Alliance www.ypinh.org.au

In 2004, we heard that the nursing home (NH) where Chris lived was going to close. Chris had nowhere to go. John and I met with 16 of Chris' family and friends to meet to discuss his needs and future. The 'What does Chris want' (WDCW) group has met monthly since then. An effective WDCW political and media campaign in 2005 resulted in the landmark 2006 agreement between State and Federal Governments to fund a YPINH Project for 5 years. WDCW focuses on Chris and the specific systemic gaps for him (and others like him). All attend closely to Chris who is now 43 years old.

For all of these groups, I instinctively adapt the 'CLC process', way of proceeding of listening and discerning the way ahead, respecting the language of others. Experience, reflection, action, evaluation; discern send support, evaluate.

Since 2000, we have uncovered and named three major 'road blocks' for Chris and others like him. We have made some progress in clearing them.

- The first was the deadlock between State and Federal governments about who was responsible for the needs of young people with disability in nursing homes who could not speak for themselves. Social and political analysis, creating societal awareness, and the 2006 landmark agreement between levels of government have made a difference. But the problem is not solved.

- The second, for those like Chris who need nursing care, is the philosophical and practical chasm between the social (disability) and medical models of care[5]. The prevailing culture of

[5] World Health Organisation (WHO) in its International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) 2001 identified and called for the two to come together. In response to this need, in 2008, WDCW a book, '*Acquired Brain Injury (ABI). A socio-medical model of care for young people with severe acquired brain injury*'.

individualism and consumerism is opposed to genuine partnership. In a work published by WDCW, Fr Herbert Alfonso sj explains the difference between individual and personalism[6].

> *"There is a world of difference between 'individual' and 'personalism'. A 'person necessarily connotes a freedom that is open to others, not a being closed in on itself (this latter is 'individualism') – one that grows, develops, matures precisely by the interpersonal relationships it establishes".*[7]

The book is significant but we still have a long way to go.

- The understanding of the brain's capacity to recover has changed radically from the hopelessness of 1996. Advances in neuroscience, neuroplasticity and new imaging techniques are revolutionising brain research – the new frontier of medical science. Our collective view of Chris as 'locked in' is[8] verified.

Chris hears and understands but is unable to move, speak or see. He communicates with facial expressions, vocalising and a long blink for yes, has a great sense of humour and continues to make small gains. By learning together to notice and 'read' his non verbal communication, he and we give and receive. We do not simply ask what can we do for you? But, also will you do something for me? Chris is not a passive recipient but an engaged and responsible person. He has gained purpose and meaning in making a difference for himself and others, and is a 'beacon of hope'. He is now eating. Last season he won the football tipping competition using his long blink to indicate his choice of teams. He has a profound influence on many, including those who come to the Meredith Music Festival which he attends and where he is still involved.[9]

Motivations, reflections

Living the Spiritual Exercises as a way of life changes us. I find myself living the grace of the first week, of being loved and accepted as I am, with energy for Christ's mission in response to such love. Of suffering with the vulnerable (like Chris), trying to engage with organisations and people who may espouse Christian values but do not always live them, and can misuse their power. I have felt that rejection deeply - as Jesus did on being by the Scribes and Pharisees who espoused one thing and lived another.

I have been blessed with the Ignatian experience of conversion, and struggle with the resulting expectation that others, particularly those in authority in Catholic organisations, will understand as I do. In spite of all my experience, as a CLC lay woman I do not have authority that for example, bureaucrats, NGOs and Jesuits have. How do I proceed in an Ignatian way? The way seems like Jesus continuing towards Jerusalem – still willing to continue the conversation, to live faith, not by the law but by the heart.

---

[6] '*Acquired brain Injury (ABI). A socio-medical model of care for young people with severe acquired brain injury*' published by WDCW in 2008.

[7] Alfonso, Herbert SJ, *The Personal Vocation* 8th edition international reprint by the Secretariate for Ignatian Spirituality, Borgo s Spirito 4 00195, Rome, Italy and Gujarat Sahita Prakash, p Box 70, Anand 388001, Gujarat, India.

[8] Bauby, Jean-Dominique '*The Diving Bell and the Butterfly,*' ISBN 1 85702 779 5 Fourth Estate Limited Great Britain 1997 and the film of the same name DVD 2007. Bauby suffered a very severe brain injury similar to Chris. His only movement was an eye blink which he used to dictate his book.

[9] http://2011.mmf.com.au/supernatural-amphitheatre/nolans-chris-nolan-jack-and-mary-nolan/, video clip of pre and post injury. http://www.youtube.com/user/rdonner2#p/a/u/2/9BOhkcCfLfo, You tube clip of Opening of Golden Plains festival 2011 with Nolan family.

All CLC persons living authentic CLC way of life, I believe, have one thing in common – a way of proceeding, of listening and being attentive to our experience of God, self, others and the world, of discerning, sending, response and evaluating on personal and communal levels. It may sound simple, but as I have discovered over these last years, *this is the means that enables and connects persons to seek truth together*[10]. It is the 'how'. I have used and adapted it with *anyone who can listen through their own story,* 'going in at their door', and with groups and organisations as I have described. We need to adapt our listening to the 'language' of the person - even if it is non verbal, and to converse from there.

Is this not spiritual conversation?[11] It is based in listening.

In Guadalajara 1990, the then World CLC Vice President Josefina Errázuriz said that *CLC has the potential to change the criteria by which judgements are made in our societies*. Despite uncertainty about what lies ahead, I know we do.

[10] CLC Identity and mission "*We will develop what we believe to be one of our most valuable contributions: the process of discernment and those listening and dialogue skills that we learn in our community. We will draw on them in resolving conflicts and taking good decisions at all levels of life" Australian Common Mission 1999 and Our Common Mission Itaici 1998. 'Mission is the quality of presence we bring to the world' – family, work, activities, groups to which we belong, the way we are in the world.*

[11] '*The Conversational Word of God,'* Thomas J Clancy sj ISBN 0-912422-34-3 Institute of Jesuit Sources 1978. '*Simple and friendly conversation ... was one of the chief means of apostolic ministry employed by St Ignatius... and this procedure penetrated and undergirded all other more visible activities to which the success of these first Jesuits is attributed...'*

Characterising social justice

Franklin Ibáñez

In this article the author tries to develop a general concept of social justice. Today, as a result of cross-cultural and interdisciplinary dialogue, we are faced with very different and even contradictory ways of understanding social justice. Therefore, rather than proposing a closed and final concept, he will present an open and dynamic one.

What is social justice? To begin with, we need to differentiate it from the criminal type justice, where there are two parties before a court: the defendant and the prosecutor, as seen in the movies. In social justice, courts are not usually involved and the subject matter is Society at large. Society at large can create or promote positions or situations that favour some and do disservice to others. The concept of social justice was especially disseminated in the 19th century as criticism against society for allowing or favouring economic differences: a few had a lot and many had little. So, at that time, social justice meant to seek certain economic equality. Nowadays, this concept has gone much further than just the economic and egalitarian meaning. Social justice has now taken on the idea of preventing or reducing widespread wrongs provoked by machismo, racism, xenophobia and homophobia, among others. At times it consists of promoting equality; at other times, more at recognizing the difference.

