



Promotio Iustitiae

Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat (SJES), General Curia of the Society of Jesus, Rome, Italy

Leadership and Governance: A call to Reconcile and Recreate

Theology of Prophetic Leadership and Governance in the Society of Jesus

Pavulraj Michael SJ

Characteristics of Ignatian Leadership: An Orientation that Bears Fruit

Sarah Broscombe

Leadership in Jesus' Style

Carlos Rafael Cabarrús Pellecer SJ

Governing in an Ignatian Spirit Today

Sandie Cornish

On Leadership in the Works of the Society of Jesus

David Fernández SJ

Perspectives on Collaboration, Networking and Discernment in Apostolic Planning: Rediscovering Collaboration as a Grace

Sandra Chaoul

Leadership in the Works of the Jesuit Social Apostolate: Learning at the Heart of Commitment

Élisabeth Garant

Ten Years of Formation in Ignatian Leadership

José M. Guibert SJ

Governance at the Service of Mission: The Role of Conferences

Mark Raper SJ

Leadership Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of the US Jesuit Conference

David McCallum SJ

Leadership and Governance: Typology and Issues for a Sustainable, Stable and Prosperous Society

Paulin Manwelo SJ

Governance and Leadership in Today's Context

Stany Pinto SJ & Erwin Lazrado SJ

Challenges for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology in the Church and the Society

Ludovic Lado SJ

Challenges and Obstacles for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology

Yolanda González Cerdeira

Editor : Xavier Jeyaraj SJ

Associate Editor : Terence Rajah

Publishing Coordinator : Rossana Mattei

Promotio Iustitiae (PJ) is published by the Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat (SJES) at the General Curia of the Society of Jesus (Rome) in English, French, Italian and Spanish. PJ is available electronically at www.sjweb.info/sjs. You may access all issues since n. 49, March 1992.

The last printed version of *Promotio Iustitiae* N. 101 was in 2009, after which we publish only the electronic version. Hence, we highly recommend that you print a copy of the issue and display it in common places such as reading rooms, libraries etc.

If you are struck by an idea in this issue, your brief comment will be greatly appreciated. To send a letter to the Editor for inclusion in a future issue, kindly send an email to sjes-sec@sjcuria.org.

Re-printing of the document is encouraged; please cite *Promotio Iustitiae* as the source, along with the address, and send a copy of the re-print to the Editor.

Contents

Editorial	5
Xavier Jeyaraj SJ	
Theology of Prophetic Leadership and Governance in the Society of Jesus.....	7
Pavulraj Michael SJ	
Characteristics of Ignatian Leadership: An Orientation that Bears Fruit	12
Sarah Broscombe	
Leadership in Jesus' Style	17
Carlos Rafael Cabarrús Pellecer SJ	
Governing in an Ignatian Spirit Today	22
Sandie Cornish	
On Leadership in the Works of the Society of Jesus	27
David Fernández SJ	
Perspectives on Collaboration, Networking, and Discernment in Apostolic Planning: Rediscovering Collaboration as a Grace.....	32
Sandra Chaoul	
Leadership in the Works of the Jesuit Social Apostolate: Learning at the Heart of Commitment	36
Élisabeth Garant	
Ten Years of Formation in Ignatian leadership.....	40
José M. Guibert SJ	
Governance at the Service of Mission: The Role of Conferences	44
Mark Raper SJ	
Leadership Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of the US Jesuit Conference.....	49
David McCallum SJ	
Leadership and Governance: Typology and Issues for a Sustainable, Stable and Prosperous Society	55
Paulin Manwelo SJ	
Governance and Leadership in Today's Context	60
Stany Pinto SJ & Erwin Lazrado SJ	
Challenges for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology in the Church and the Society.....	66
Ludovic Lado SJ	

Challenges and Obstacles for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology71
Yolanda González Cerdeira



Editorial

Xavier Jeyaraj, SJ

The last two General Congregations expressed the importance of leadership and 'governance at the service of universal mission' (GC 35, D 5). GC 35 acknowledging the demanding nature of this ministry (D 5, n. 171) of leadership gave three guiding principles for governance structures within the Society of Jesus: a) it should flow from a perspective of greater universality; b) should be streamlined, modernized, and made more flexible where possible, and c) a better articulation of Ignatian values and ways of proceeding in our contemporary life and work.