The purpose herein is to expound a general concept of social justice based upon philosophy, social sciences and political theory. A lot has already been written regarding this topic from the most diverse disciplines and cultural traditions. Today, as a result of cross-cultural and interdisciplinary dialogue, we are faced with very different and even contradictory ways of understanding social justice. Therefore, rather than proposing a closed and final concept, we will present an open and dynamic one. In other words, what we understand as social justice is still under development, but we can identify at least some minimum characteristics of the same. Those characteristics will be explained herein by way of a thesis and by posing questions.

1) Regarding the normative principle: What causes something to be socially unjust?

It is socially unjust to carry on a practice that contradicts the common beliefs formally subscribed to by various groups that all people have equal moral value according to the culture of human rights.

The normative criterion or principle is the basis for justice; it is that upon which standards are developed. At times people speak about principles of justice, of moral foundations, etc., where something is deemed just or unjust if it agrees with or is against such principles.

In this contemporary world, even in the apparently more homogeneous societies, it is difficult to find a normative criterion accepted by all members, given that not all share the same beliefs. For example, for some the foundation for justice is found in their own religion: "Something is good or evil because *God* judges it so" (The expression *God* can mean the God of the Bible or of the Koran, or that which other religions consider as divine principle of the universe). But those that do not believe in a specific religion, or in any at all, deny this principle.

What can be therefore a normative criterion that, although not yet universally accepted, at least has possibilities, or is in the process of being universalised? The belief that all human beings are of equal moral value. It is true that presently this is not universally accepted. For example, in the 20th century, many wars have precipitated in Europe, Africa or the Middle East because some believed the opposite principle: that some people or human groups are more valuable than others. World War II, the Balkan War, the genocide of the Kurd population or that of Rwanda, are some sad to say infamous examples regarding the issue.

At any rate, this is the most universal and promising principle that we have. It was strongly developed in the modern western world based upon its Christian and philosophical tradition; but also, and even before that, in different oriental cultures. It is at the heart of the culture of human rights and it has two advantages: a theoretical and a practical one. From the theoretical point of view, it is a moral belief shared extensively by the influence (at times violent) that the West has exerted upon the rest of the world. Nevertheless, this belief likewise finds its own reasons for support and recognition in non-western cultures. For example, many centuries before the modern West spoke about the issue, some oriental cultures practised religious tolerance thinking that all human beings had the right to follow their own religious beliefs. From a practical point of view, most nations are formally undertaking (signing international agreements) to respect human rights, likewise implementing institutional mechanisms to ensure compliance with the same. The culture of human rights is making progress in spite of stumbles and setbacks, including dramatic obstacles. Nevertheless, due to moral reasons and historical processes, many people "already" believe in the equal moral value of human beings and politically, many populations are undertaking to implement this principle.

2) Regarding dimensions, what areas of life are covered by social justice?

Social justice is multidimensional, including at least three types of institutions or dimensions: economy, culture and politics, without any of them in particular being more basic on a universal scale than the others.

Is any dimension of social life more important than others? Some social theoreticians and oppressed groups thought that there was one dimension that was more basic than the rest of them. For example, at times it was thought that politics was the key: "Change voter access and that will generate more equality". At other times, emphasis was put on the economy: "If people were more equal economically, there would not be any discrimination or other abuses". In the French Revolution, the political participation rights were extended: citizens could decide who would govern and how they would govern. But in many ways, oppression continued to exist. Thereafter, Marxist and socialist groups arose, emphasising that economic processes were the key, that the economy determined culture and politics. In a simplified Marxist model, the production system divided society into two groups: oppressors (rich capitalist class) and oppressed (poor proletarian class). This theory had a lot of reception at the time, but not all the

marginalised groups identified with it: women and coloured people, among others, said that their oppression was not just economic. (For example, a woman or an immigrant could be despised and discriminated against, not for being poor but precisely for being a woman or immigrant, even though they might have money). Further along, some feminism line of thought upheld that the great social factor of oppression was the gender culture. But this thinking was also questioned theoretically and practically, given that some women, before feeling they were women, felt first of all black, indigenous or poor (Example: some white women with education demanded social respect above all, in the meantime some poor women prioritised a better economic situation for their family, including poor mothers).

In a society that is commercialised to a large extent, economic factors (money, work, etc.) can be more determining in this regard: those who have money will have social respect and political power. In other societies, the most decisive factor, among many others, can be caste, ancestry, gender, race etc. It seems impossible, in most complex contemporary societies, to reduce the origin of the injustices to a single factor (whether political, economic or cultural). For some reason, the origin of social injustices and what marginalised people demand is more or less present and intertwined with these three dimensions: culture, economy and politics. Moreover, some people can undergo injustices in all those three dimensions at the same time. For example, in various societies, the labour market, social respect and even the possibility of political participation is structured around race or ethnic groups. Then, there are cases of low paid work positions for coloured or indigenous people, who, likewise, are despised culturally and have few possibilities for participating in government (even when the same are at times a majority).

Given that injustices are multidimensional and have to do with various factors, it is possible to accumulate them. Continuing with the previous example, think about a coloured or indigenous person who happens to be in cultural, political, and economic disadvantage. If besides this, she is an immigrant and a poor woman, she can accumulate more injustices than a person that is despised only due to his or her race. In this case, the same person belongs to three marginalised groups: women, immigrants and poor people. This person is at least three times oppressed.

3) Regarding frameworks, in which frameworks or political units is social justice applied?

Social justice is flexible to diverse frameworks or political units, such as state-nation, or smaller units (due to decentralisation processes) and larger units (due to globalisation processes).

Is the State the fundamental political framework? Until some decades ago, it was clear that the framework of social justice administration (and of other justices), was above all the state-nation, considered the political unit par excellence. The theory regarding justice and its institutional implementations were thought out and designed for that framework. Although it still has value, the original framework has changed: it has fragmented inwardly due to decentralisation processes and has overflowed outwardly through globalisation processes.

In many countries, especially to the extent in which democracy is being consolidated, processes of internal decentralisation are arising. That is to say, local or regional or departmental autonomies are created according to the territory and other factors, thus improving the empowerment of the populations, such as efficiency in justice administration. At the same time on an international level, globalisation in diverse areas is affecting the life of all populations, even those that try to shield themselves by taking economic, cultural and/or political measures of protectionism. Terrorism, migration, power of capital, global warming etc. are some international subject matters that one country cannot resolve in and of itself.

Two examples are developed herein. First, during the twentieth century there was a large social demand for greater economic redistribution to the interior of a State, which could thus become a benefactor by ensuring economic minimums and health and education for all its population. Now States are no longer economically autonomous and the economic fortune of its population depends on what happens on the global market. Likewise, redistribution is now also a matter of international agents (corporations, agencies –FAO, WTO, WHO, etc. – NGOs, etc.). Second, greenhouse gases –which produce global warming and other damages– and other contaminants, do not respect borders, retaining walls or exacting requirements, as they freely roam throughout the world. They are the wandering, unwanted visitors that nobody wants to receive; nevertheless, nobody can prevent them from entering their house.

Both processes of decentralisation and globalisation, hit upon multiple tensions. Therefore, both the theoretical bases of justice, as well as its practical implementations, should be redefined with these new scenarios in mind. We should rethink roles and justifications for new local bodies (such as the States and their decentralised agencies) as well as transnational bodies (such as the United Nations and derived agencies or similar –Example: International Criminal Court, International Protocols regarding war, natural disasters, ecology, etc.).

4) Regarding the solutions, which are the adequate strategies for solving social injustices?

The demands of social justice can be solved by utilising strategies that oscillate between conservative and radical aspects, keeping in mind morals, process efficiency and results.

How many strategies are there for solving social justice demands? There are many and very diverse solutions that can be categorised in three large types: conservative, radical and intermediate. For example, when considering the topic of poverty we think about traditional and simplified answers from the ultraliberal people, the communists and those defending the welfare State. The first group believe that the solution is to promote the system of free competition: with the free market (free personal actions) there will not be any losers, given that each one will endeavour to achieve and obtain the maximum benefit. The second group considers that property and production systems should be restructured, prioritising the welfare of the community more than that of the individual: common property will ensure the welfare of each of its members. The last group accepts a compromise between free individual choice and the community perspective of society, allowing the redistribution of goods and services of the State to some degree. In the face of the demands of gender, we can try to achieve a similar classification: some feminists seek equality; others, that gender be "deconstructed" or eliminated as a category; others, that there be a positive recognition of the differences of gender.

Which option is the best? It is not possible to decide *a priori* which is the best and most adequate strategy from normative (to be morally correct) and practical points of view (to be efficient in practice). At times a solution is very moral but inefficient, or vice versa. At other times there can be simultaneously good normative reasons and practices for each type of solution. Therefore, when opting for a strategy, practical and normative criteria should be kept in mind, according to the specific context and pursuant to the specific society at issue.

Is it better to seek solutions for each problem or for the whole group? Solution strategies should be designed for a specific problem, without neglecting the relationship with others. For example, in an X society, gender is a factor that structures the market and the hierarchies of social respect, therefore there are two problems: low income for women and their underestimation. The labour market does not recognise parenting activities (e.g.: raising children) nor domestic work. Likewise it has some "pink collar" positions (e.g.: secretaries) that are not paid as well as work

done by men; therefore, the income of women is low. Furthermore, women are characterised as needing protection because they are fragile and dependent, not as autonomous and capable as men. To solve the first problem (low income), society can decide to transfer extra income or special services for the women. But this could actually aggravate the second problem (underestimation), showing that women are truly dependent people, who require the paternalistic protection of the State. Therefore, keeping in mind that solution strategies have diverse and multiple effects upon the economy, culture and politics, we should carefully deliberate to ensure that the overall effects are moral and efficient.

5) Regarding nature, what is the relationship between nature and social justice?

Besides society, social justice takes nature (or ecosystem) into consideration as an equally fundamental scenario that offers moral and efficient limits to human action.

What was the role of nature in the ethical and legal tradition of the West? Almost none. For a long time, most of western tradition considered society as the only relevant scenario for justice. Nature was a dispensable and ineffective background, just "still life" without anything relevant for the topic of justice. On a practical level, the current ecological crisis obliges us to rethink the relationship between human beings and the ecosystem, even to the point of defining social justice. On a theoretical level, the development of ecology as science leads us to the redefinition of the limits between society and nature. The efficiency limit is more obvious: nature cannot be exploited infinitely given that we would end up destroying it and therefore ourselves too. But the moral limits interest us more.

What changes occur in social justice in a moral sense when considering ecology? At least the object and the subject. The changes in the object of justice, that which is distributed, can be perceived at least in the appearance of two new categories: climate justice and environmental justice. Only in the last decade has "Climate Justice" been spoken about: the damage produced by climatic change (particularly global warming) should be solved and compensated by those who produce it the most (more developed countries). The concept of "environmental justice" is birthed probably before the 90s but expands especially after the 90s. This justice is related to how goods are distributed (clean air, land, water and environmental assets) and damages (contamination, degradation and other environmental liabilities) from the ecological point of view. Climate justice would be a subset of environmental justice.

In this dialogue between society and nature, the subjects of justice, those that have right to justice or to whom goods are distributed, also change. For centuries it was thought that nature, including the living beings therein, could be distributed among human beings. Likewise, during the centuries of slavery, it was thought that slaves were animals, not people, and that they could be bartered with according to the interests of the masters. In the 19th century, with the end of slavery, previous slaves now became individuals with rights, thus recognised as human beings. But animals or nature as a whole remained excluded from the circle of those considered holders of rights. Human beings were the only ones with rights; this was the single principle of justice. No wonder it is said that this is an anthropocentric vision: good and evil are determined by what is convenient or not to human beings. Today that vision is rendered questionable. Inspired by scientific arguments, by reappraised traditional visions (pertaining to the populations that were colonised) and by emotional sympathy, thousands of activists demand that rights be extended to animals and nature. There are some States that have begun to recognise that these are legal rights holders. Therefore, the first characteristic or thesis, on the equal moral value of human beings, should be supplemented with this thesis: the welfare of human beings can be the first principle for social justice. But it is not an absolute value.

6) Regarding democracy, how does one interpret and implement that which is just?

Social justice is defined historically and contextually on the basis of a democratic process, which, to the extent possible, is increasingly more participatory in its interpretation and implementation.

In the previous thesis, it is clearly seen that social justice is historical and contextual in its development. How it is interpreted theoretically and how it is implemented practically depend on history and context. As a summary, here are some examples of what we have presenting.

In thesis one, the foundation is the equal moral value of human beings, which has only gained strength universally within the last two centuries. During the centuries of European colonialism, XVI-XVIII, that assertion did not have a lot of endorsement. Nowadays it seems that we cannot backtrack: we are already achieving the goal of recognising all human beings as equal. But we admit that this has not always been so. In thesis two, throughout the various dimensions of justice, there have also been changes over time and in context. For example, the economy can be the fundamental dimension, especially in capitalist societies, but capitalist societies appeared in the history of the West only recently with the Modern Age. Many societies were foreign to capitalism for centuries. Today global capitalism is expanding to all the corners of the earth, but we cannot yet say that the capitalist economy is the main factor structuring societies.

Our concept of justice changes, it is dynamic. The validity and meaning of our thesis are not absolute, but they depend on the time in history and context from whence we judge. Today it seems that the most appropriate characteristics in the context of globalisation are, among other factors, the ecological crisis and the human rights culture. But, stating it emphatically, nothing guarantees that this will not change in time. Today it seems incredible to us that slavery was tolerated for centuries. Perhaps new generations will consider it grotesque that in our societies, economic exploitation, racism, machismo, homophobia, etc. were tolerated. Or perhaps they will criticise us for not having integrated, to the extent possible, the new generations within social justice, or for not having taken into account the animals and nature. Or perhaps we will discover new expressions of injustice.

Presently, who should decide how to interpret and to implement justice? All of us, the *demos*. The author of social justice is not the theoretician neither the professional politician, but the democratic community that is directly affected by these problems. The legitimacy of the interpretation and implementation of social justice is granted by the political community through democratic procedures. The educator, the ruler, the social activist (or others) are members with specific roles, but none of them has the absolute power to determine what is just. World events (such as the opposition to the invasion of Iraq by USA and allies or the "indignant" protest against the economic crisis 2008-2011) show that a global democratic community is slowly appearing. Different democratic communities (local, national or international) should be recognised as the authors of justice.