Jesus was a *servant leader* with a clear vision, who led by example and built a team around himself. He cared for the weak, the marginalised and invested in empowering them. He was also a *prophetic leader* who critiqued and even condemned leadership that relied heavily on the powers of law that control and dominate. Jesus showed that leadership is not a tool to rule and dictate but a mission to reconcile and recreate right relationships with God, others and creation (GC 35, D 3, n. 12).

GC 36, D 2 on 'Renewed governance for a renewed mission' says, "Governance in the Society is personal, spiritual and apostolic." It further states, "discernment, collaboration and networking offer three important perspectives on our contemporary way of proceeding" and help "streamline governance and make it more flexible and apostolically effective."

In the present edition of *Promotio Iustitiae* - 125 on **Leadership and Governance: A Call to Reconcile and Recreate**, the authors approach and reflect not merely from the viewpoints of the person Jesus, bible, theology, Ignatian spirituality and the Society's apostolic orientation and mission but also emphasise the numerous challenges and opportunities that the Society of Jesus experiences today in various conferences. The authors are quite realistic and challenging in their approach and give valuable suggestion for the leadership and governance to become "personal, spiritual and apostolic."

Pavulraj in his article affirms how Jesus had modelled servanthood with prophecy and challenged His disciples to follow his example. *Sarah* emphasises how real God-orientation actually shaped the action and decision of St. Ignatius in his life. She

compares this God-orientation to compass needle that always returns to North, even if temporarily deflected by force. *Carlos Rafael* on the other hand compares the character of a leader to a 'salmon' that returns to its origin while swimming against the current. *Sandie, David* and *Sandra* stress the need for Ignatian leadership and governance to be more spiritual and apostolic in character focussing what one is entrusted with is not a personal mission but *missio Dei*. All these authors, in different ways call for a true Ignatian discernment - which may remain quite ambiguous - and to collaborate with an open mind and heart if we really wish to receive the graces of God's work in and through us.

Speaking of shared and nourishing leadership, *Élizabeth* based on her own experience in Canada calls for a 'pedagogy of companionship' in fulfilling the common mission. Though decreasing number of Jesuits today may be seen as a weakness, it probably provides an opportunity for both Jesuits and lay people to "create new relationships", to begin lay formation in Ignatian ways and "dare to tread unfamiliar paths" in the governance.

Based on the personal experience, knowledge and analysis of leadership and governance in different conferences of the Society of Jesus as well as in the context of leadership and governance today in the world around, *David McCallum* from Canada-USA, *Mark* from Asia Pacific, *Manuelo* and *Ludovic* from Africa-Madagascar, *Guibert* from Spain - Europe, *Stany* and *Erwin* from South Asia and *Yolanda* from Latin America share their reflections on the challenges and opportunities for leadership and governance especially for promoting justice and reconciliation in the Church and the Society of Jesus.

These articles, I am sure will enlighten each of us to discern the way of the Spirit, revisit our own human styles of leadership and governance and return to our roots so that we may respond as McCallum says, "to the growing demands and necessities of that apostolic mission, especially in times of increased volatility, uncertainty, and social, economic and political disruption" with a greater sense of *missio Dei*.