Does democracy guarantee justice? No. Democracy is not infallible, but it can be reviewed and, therefore, is capable of improvement. There is not a single society (even less within a global scenario) that has all of its citizens on equal terms for participating democratically regarding its issues. After more than two centuries of expansion of modern democracy, its shortcomings have been seen clearly. Some groups (poor people, women, indigenous people, homosexuals, immigrants, etc.) haven been "democratically" oppressed many times. Nevertheless, it is likewise true that many of the oppressed groups have been democratically gaining their own position within democracy. Democracy bears that paradox: it can expand or annihilate itself. It is the vehicle for public power, pertaining to the citizens, meant to transform any issue, including

itself. The goal is that a democratic society (local, national or global) should reflect upon itself, for the purpose of being ever more participatory and just.

Original in Spanish
Translated by Clifford Schisler

Making justice a reality in the 21st century

Raúl González Fabre, SJ (Comillas Pontifical University-Pueblos Unidos, Madrid)

In the last 40 years, the apostolic body of the Society of Jesus has taken the link between the defence of faith and the promotion of justice seriously. This apostolic body includes Jesuits and many others who share the Ignatian spiritual inspiration, and take direct responsibility for works and actions of the Society or contribute to them in other ways.

Taking justice seriously

In the last 40 years, the apostolic body of the Society of Jesus has taken the link between the defence of faith and the promotion of justice seriously. This apostolic body includes Jesuits and many others who share the Ignatian spiritual inspiration, and take direct responsibility for works and actions of the Society or contribute to them in other ways. The term apostolic body refers to a large number of diverse groups – about which it is possible to make general observations – trying to connect faith with justice, as insisted on by the 32nd General Congregation: Since evangelization is proclamation of that faith which is made operative in love of others, the promotion of justice is indispensable to it. What is at stake here is the fruitfulness of all our apostolic endeavours (Decree 4, 28-29).

It is clear in the multitude of social works, the significant emphasis of our theological thought, the socio-economic positions taken by Jesuit magazines, and the conflicts in which we have been involved, sometimes with fatal consequences, that this conception of the mission has been taken with great seriousness by the Society. Moreover, it could be one of the underlying and persistent dimensions in most of the works of the Society, including those which at first glance seem to be less 'social'. The reader can look for his or her most appropriate example. It is uncommon to find a Jesuit college, university, parish or spiritual director which in some way does not raise awareness of the plight of the poor and marginalised, encourage analysis of the causes of their circumstances, and provide opportunities for contact or direct work with them, creating the impetus to make a deeper socio-economic commitment.

This is the first way we seriously address the question of justice which could be described as subjective. After a number of years of effort and discussion, including internal debate, we have firmly established a commitment to justice as a gospel requirement. In other words, it expresses who we are; it expresses our experience of faith. This subjective dimension has been spoken and written about in many Jesuit environments over the last few decades.

However, there has been less internal debate on the objective dimension of our commitment, which poses question: of what does bringing about justice for the poor consist, and how can it be effectively realised? While the subjective dimension examines our interior commitment, the objective dimension examines the skills with which we bring about real results. As it is a question of love, the purpose of the promotion of justice is not found in ourselves, but in others, in the victims of injustice. It is not enough that we express our commitment well; the other needs to be effectively served and offered justice, something that good intentions do not guarantee.

Issues of objective justice are constantly discussed in the social apostolate, and in the work of other apostolates whose actions strive for socio-political outcomes. But we have written much less, had fewer opportunities to systematically exchange information and develop our own ideas, and have achieved less consensus on the objectives and methods of promoting justice than those regarding spiritual motivations and religious symbols.

This would not be of such great importance if the question of justice could primarily be tackled at national level. This level of decision making is more or less within the reach of the provinces of the Society, inside which the dialogue of discernment between Jesuits, religious and lay people is more comprehensive. If justice depended above all on events and decisions taken inside each country, the Society could be satisfied in sustaining a global community through the subjective aspect of our commitment, and accept the very different national specificities of the objective aspect of this commitment.

Reality, however, prevents us from being satisfied with this schema, because the part of justice and injustice which concerns us is, or will be, increasingly globally defined. National societies can only resolve those aspects which do not significantly affect their position in the market; when economics are at stake, nations melt into the global market.

Therefore, if we are to take seriously the objective achievement of justice, we must build capacity for global, as well as national, advocacy and social action. In the objective field of the attainment of justice we must look for a community of ideas and beliefs on the same scale as that already achieved in the subjective field of the interior commitment to justice. Only in this way will our commitment meet the challenge of this historic moment.

Our historic moment

During the second half of the 20th century, it seemed that in some parts of the world (Western Europe, Canada, Australia, and perhaps the United States), the formula of reasonably balanced economic, social and political development was found. This formula consisted of: (a) capitalist economies principally operating in national markets; (b) a welfare state which regulated these markets and distributed approximately 40% of the national product through the provision of universal public services; and (c) a representative democracy with a certain decentralisation and division of power, in order to govern the welfare state and, through which, national markets.

This schema was far from perfect. Among other things it was accused of facilitating the imperialist exploitation of the peoples' of the Third World in order to sustain the high living standards in developed countries (much truer for the United States or France than for Denmark or Luxembourg), and of being ignorant of the ecological unsustainability of consumption levels that wealthy societies were reaching. Despite these accusations, many countries tried to promote development by way of democratic capitalism with a welfare state; and some were successful.

This schema depended on the ability of the state to effectively regulate markets. The obstacles to the movement of goods and capital ensured the external sector of each economy remained relatively limited, and permitted the development of national goods' markets under the control

of national governments. With this, the political control of markets became possible, and where this was achieved with sufficiently healthy institutional policies, it produced good socio-economic outcomes (better than any other regime humanity has ever known).

However, we no longer live in this historic moment. In the last 30 years, capital has dismantled the structures built during the 20th century to regulate it. Market relations have become globalised, and in great measure have escaped from national political control. Capital initiatives are no longer under the control of one state, but are spread across many, which now must compete for investment. The precarious equilibria reached in some parts of the world in the second half of the 20th century have been falling apart since the 1980s.

This should not be a surprise. The best private investment opportunity – one that does not depend on the exploitation of one party's strength, the illegitimate use of informational asymmetries, undue outsourcing of costs, or bribes to politicians or public servants – is found in relationships in which all parties enter voluntarily, and from which they benefit. These are win-win situations; with a little luck, situations in which all the parties involved win, and nobody loses.

It is much easier to establish market than legal relations, particularly between states. Market relations can be produced and extended with much more flexibility, thus, much more quickly. Buying and selling only requires shared acknowledgment of the other's property and a minimal language with which to understand the terms of the exchange. One can even negotiate without knowing the same language, using sign language instead. Market transactions constitute only fleeting relationships which end with the exchange of objects, without the need to have a great knowledge of the other party, neither to confide in him beyond the moment of the exchange, nor commit oneself to anything further than the agreed compensation.

On the contrary, legal relations demand a much more detailed knowledge of the other party, more communication and stability of relationships. Being subject to the same law implies the acceptance of complex rules and procedures of which all the parties must have a common understanding. These rules will be enforced not only in the present but also in an uncertain future. These rules, therefore, require the ability to speak the same language at least in relation to actions of a public nature, know others sufficiently well enough to estimate their long-term trustworthiness, recognise them as fellow citizens, and commit oneself to abiding by the same laws as them. Legal relations take more time to establish than market relations, and therefore, spread more slowly.

As quickly as technological developments have made it economically possible, market relations have been globalising. One must look no further than the origin of the products available in any shop throughout the world, be it in a rich or poor country. Tempted by the opportunities of increased wellbeing offered by the international division of labour and the specialisation into areas of comparative advantage, states have dismantled a large number of the barriers which made the market coincide with the nation state. This facilitated the transnational flow of capital, goods and symbols of consumption. Commercial relations, easy to establish as explained above, have globalised, producing new consumption and development opportunities. At the same time, they have generated dynamics which are difficult to control, posing serious global risks. Political relations, much less flexible and more complex, have not developed in the same manner.

Our historic moment is, therefore, a period of transition. Capital has again escaped the control of political institutions which were able to regulate it in a way which promoted social

development. The main challenge of this period consists in the construction of global political institutions with which to govern globalised economic relations.

This is not the first time, at least not in the West, we find ourselves facing a similar challenge. During other periods of history, such as during commercial capitalism of the 14th century or with the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century, capital got ahead of the political institutions, producing dynamics which created wealth but at the same time generated serious instability and social conflict. In each instance, societies were pushed to establish higher levels of political institutions (successively in these cases: the nation state and the welfare state) to minimise the adverse effects of uncontrolled capital flows, while conserving the advantage of its expansion in terms of efficiency, innovation, and accrued social cooperation. In each of these aforementioned examples from Europe, the period of transition between the emergence of capitalism and the consolidation of political institutions capable of its regulation was approximately 200 years.

Even though these powerful forces appear beyond control and the construction of institutions necessary to harness them appears a remote possibility, there is no reason for despair. It may take a century or two of patient work to complete the construction of global institutional structures with which to control the activities of transnational capital in global markets.

What is at stake in the dynamics of global economy – and of related areas of the environment or demography – which can no longer be addressed by the political actions of nation states but require global political institutions? The opinions expressed by those who work on these issues are relatively convergent; so it is sufficient to present the views of one well-informed author.

Unresolved questions

In 2001, the Luxembourger and economist, Jean-Francois Rischard, then vice president of the World Bank, published a book entitled, *High Noon: twenty global problems, twenty years to solve them* (New York: Basic Books). With the hindsight of almost 10 years, his list of global problems helps to situate the discussion. It is as follows:

A. Sharing Our planet: Issues involving the Global Commons

1. Global warming
2. Biodiversity and ecosystem losses
3. Fisheries depletion
4. Deforestation
5. Water deficits
6. Maritime safety and pollution

B. Sharing our Humanity: Issues Requiring a Global Commitment

7. Massive step up in the fight against poverty
8. Peacekeeping, conflict prevention, combating terrorism
9. Education for all
10. Global infectious diseases

11. Digital divide

12. Natural disaster prevention and mitigation

C. Sharing our Rulebook: issues needing a global regulatory approach

13. Reinventing taxation for the twenty-first century

14. Biotechnology rules

15. Global financial architecture

16. Illegal drugs

17. Trade, investment and competition rules

18. Intellectual property rights

19. E-commerce rules

20. International labour and migration rules

Depending on one's perspective, one or more issues could be added to or subtracted from each of the above headings. For instance, I would civil and political rights, which has become a global issue capable of generating instability and transnational migrations. However, Rischard comes very close to his objective of providing us with list of pending issues for humanity which, without doubt, already constitutes a single economic and biological, if not political, society.

Each one of these problems affects the three desirable qualities of all social systems, including the global economic society: stability, efficiency and justice. These three are crucial for the sustainability of the human presence on earth; so much is at stake in them.

These are intertwined questions of an economic dimension. On the one hand, many of these problems require a significant investment of resources before they can be addressed. If they are to be efficiently addressed at the global level, there would need to be a global redistribution of resources comparable to that which has already takes place within nation states. On the other hand, the resolution of some of these problems would have immediate consequences for economic competition between nations. Deciding on a set of rules would create winners and losers in the short term, and those states which saw themselves as losers may block agreement. Moreover, most of the problems highlighted by Rischard relate to natural resources or public goods which affect humanity in its entirety. The division of costs and benefits of taking care of managing these natural resources and producing these public goods constitutes another challenge, one which, until now, has been too difficult for nations to reach agreement.

In short, the great problems identified by Rischard can only be resolved by building the capacity for collective global action, capable of questioning old concepts of national sovereignty in favour of new global institutions, as requested by Benedict XVI (Caritas in Veritate, 67). If we fail in this historic task and nation states close in on themselves in defence of their immediate interests in an attempt to resolve their problems alone, catastrophe awaits us, and serious conflicts on the major global issues will lead to crises. One only need think of the current financial crisis. In the absence of global financial structures (point 15 of Rischard), we were neither able to avoid the present crisis, nor control it over the last four years.

Our historic moment presents us with a series of challenges in harnessing the globalised economy, which can only be met through the construction of a new global institutional polity.

This is our fundamental moment. The new global institutions which humanity must work hard to build in the following decades or centuries will require fundamental agreements on the basic concepts of justice to be attained. And whatever social group, like ours, which wishes to help build these new global institutions, must propose coherent and viable ideas of global justice. Are we capable of doing so today?

The Jesuits

As indicated in the previous section, we have seriously committed ourselves to the promotion of justice as a part of our vocation of evangelisation. It is a significant achievement for such a large and widespread apostolic body, having autonomously and uniformly developed thousands of small initiatives throughout the world, to be able to reach this level of spiritual harmony. This achievement is even greater because it includes the incorporation of a strong social dimension within all the Jesuit apostolates: education, pastoral, intellectual, and certainly in the formation of both Jesuits and lay collaborators.

This Jesuit social action, spread beyond that of the social apostolate, could be characterised by paraphrasing the three-word slogan of the Jesuit Refugee Service: accompany, serve, and transform.

Accompaniment refers to the introduction of one's personal presence into the world of the poor, to a greater or lesser extent sharing their way of life, even including "drawing lots" with them, as the expression of Ignacio Ellacuría goes.

Service consists in bringing our own personal and collective capabilities in the promotion of life to this vital journey of the poor. Above all, our service is offered in the areas of pastoral care, education, community formation, but at times it includes economic assistance, organisational and management tasks, peace mediation…

The action of transformation (which JRS translates as advocacy in its concrete working environment) is intended to change the way more powerful third parties treat the poor, when this treatment is unjust. It is the most political aspect of our social action, as it seeks to change social structures which create and reproduce injustice; combat the ideas which legitimate these structures; find alternatives to the institutions which underpin these structures; modify the social and political power relationships upon they are built and sustained; help the unjustly impoverished victims organise themselves; and raise awareness of those living on the margins and offer them ways of getting involved in the defence

Whether or not this is the same as what we refer to as 'advocating' depends on one's understanding of the word. As it is commonly used by NGOs, 'advocating' hides more than it reveals about the richness of the forms and dimensions of the social struggle for justice in which the Jesuit apostolic body has been involved since the times of Rerum Novarum. From the motivational perspective, 'advocating' fails to capture the pain of that struggle: ours were not martyrs of advocating, but of justice. 'Advocating' also evokes a certain technocracy: experts who take on causes and campaign in their favour, rather than the poor organising themselves as protagonists in their own liberation.