Original English



Theology of Prophetic Leadership and Governance in the Society of Jesus

Pavulraj Michael, SJ
Gregorian University, Rome

Memory and Vision

The 35th General Congregation establishes three principles to guide our consideration of governance in the Society of Jesus based on the experiences of recent decades and our apostolic mission: “a) Our governance structures and ways of proceeding should flow from a perspective of greater universality. b) Structures of governance should be streamlined, modernized, and made more flexible where possible. The Society is organized in function of its mission. c) Changing circumstances require a better articulation of Ignatian values and ways of proceeding in our contemporary life and work” (GC 35, D. 5, n. 1). Our reflection centres around this number because it invites the Society to read the signs of the time and respond meaningfully as St. Ignatius and the First Companions did. It also calls us to theologize as the prophets did by having memory and vision when they were asked to respond to the context in an effective way. The prophets are supposed to carry out their calling with a sense of standing in the dynamic tension between memory and vision. On the one hand the prophets had an acute sense of what God had done in the life of the community. The prophets call the people to remember and respond in celebration, praise, recital and proclamation of the God known to Israel in its own story of promise, deliverance, covenant-making, and community building in the land. Such remembering allowed the affirmation of God’s faithfulness and served as the basis to renew their own commitment to the obligations of partnership in God’s covenant – a commitment that included the claims of justice and righteousness. On the other hand, the prophets also possessed a vision of what God yet can do beyond the challenges, limitations, and circumstances of their own time. God’s faithfulness in commitment to his people does not reside in the past. God is sovereign over all of history, therefore is active to open new possibilities to his people for its own future. The prophets can dare to dream dreams and see visions and their message challenged the people to new possibilities in renewed partnership with God who resides not simply in the past but goes before them to create new futures. Rich and imaginative images envision God’s future for humankind – from peaceable kingdom (Is 7:14) to new covenant written on the heart (Jer 31:31-34) to dry bones that may live again (Eze 37:1-14) to the appearance of God’s anointed one once again (Is 45:1-8; Jer 23:5-33:15; Zech 3:8). The prophets teach the people that leadership for even the most noble principles cannot be pursued for individual goals and purposes. It is undertaken in solidarity with the whole of people and in the concrete contexts

of the social, historical, cultural, and religious realities of their lives. The leadership style that Jesus taught and modelled was neither about command and control, nor status and power. He did not teach techniques, but grew character – a character centred on a Christ-like servant heart. He modelled servanthood with prophecy and challenged his disciples to follow that example – to be like him. From the Kingdom perspective, this makes leadership modelled on Jesus and centred on his indwelling character superior to all secular leadership styles. Jesus also shared his vision with a wider circle of disciples and with the masses, and he instilled confidence and enthusiasm about his vision of a coming Kingdom of God (Mt 4:17; Mk 1:15; Lk 4:16-20). In the process of casting his Kingdom vision and teaching in parables, he enabled people to see his vision for themselves, and he drew many people to his vision. Jesus the Messiah created a community of people who were focused on his Kingdom vision, and by leading, teaching, motivating, and inspiring those people.

Characteristics of Prophetic Leader in the Constitutions

The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus portrays the General of the Society as a prophet having memory and vision, by inheriting the true qualities of the prophets of the Old Testament and Jesus Christ of the New Testament. First, the General “should be closely united with God our Lord and intimate with him in prayer and all his actions” (Cons. 723). It is important that the leader is a person of prayer; it is also important that he has the spirituality of a contemplative in action. The reason for union with God is that “he may so much the better obtain for the whole body of the Society from God, the fountain of all good, a large share of his gifts and graces”. Secondly, he should “be a person whose example in the practice of all the virtues is a help to the other members of the Society” (Cons. 725). He should be model to the whole Society in the practice of all virtues, especially in the practice of charity and genuine humility. These two virtues will make the prophetic leader highly lovable to God our Lord and to human beings. He should know how to blend gentleness with effectiveness, kindness with severity. Magnanimity, fortitude and constancy are important qualities for the General of the Society, “to bear the weakness of many” (Cons. 728). As a third quality, the leader “ought to be endowed with great understanding and judgment” (Cons. 729) with ability at discernment and the giving of advice. The prophetic leader should be intelligent, learned, prudent and discreet. Fourth, he should be “vigilant and solicitous to undertake enterprises and carry them to successful completion” (Cons. 730). The proactive leader has to be assiduously applied to governing and should have energy and courage in fulfilling his duties avoiding negligence. Fifth, as Ignatius says, “has reference to the body, in regard to health, appearance and age along with the physical energies needed to fulfil his office” (Cons. 731). Sixth “he ought to have extrinsic endowments such as reputation, high esteem and whatever else aids toward prestige with those within and without the Society” (Cons. 734). After all of these Ignatius ends up by saying “finally he ought to be one of those most outstanding in every virtue, most deserving in the Society, and known as such for a considerable time. If any of the previously mentioned qualities should be wanting, there should at least be no lack of great probity and of love for the Society nor of good judgment accompanied by sound learning” (Cons. 735). Ignatius was very realistic in realizing that it would not be easy to find an individual in whom all these qualities would be joined and balanced. These characteristics of the General of the Society of Jesus are the source of prophetic leadership at different levels of governance.