More importantly for own argument, 'advocating' as term could become a political short cut; it suggests issues rather than structures, groups of concern rather than society as a whole, influence over decisions rather than the radical reconstruction of the framework in which decisions are taken. As we have stated, it is precisely this frameworks we see going into successive crises, having demonstrated its impotence in the face of the massive problems of the

global economy, and its inability to develop concepts of justice capable of tackling these challenges.

It is not that the word 'advocating', as it is commonly understood by NGOs, lacks sense or is in some way harmful. No; the expert action of local or sectorial advocating within a framework of established decision-making has its place in the work of social transformation towards greater justice. However, it only constitutes part of this work, not all of it. It does not even constitute the most historically enlightened part: for it responds better to the various short-term opportunities – the deadline of projects presented for funding – rather than the underlying need for historic transition in which we find ourselves. As such, if we are going to use the term 'advocating' as a synonym of the moment for transformation, we will have to revise this term carefully.

As indicated above, our greatest historic necessity lies in the construction of a worldwide institutionalised polity able to restrain globalised capital, regulate markets which have expanded throughout the world and subordinate their excessive strength for the good of humanity. This global institutionalised polity will need to be underpinned by far reaching and coherent concepts of justice within a legal structure.

Over the last century, the Social Apostolate of the Society has been taking concrete measures supporting justice. Throughout most of this period, the scale of the problem was national, as were the political instruments and theories of justice designed to address it. In many places, we gained a significant degree of influence over national decision-makers in political and governmental circles and among grassroots social activists.

In recent decades, effective solutions to problems of justice have increasingly slipped beyond the reach of individual nation state. Concepts of justice based on the nation, political instruments of nation states – or the organisations established to influence them – are no longer sufficient to address these problems. They are not only insufficient, but often completely ineffective, because they are based on the concept of national sovereignty, the principal obstacle to the necessary establishment of a new institutional framework. In a single global economy, certain outcomes, desirable at national level, could cause unjust harm to others outside that nation, and national interests could paralyse necessary collective global action.

The division of the Society's apostolic body into provinces along national and sub-national lines has probably been the reason we have been slow in developing ideas of justice and organisational structures which would have offered us opportunities to make a significant contribution to this constituent phase for the world. It is no coincidence that the Society's organisation best able to take the leap into global political action in its own specific area of activities have been JRS, an organisation whose authority does not depend on the provinces. However, the actions of JRS are limited to sectorial advocacy in favour of specific interest groups. For instance, it does not cover all the aspects which should be taken into account to establish a new global institutional framework regarding the migration of the poor.

Those in the apostolic body of the Society who work in local and/or sectorial advocacy are being led by their own work, sometimes with perplexity, to tackle global issues which cannot be addressed by summing the interests of the groups whose rights they defend. They are faced with a global economic society far more complex than the national situations with which they are used to dealing. The perplexity as to how to organise this new global society, maybe a feeling shared by us all, constitutes a good starting point from which to address fundamental tasks ahead of us.

Conclusion: three fundamental tasks which we are not taking seriously enough

1. We must recognise that an increasing number of problems of justice and sustainability facing humanity cannot be addressed at national level.

If we want to maintain the level of capacity we have developed over the last 100 years promoting justice at national level, we have to organise ourselves on a global scale for this struggle for justice. This requires a change in mentality, a willingness to invest seriously in transnational initiatives, to find a shared model of discernment, organisation and action at international level, and dispose of a form of central coordination of all these processes, which can only be the General Curia because only the Father General has a specific mission with respect to global action.

2. We must recognise that specific, local, sectorial etc. advocacy actions we develop at national, and to a much less extent, global level constitute valuable steps forward but are in themselves insufficient to meet the scale of the challenge facing humanity: the construction of a political institutional framework capable of regulating markets to serve the common good.

Going from national to global levels does not mean only extending or coordinating our present socio-political work, it also means extending our ambition towards effectively influencing the on-going constituent processes of the new institutional framework. The possibility of promoting justice at local and sectorial levels in the forthcoming centuries will depend crucially on the outcome of these processes.

3. With regard to the aforementioned, we must also recognise that our community of spiritual motivation (subjective) in favour of the promotion of justice that we have achieved in the universal apostolic body of the Society cannot be automatically translated into capacity for global action.

In fact, we lack capacity. This incapacity will grow the more we detach ourselves from current sectorial advocacy activities, and turn our attention to the constituent processes of the new global institutional framework which will determine which policies will be possible in the future. Our shared spiritual motivation constitutes a basis of enormous value, but it is only a basis. To make real progress in meeting the challenges of justice in our time and truly promote the liberation of the poor, we need to build shared concepts of global justice onto these spiritual foundations. Upon these concepts we need to construct organisational forms proposed by a range of groups from social movements to bodies where the constituent discussions on the new world institutional framework are taking place.

The Society of Jesus can and must feel insignificant in the face of the complexity of the world, of the power of the economic and political forces operating within it, of the spiritual and moral richness of other traditions and groups… However, we must not abandon the fundamental ambition of bringing the real justice of the Kingdom of God to the poor of the earth, for the salvation of all. In our view, this requires we take on these three fundamental tasks, first in the area of ideas and discussion, then also in the area of organisation and action.

Original in Spanish
Translated by James Stapleton

A year after my return from Haiti

Ramiro Pampols SJ[12]

In this article the author describes his experience among the poor in Haiti after he had been working for 28 years in Barcelona as a worker priest. In Haiti he collaborated with his Jesuit companions working for JRS and the Fe y Alegria schools and experienced first-hand a poverty that is difficult to imagine.

When you want to describe an event in your life in a moment in which you are well into retirement age, it is both easy and difficult to be evocative. I can't think of any alternative, but to interweave in puzzle-like form, two experiences which continue to mark my life.

The first was my time as a worker priest in a number of factories in Barcelona. This experience lasted 28 years, most of my working life, and has determined the course of my past, present, and, I imagine, my future.

However, upon retirement at 65 years of age, I wanted to "rediscover" something which my exclusive dedication to the working class and trade union world has not allowed: the world of the really poor.

In addition to this concern, the option of most importance at 70 years of age has been my desire to serve in the poorest Latin America country, Haiti. There I collaborated with my Jesuit companions working for JRS and the Fe y Alegria schools, Lafwa ak kè kontan.

My four years there allowed me to develop a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of material poverty and, above all, of the poor. Let's say that the world of the European working class initially formed part of the world's poor. But now it's much more complex and difficult to determine, despite the fact that there are more than four million people unemployed in my country at the moment.

The poverty I experienced first-hand in Haiti is much harsher and harder to imagine. After the January-2010 earthquake – the intensity of which I personally experienced – it became even crueller, if that's possible.

Experiencing this reality, up close on a daily basis, has made an enormous impact on me. Concrete imagines and events in my mind interconnect at every moment with other much more

[12] Tarragona Province, Coordinator of the Workers Mission in Spain.

pleasurable and provocative imagines from my immediate environment. Since my return I haven't been able imagine life – or my remaining active years – without thinking of three or four aspects of last four years which will always remain deeply embedded in my inner conscious:

The meaning of **justice** with which I feel a certain tension; between justice as it commonly understood and how it's understood in the religious sense of the term, that is open to transcendence. I don't want to "denigrate" the passion showed by my non-believer trade union and NGO friends who struggle for greater justice, but my way of understanding of justice, based on faith, goes much deeper than a strictly material definition.

I often surprise myself with a question that may seem excessive. For those of us who choose a preferential option for the poor – in this way redefining our justice-faith mission–, and I am particularly thinking of the Society, especially its colleges, universities, spiritual centres: what use are we if we're not capable of significantly alleviating the suffering of so many victims of injustice?

Likewise, the **political** perspective of human activity related to justice and poverty. When I see the projects of many NGOs in Haiti I always ask myself if they have taken the political impact, good or ambiguous, of their actions into consideration. I ask myself, will this strengthen or weaken the economic system that is so terribly unjust? Or will it be used justify the "urgent" need for more "humanitarian" aid and just become a vicious circle?

Moreover, the need to place these concerns into a certain **ideological** approach, that puts the "pieces" of what I am doing into a more adequate framework, so as to avoid going in blindly. Put more clearly: what possible model for a new society does my desire for justice and struggle against poverty refer to?

During the Social Week we Jesuits celebrated in Brussels last year I was taken aback by the testimony of Michael Bingham SJ, when referring to his difficult work with Irish prisoners, he emphasised the need to understand the situation from a particular ideological perspective…

Without an explicitly declared ideological perspective, Haitians are debating whether the post-earthquake view of their country should be one of "reconstruction" or "re-foundation". Two radically distinct conceptions.

From a more simple and everyday perspective, I have felt moved to live **much more humbly.** In Haiti, I learned to live with much less than I had previously thought possible. For instance, I have stopped using the car and have forgone making other perfectly unessential purchases.

Even though I recognise it's not easy to use the word **"greater radicalness"** with care when referring to religious life, but from then on I began noticing the absence of this perspective and a more countercultural, if not a prophetic, lifestyle.

It's clear that the life of a pensioner offers freedom to work on the personal aspects of one's life for which "there was no time" before. I would like to conclude with this pledge which I find increasingly rewarding: to use my remaining years to go further than I had previously thought "reasonable" and "appropriate" and tell myself that while I'm in good health there are no obstacles to accepting a job or a destiny far away from home with poor groups in the same way as I did during my four years in Haiti (2006-2010), which had such a profound impact on my life.

Original in Spanish
Translated by James Stapleton

Our mission: to share an experience with a refugee family

Lara Kadouzian Haddad

In this short article Lara Kadouzian Haddad shares with us her experience with two families of refugees that has deeply affected her life.

What I have to offer is to be able to listen to the other. That is why I felt driven to visit someone who needs to talk of a past long gone, a present which seems so ambiguous, and a future full of dread, impatience and hope.

Having lived myself this experience during the war in Lebanon, meeting these people was not heavy or a yoke to bear. Quite the opposite; it proved to be a time of joy and sharing. This time with them made me recall the time when we ourselves, and all our family, escaped to Syria to stay with my maternal grandmother. For me this was a good memory, despite the reasons we were there, and the reason was because of the people who welcomed us with open hearts. But I must admit that the war, especially when it continued for such a long time, did on one hand harden our hearts and on the other made us vulnerable.

On my visits I had with me another CLC member, Rindala. We were of the same opinion that we should take our children with us on these visits because the two families we were visiting had children too and they were of the same age as ours. We were so delighted to see our children and those we were visiting had so much joy and got on so well with each other. Our children looked forward to the visits and were disappointed when they could not come with us. One of the families had two children: a boy of 8 and a girl of 4. The other family had 7 girls between age 20 and 3.

What really touched me in the sharing with these two families was that the parents did not complain about their situation. Their only concern was the education of their children in a country where the culture and scholastic education was so different. They have a challenge to face in trying to adapt and get used to the new customs and at the same time maintain their own identity and own customs. Moreover, the older children could not go to school because they have to work to help their parents.

In short this is what I really wanted to share with you: a simple experience with these two families that have left an imprint in me and who have given me so much.

May the Lord be their guide in every step of their lives.

Original in French
Translated by David Formosa

Experience of justice

Oh In-don Francisco, SJ

This article describes the author's personal experience as a director at The Centre of the Dove, better known as Banteay Prieb, in Cambodia. This centre, that was once a killing field, is now a place where physically disabled people share their difficulties and find peace, reconciliation and friendship.

I have been working in Banteay Prieb since 2008. The Centre of the Dove, Banteay Prieb, as it is known in Khmer, was started in 1991 by the Jesuit Refugee Service. Before it became Banteay Prieb, this place was a communication centre for the military, as well as a prison and a Khmer Rouge killing field. Despite its painful previous history, Banteay Prieb became a training centre for soldiers and civilians who had been maimed in the war or had stepped on landmines. Here they came, lived together, shared their own respective stories and hoped to find companionship.

At the beginning, most of the trainees were former soldiers who belonged to 4 different groups and had taken part in the civil war. They were physically disabled and faced all the resulting difficulties. They had finally got a chance to come to Banteay Prieb, hoping to learn technical skills. Upon arrival at the centre, they realized that they had to live in the same place with their opponents. All their anger and fear came back; it was not at all easy living with former enemies. But the reality of everybody being physically disabled led them slowly to start talking and eating together. Finally, they became good friends. The centre made a great impact on society as it transformed a place for fighting and killing into a place for peace, justice and reconciliation. In the centre enemies disappeared and friends remained as they continued to share their lives with other physically disabled persons.

Cambodia slowly found peace; the victims of war or landmines became fewer and fewer. As a result the centre mostly took on individuals whose disabilities were due to accidents or diseases such as polio. As of now, more than half the trainees are polio victims. Polio could have been prevented by a simple vaccination, but during the 25-year civil war most children could not get this vaccination and many were infected by polio. Therefore the centre considers them as indirect victims of war. Most of these trainees come from poor families in various provinces of Cambodia. Even though the general society is developing rapidly and people have more chances for education and job opportunities, those with disabilities are still the most marginalized people in Cambodia. Forty per cent of our trainees are still illiterate and the average education level of them all is below that of secondary school students. Banteay Prieb

continues to be true to its motto, which is to serve the poorest among the poor. Serving the poor in Banteay Prieb is the first apostolic work of the Jesuits' mission in Cambodia. Therefore, when I was assigned here, I had strong desire to help with all my strength those persons with physical disabilities. The longer I stay in this place, the more I realize that I did not come here just to help the poor, but also to be helped by them. Now I faintly understand why God sent me to Banteay Prieb. It was not about doing, but being. Persons with disabilities in Cambodia are poor. The poor are easily thankful for small opportunities, are satisfied with their circumstances and know how to share with others. There is always a smile on their faces. It seems they are happier than others. From all this experience, I understand the meaning of the first beatitude: "*How blessed are you who are poor: the kingdom of God is yours*. (Lk 6,20)"

My role as Director of Bantey Prieb is closer to that of a Social worker than of a priest. Because most of the trainees are Buddhists I have very little opportunity of celebrating a Catholic liturgy. But I can sense the Presence of Jesus among the people more than at any other time in my Jesuit life. One feels the beauty of life in Banteay Prieb!