Prophetic Leadership and Governance for Mission

The prophetic leadership permeates and sustains all dimensions of governance in the Society of Jesus. On the Central Governance, the Superior General, who is a man of God and prayer, is a source of unity in the universal body of the Society (Cons. 666, 719). As governance in the Society is always measured in an appropriate balance of union and diversity, “the office of General must be exercised in a manner which respects diversity while placing it at the service of our universal mission and identity” (GC 35, D 5, n. 7). The Society of Jesus is a mission-oriented body. For Jesuits, identity is inseparable from mission, whose centrality shapes all dimensions of life and structures. It is apostolic action of a distinctive quality, shapes and determines as it were by the principle that God’s greater glory is ever the objective – *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. This Jesuit identity is: a self-propelled, Spirit-directed, Word-penetrated communicator of the Word, sent on a mission under the banner of the Cross, one so dedicated to our apostolic enterprise that he gives himself thoroughly to communal apostolic discernment at which he has become adept, one so absorbed by this commitment to Christ in mission that he prizes any support he can give to his Jesuit companions. The mission promoted by the Jesuit leadership is truly a seamless fabric. It never ceases, because it is divine. Jesuits in mission are both “men for others” and “men with others” (GC 34, D 14, n. 34). This basic characteristic of our way of proceeding calls for an attitude and readiness to cooperate, to listen and to learn from others, to share our spiritual and apostolic inheritance. While recognizing the authority of the General of the Society of Jesus for universal mission, it is important to note that today “cooperation among Provinces and Regions to realize the apostolic mission of the Society is an undeniable necessity” (GC 35, D 5, n. 17). To be “men for others” and “men with others” are the critical aspects of our charism and deepen our Jesuit identity. In our way of proceeding, the principles of unity of governance (*cura personalis*, *cura apostolica*), subsidiarity, and sufficient authority to exercise one’s office, are to be applied appropriately as Jesus did. Thus, the governance of the Society of Jesus in general and of the Jesuit communities in particular aims at mission: “From his privileged place at the heart of the community, the superior is also responsible, together with each member, for developing its apostolic life. Concretely, this commits the local superior to lead his community in a Jesuit common life characterized by the celebration of Eucharist, prayer, faith sharing, communal discernment, simplicity, hospitality, solidarity with the poor, and the witness that ‘friends in the Lord’ can make to the world” (GC 35, D 5, n. 34). Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini says, “If there is something for which credit must be given to the Jesuits in their history, in spite of all their faults and mistakes, it is, I think, the fact that they never sought to establish themselves on the already ‘existing’ or on the ‘already known’, and have constantly felt the invitation to discover, to define, to reach new horizons of evangelization and of service to culture and human development. That is why the notion of frontier... has always attracted the Jesuits like an obstacle to be overcome, a finishing line to be reached and to go beyond it”.

Discernment-Collaboration-Networking in Jesuit Governance for Mission

The apostolic priorities of the Society and the Ignatian criteria of discernment to decide them and to seek the means to make them effective are themes connected the one with the other, and, since they refer precisely to making apostolic mission concrete, central in the

Constitutions of the Society of Jesus. This great desire is in Part VII of the Constitutions in a palpable way, denser and defined, but with obvious resonances in all the rest. The ability to see the connection between the ideal and the real, the universal and the concrete, is, as the epithet affirms, truly divine. For this is what Jesus Christ was able to unite, the divine and the human, the universal and the particular. One small example of this is the instruction of Ignatius to Lainez and Salmeron as they proceed to the Council of Trent as theological consultants. At the same time as they fulfil this grand role, Ignatius instructs them to engage in the teaching of catechism to children. Both apostolates, the lofty and the lowly, are authentic ways of the human person to seek, find, and serve God. This is why discernment, collaboration and networking can only be understood from the perspective of finding innovative ways to embrace our mission. Jesuits discern, collaborate and network for the good of the mission as a modern prophet. Our adaptive spirituality and our tradition of dialogue with the world urge the Jesuits to re-align existing structures so as to find better answers to global challenges and international problems from a collaborative approach involving concerted action with a wider scope. Our new apostolic way of proceeding requires a cultural change in the Society of Jesus in order to develop agents with the new skills needed to provide vision and leadership in a universal and collaborative mission. Leadership in the Society of Jesus today is a very demanding ministry. When we look at the contemporary world, “the need for international cooperation, new structures for partnership with others, and heightened expectations about the quality of community life are only some of the factors that call for new attitudes and new skills in superiors and directors of works at all levels of governance. Specific formation for Jesuits and others in positions of leadership is needed” (GC 35, D 5, n. 30).

Discernment, a precious gift of Ignatius, is integral to our personal and corporate apostolic life. It begins in contemplation of God at work in our world (SE 23, 236) and allows us to draw more fruit in joining our efforts to God’s designs. The process of discernment requires a continuing “dialectic” of the existential word of God as manifested through concrete actual situations and the prophetic word of God revealed in Christ, in the Gospel, and in the living tradition. The dialectic consists of attending to all the factors posed within the concrete situation and then reflecting upon them in the light of the prophetic word of God, until the Jesuit finally can assess, interpret, and determine what God is actually demanding from him as his response to the call of God to him here and now. Thus, discernment of God’s will is at the heart of prophetic leadership and governance of the Society, because when we walk a disciple’s path we are constantly faced with changing situations in which we have to discover how to be faithful to the Gospel and to the leading of the Spirit, and true to ourselves. This involves us constantly in making choices, in our attempts to integrate prayer and life, contemplation and action. Discernment is what “roots us in the Church in which the Spirit works and distributes his various gifts for the common good” (Address of Pope Francis to GC 36, 24 October 2016). Discernment serves as the foundation for decision-making by the proper authority in our way of proceeding (GC 36, D 2, n. 4).

GC 35 stated that “collaboration in mission... expresses our true identity as members of the Church, the complementarity of our diverse calls to holiness, our mutual responsibility for the mission of Christ, our desire to join people of good will in the service of the human family, and the coming of the Kingdom of God” (GC 35, D 6, n. 30). Mutual understanding and respect

are indispensable in our collaboration with people of good will: a real appreciation of the dignity, equality and difference in our vocations, and a readiness to recognize the gifts, needs and sensitivities typical of each group. GC 36 recognizes “the decisive role of our partners in the vitality of the Society’s mission today and expresses its gratitude to all those who contribute to and play significant roles in Jesuit ministry. That mission is deepened and ministry is extended by collaboration among all with whom we work, especially those inspired by the Ignatian call” (GC 36, D 2, n. 6).

Jesuits are constantly driven to discover, redefine, and reach out for “the magis” (SE 23, 95, 97, 98, 149, 151, 152, 155, 167). Networking has to take place on all levels from local through regional to international, with at times complex interrelationships running through different levels of a single problem. GC34 strongly encourages regional and worldwide cooperation: “Such networks of persons and institutions should be capable of addressing global concerns through support, sharing of information, planning and evaluation, or through implementation of projects that cannot easily be carried out within Province structures. The potential exists for networks of specialists who differ in expertise and perspectives but who share a common concern, as well as for networks of university departments, research centres, scholarly journals and regional advocacy groups. The potential also exists for cooperation in and through international agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other emerging associations of men and women of good will” (G 34, D 21, n. 14). For Jesuits, frontiers and boundaries are not obstacles or ends, but new challenges to be faced, new opportunities to be welcomed. Indeed, ours is a holy boldness, “a certain apostolic aggressivity” (GC 34, D 26, n. 27), typical of our way of proceeding, which is possible only through proper networking: “Collaboration naturally leads to cooperation through networks. New technologies of communication open up forms of organization that facilitate collaboration. They make it possible to mobilize human and material resources in support of mission, and to go beyond national borders and the boundaries of Provinces and Regions. Often mentioned in our recent Congregation documents, networking builds on a shared vision and requires a culture of generosity, openness to work with others and a desire to celebrate successes. Networks also depend on persons able to provide vision and leadership for collaborative mission” (GC 36, D 2, n. 8).