Six indigenous ethnic groups and the contribution of fair trade

Roberto Núñez and Silvia Macías, Members of CLC-Mexico

In this article the author describes his experience as a volunteer in Mexico where, together with other companions, established an association in favour of the indigenous people.

From the ashes they claimed, with dignity, the fruit of their work, to eat and to live, but in the markets of injustice they were swallowed up, yet they continued living - Pedro Arriaga SJ

Ten years ago, in response to an invitation from Gonzalo Roses SJ, who had already spent several years in Chiapas, 13 of us volunteers, belonging mostly to different CVX (Christian Life Community) groups of Guadalajara, Mexico, offered our services to continue helping the *compas* of that region. He encouraged us to become distributors of their crafts and of the organic coffee that they were beginning to produce.

For us it seemed vitally important to do something on their behalf. We thus established the *Manos Indígenas Trabajando (Indigenous Working Hands) (MIT)*, now an association and registered trademark, with the following objectives:

- to help some of the indigenous people to live off their work production,
- to raise the awareness within our environment regarding the value of the indigenous culture, traditions and art,
- to promote the philosophy of solidarity and fair trade.

Not only have we been organising ourselves to market articles from Chiapas, but we have likewise incorporated around 11 ethnic groups (there are some Jesuits present in several of those groups promoting a more dignified life). We focus mainly on assisting: the **Tzotziles** and **Tzeltales** of Chiapas, who produce organic coffee and beautiful embroidery as well as symmetrically designed handlooms, the **Wirárika** , who, in the mountains of Jalisco, create pictures and decorate objects with threads and coloured chaquiras (clay beads), utilising the ancient symbols of their mythology, the migrant **Mixtec** civilization located in Guadalajara, who create ornamental articles from palm leaves, the nomadic **Rarámuri** of the impressive Barranca del Cobre and adjoining mountains, who utilise natural fibres of their habitat in

their handicrafts, and the **Purepecha** of the Michoacán plateau, who specialise in working with clay, copper and different natural fibres of the region. This enables us to maintain an extensive variety of exquisite handicrafts, one of our best decisions for maintaining our position as a distribution channel for those products.

Two indigenous migrants have been the key actors of this programme: Celeste, a Mixtec, and Rodolfo, who is native of Chiapas. While Celeste creates earrings as well as animal and human miniatures from fine strands of palm, she attends to the people that are interested in acquiring her crafts and those of the other ethnic groups put on display. Rodolfo has been responsible for establishing and maintaining the relationship with the indigenous artisans, especially those of Chiapas.

Both of them have developed their work within *MIT,* creating at the same time other options for personal development: Rodolfo completed a Business Administration programme at ITESO, a local Jesuit university, while Celeste and her sister have been promoting their own business for selling their crafts.

We are permanently present in the activities of the Centro Ignaciano de Espiritualidad (Ignatian Centre of Spirituality), as well as in diverse educational institutions of the metropolitan area. The action carried out has a double purpose: on one hand it is to sell, and on the other, to raise the awareness of those who approach our stand to the fact that more than 10 million Mexicans are indigenous people, having the same rights as any of us to a life with dignity, deserving likewise our respect for their culture and traditions.

Due to this work and the evidence thereof on a public scale, others have likewise been motivated to do something to benefit the indigenous people.

In an article published by a newspaper of national coverage it specifies that: The group advises the indigenous people regarding quality systems and proposes designs for creating modern accessories as well, such as diary, cell phone or computer covers.

The path undertaken has been a testimony and search for ways to respond to the silenced claim of those who were our brothers living in this territory, long before we mestizos arrived acting as owners of the land.

Likewise, it represents a modest effort to create an organised apostolic body that facilitates synergies with the lay people of the different CVX communities and other groups, as well as with Jesuits in various enterprises.

The obstacles encountered and economic contributions invested have not been few. In both cases we have been discovering the best modalities for responding to our objectives and to our limitations of time and experience.

We have not yet found the way to adequately measure the impact of our action, but we frequently meet strangers who know about *MIT* and who consider this a valuable contribution. No doubt this is what it means to *do all things as if it depended on you, yet fully trusting God as if it all depended upon Him.*

Original in Spanish
Translated by Patricia Kane

Justice: promotion of a faith that does justice

Elias Mokua SJ

In this article, Elias Mokua describes his experience in South Kenya, among the Kuria tribe, where he conducted a peace building training. He was very surprised to learn that most of those in attendance had been experiencing intertribal conflicts and, this context, provided a cue of reflection upon the difference between human rights and justice, and, how the promotion of human rights not always grant justice.

Early this year (2011), when we conducted peace building training at Ntimaru Catholic Parish, South West Kenya, among the Kuria tribe who live at the Isibania – Sirare border between Kenya and Tanzania I was left in utter shock at some of the intra-tribal conflict experiences participants shared. The most vivid, in my mind, is a sharing that women including those married for over 50 years to the "enemy clan" were sent back to their "home") [read place of birth] because they were believed to be spying for their "homeland". Well, the intra-clan lasted several months. Notably, the conflict was sporadic and hence was re-ignited from time to time.

I have been wrestling in my mind with the thought whether the women sent back "to their homes" felt patriotic to their ancestral clans or felt betrayed by their "new home". I do not know whether they questioned their children and husbands if they belonged only at times of peace. I still wonder whether this was simply a "men thing" or it was a cultural act. Whichever way I look at it, something disturbing remains in my heart. Deep within, I know this is to do with rights. Yet, it is beyond rights. It has a strong dimension of justice. Perhaps not.

I put this question to a group of participants who were tackling the relationship between faith and (secular) law: what is the difference between rights and justice? No one gave a clear distinction and I couldn't either, because this was not meant to be a lecture, and moreover, we were not looking for the "right answers". But, again I was left wondering if our work as a social Centre run by the Society of Jesus is essentially a promotion of human rights and not justice. Indeed, I have come to the realization that a denial of a right leads to a demand for justice. However, not all rights grant justice. This is why, next time I go back to Ntimaru, I am likely to take offence with the Kuria clan that sent away the grandmothers to their place of birth during the conflict. But, shouldn't I expect a fight back as the clan was

strategizing on how to defeat the enemy? On what moral ground would I justify my offence?

More and more I am losing my grip on the promotion of rights as a conveyer belt for a just world. Not only do rights contradict themselves in complex cases such as feuds between husbands and wives, children and parents, institutions and the executive arms of governments and so forth but also often come directly in conflict with the concept and practice of justice. The huge gap between the rich and the poor in developing countries; the culture of sustaining impunity amongst the rich and powerful in order to selfishly exploit common resources, and the difficulty of forming solidarity groups at lower classes in view of demanding justice from duty bearers point to a reality that requires networks beyond local boundaries. We must venture into new frontiers if only to promote a faith that does justice.

Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat

C. P. 6139 – 00193 Roma – Italia

+39 06689 77380 (fax)

sjes-sec@sjcuria.org