Thus, the theology of prophetic leadership and governance in the Society of Jesus has its source in the prophets of the Old Testament and its summit in Jesus the Prophet of prophets. The Jesuits of the Third Millennium, having memory and vision, fall back to the charism of Ignatius and reach out to the contemporary world with creative fidelity. Jesus imbues the sons of Ignatius with the vision of God’s reign, a vision which brought him into conflict with the kingdoms of the world. And so, the leadership and governance in the Society of Jesus is liberating, redemptive, prophetic, transforming and salvific.

Original English



Characteristics of Ignatian Leadership: An Orientation that Bears Fruit

Sarah Broscombe

Coordinator, Ignatian Leadership Programme, Yorkshire, UK

Ignatian Leadership is on an irrevocable change curve. Unsurprising, perhaps: the Society's history is full of extraordinary demands, and extraordinarily creative change in response. But until recently, almost all Ignatian leaders were Jesuits. Leadership was therefore an outworking of Jesuit formation, often instinctual rather than deliberate. This formation (novitiate, extensive studies, community life (albeit relatively unconventional), Experiments, the lenses of the Spiritual Exercises and the Jesuit Constitutions) does not homogenise individuals, but does embed a way of proceeding, and structured encounter with a particular spirituality, that results in some shared approaches and vocabulary for thinking about leadership and governance. For lay Ignatian leaders, formation is less thorough and coherent. Their encounter with what it means to be Ignatian may be through making the Spiritual Exercises, or formation courses, or even just through reading.

These different formations make it complex to generalise about characteristics of Ignatian leadership. They also give urgency to the need for a shared understanding. If laypeople are to develop as confidently Ignatian leaders, we must be able to articulate what Ignatian leadership is. Formational needs will differ: where Jesuits in leadership often perceive technical management expertise needs, for lay leaders it isn't always clear how to lead in a distinctively Ignatian way. If we cannot give clarity about what needs to be present in an Ignatian leader, and help people grow in these attitudes, qualities and actions, how can we become "ever better collaborators in God's work in the world"¹ together? Ignatian leaders, Jesuit and lay, need to be resourced to thrive in leadership as skilled people of consolation and discerning love, the 'discreta caritas' of Ignatius². Perhaps this is why both recent General Congregations of the Society of Jesus³ highlight leadership and governance as a priority.

This article opened by framing the new context and challenge facing Ignatian leadership; a world in which leadership by formational osmosis is no longer sufficient, because not all

¹ Arturo Sosa SJ, Superior General, "On Discernment in Common": Letter to the whole Society, 27 Sept 2017, p. 2.

² Ignatius to Juan Nunes, Patriarch of Ethiopia: Sancti Ignatii de Loyola Societatis Jesu fundatoris epistolae et instructiones, Vol 8, 680-690.

³ GC 35, D 5, "Governance at the Service of the Universal Mission"; GC 36, D 2, "Renewed Governance for a Renewed Mission".

Ignatian leaders are or will be Jesuits, and a world in which many Ignatian leaders have urgent formational needs which must be met if we are to serve the universal mission. Articulating the heart of Ignatian leadership is a task beyond both my scope and that of this article, but the following paragraphs offer an approach to Ignatian leadership as an orientation that bears particular fruit. First I will touch on the scope and limitations of secular leadership theory, and then focus on some distinctive facets of Ignatian leadership in terms of orientation and fruits.

Excellence in leadership is a burgeoning field of study. There is a wealth of research, data and tools to tap into; not least leadership agility work, the neuroscience of human functioning, and emotional intelligence in leadership. As a snapshot, good leaders need the personal qualities of self-awareness, integrity, authenticity and courage; interpersonally they need to be inspiring, motivating, empathetic and good communicators; and strategically they need to be visionary, purposeful and mission-driven. None of these are unique to Ignatian leadership, although many are congruent with it. Leaders certainly need technical knowledge and skill, and Ignatian leadership training will draw on secular leadership theory to resource them. But the deep orientation is different.

In his *Treatise on the Governance of St Ignatius Loyola*, Pedro de Ribadeneira gives equal weight to what Ignatius said, did and was. Ignatius's own portrait of 'The kind of person the Superior General ought to be' in the Constitutions⁴ is of a leader who is not a mere expert, but a mirror and model, "a person whose example in all the virtues will be a help to the other members of the Society"⁵. In both texts, role-modelling is core to an Ignatian leader's authenticity: "In order to help others to make progress they should have most care and give most importance to making progress themselves, striving to be more perfect, and growing each day in virtue"⁶. Mark Rotsaert SJ observes: "This principle is still valid today: your example is more important than your words."⁷ The Spiritual Exercises embed this integrative principle, engaging all we think, do and are. The Exercises do not principally teach you: they change you, through relationship.

Ignatian leadership therefore is irreducible to a finite schema of 'Essential Competencies' against which we can measure. But just as Ignatius in the Constitutions gives qualities of a good leader for the Jesuits, so we can expect certain qualities growing in leaders committed to being Ignatian.

⁴ The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts (Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996) Part IX, Chapter 2, [723-735]. Hereafter this source will be abbreviated to CN.

⁵ CN [725-726]

⁶ Pedro de Ribadeneira, *Treatise on the Governance of St Ignatius Loyola*, trans. Joseph A. Munitiz (Oxford: The Way Books, 2016) [5:1]. Hereafter this source will be abbreviated to Ribadeneira, *Treatise*.

⁷ Mark Rotsaert SJ in Ribadeneira, *Treatise*; Afterword p. 50. He continues with even greater challenge: "If you want to undertake great things for Our Lord, you should not fear to lead a life like his... This is still the only way for a good apostle."

Let's start where Ignatius does; friendship with God⁸. Real God-orientation influences every action and decision. As for a compass needle, North (God's presence, the Holy Spirit's movement in our life) is immanent, always magnetically attracting. Even if temporarily deflected by force, the needle when released to its own volition returns to its North, its God-orientation.

With a steady orientation - where, as in the Principle and Foundation of the Exercises, God's praise, reverence and service come first - freedom grows. Ignatian freedom is both an 'indifference' ("be[ing] prepared to wish to relinquish something out of love of God"⁹) and an active disposition that is open, unencumbered and therefore equally able to welcome everything, or let it go. Freedom is a grace we seek. From this beginning, the Exercises moves on to growing in self-understanding as a loved sinner. Being utterly loved within the felt experience of my own brokenness brings humility; not the false humility of self-rejection or worthlessness, but acceptance of my real need for redemption. Humility fosters authenticity, because it counters the pressure of perfectionism. This is inherently freeing.

The Meditation on the Two Standards¹⁰ encapsulates the challenge of humility for Ignatian leaders. Here are two wisdoms or sets of values¹¹. On the one hand, the Enemy offers riches, honour and pride, with the self as absolute. On the other, Jesus offers poverty, contempt and humility in companionship with him. The Two Standards is nonsensical as responsible leadership unless you believe in God's work in the world. Michael Ivens SJ warns us not to underestimate the plausibility of the Enemy's values; riches, honour and pride can look sensible and necessary when we perceive them as credibility, legitimacy, excellence and quality. Being discerning when egocentricity creeps in is hard; the Enemy's fetters are subtly and plausibly disguised. Jesus's wisdom is counterintuitive and even implausible, until we comprehend that it's the only way to stay alongside the Christ we love. Poverty, contempt and humility are not courted from masochism, but from love. They foster freedom.

"You will know them by their fruits"¹². Both in the Constitutions¹³ and in Ribadeneira's treatise¹⁴, for Ignatius, friendship with God inevitably manifests in practical action. Ignatian leaders are not solely contemplatives, or theoreticians. They bear fruit when they live out the consequences of their relationship with God. In action, their authority will be characterised by a distinctive 'taste and smell': "Although it is necessary to have authority in order to help and do good to others, and for that reason it has to be acquired, still this authority is not won with anything that tastes or smells of the world, but rather with... true humility, showing by

⁸ "... closely united with God our Lord and [has] familiarity with him in prayer and in all his operations" CN [723]

⁹ Joe Munitiz SJ *ibid*, Glossary.

¹⁰ Spiritual Exercises [136] - [147]

¹¹ This summary of the Two Standards Meditation is based on Michael Ivens's Commentary, *Understanding the Spiritual Exercises* (Michael Ivens SJ (Gracewing, Leominster UK: 1998) p. 105-113

¹² Mt 7:16

¹³ CN [730]

¹⁴ Regarding the selection of men for the Society- "Thus he was more willing to accept somebody whom he hoped could be outstanding in practical matters while setting a good example... rather than someone who might have an academic degree and some ability but had no inclination or aptitude for practical issues" Ribadeneira, *Treatise* [1:4]

deeds rather than by words that a person is a disciple and imitator of a humble Christ, not wanting or seeking anything except His glory”¹⁵

Ignatius’s biographers used ‘helping souls’ almost as shorthand for the Jesuit mission¹⁶. We ‘help souls’ through discerning love. Ribadeneira waxes lyrical about Ignatius’s ‘discreta caritas’¹⁷. Mark Rotsaert SJ, writing on the Treatise’s implications today, says, “Similarly, the love shown ... should always be that of discreta caritas, a love capable of discerning what is good and what should be done”¹⁸ Magnanimity, the quality Pope Francis describes as “a big heart, open to God and to others”¹⁹, that Ignatius prioritises for Father General, fosters discerning love. The Presupposition of the Spiritual Exercises²⁰ – “readier to justify than condemn”²¹ – helps us cultivate it, and was demonstrated by Ignatius’ generosity in speaking of his brother Jesuits²².

Discernment – ‘the movements felt in the heart and weighed by the mind’²³ – is fundamental to the Ignatian way of proceeding. “Discernment is a graced seeking – almost an aesthetic sense – for the movements of God’s salvific action present in all our relational dynamics: ... It is an operational wisdom that comes from knowing to whom we belong, where our heart really lies. It asks us to be attentive to the movement of the Spirit, both in the world and in ourselves, especially to be alert to whatever makes us deaf or distorts.”²⁴ Ignatius expects this ‘operational wisdom’ or ‘prudential’ in a Father General. Ignatian leaders are people continuously discerning, thus continuously open to change. Growing in discernment is a key component of the Spiritual Exercises: it’s essential in an Ignatian leader.

‘The task of consolation’ is a distinctive and beautiful calling for Ignatian leaders. Others may lose hope, but we cannot: we are people of Incarnation and Resurrection. ‘Finding God in all things’ is an attitude of hope- that our task is not to ‘bring’ God, but to find and collaborate

¹⁵ Ibid, [5:10]

¹⁶ When Ignatius was disappointed in his plans to stay in Jerusalem, “In the end he was inclining more towards studying for a time in order to be able to help souls” (Saint Ignatius of Loyola, *Personal Writings: Reminiscences, Spiritual Diary, Select Letters Including the Text of the Spiritual Exercises*, trans. Joseph A. Munitiz and Philip Endean (London: Penguin Books, 1996), Autobiography [50] – this is one among many references to “helping souls” and “saving souls” throughout the autobiography.

¹⁷ “His principal means was to win their hearts with the love of a most gentle and loving father”; “To sum up, there is no mother who takes such care of her children as did our blessed Father of his own”; “A love so solicitous and so affectionate that it is impossible to express it in words.” Ibid, [3 introduction; 3:11; 3:12]

¹⁸ Mark Rotsaert SJ, Afterword, in Ribadeneira, *Treatise* p. 48

¹⁹ Address of Pope Francis to the Students of the Jesuit Schools of Italy and Albania, (7 June 2013), https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/june/documents/papa-francesco_20130607_scuole-gesuiti.html

²⁰ “...in a magnanimous spirit and with great liberality towards their Creator and Lord” *Spiritual Exercises* [5]

²¹ *Spiritual Exercises* [22]

²² “He himself always spoke well of them” Ribadeneira, *Treatise* [3:6]; “He showed his love in a wonderful way by covering over and burying in perpetual oblivion the faults of those who acknowledged them”. Ibid [3:10]

²³ Saint Ignatius of Loyola, *Personal Writings* (op. cit.), Glossary

²⁴ James Hanvey SJ, “Because you give me hope”, *Thinking Faith*, 30 April 2013: https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/20130430_1.htm

with God already present, incarnated. In his address to GC 36, Pope Francis links consolation, joy and love: “In the Exercises, Ignatius asks his companions to contemplate ‘the task of consolation’ as something specific to the Resurrected Christ... Joy is not a decorative ‘add-on’ but a clear indicator of grace: it indicates that love is active, operative, present.”²⁵

In conclusion, I believe that Ignatian leadership is a deep, integrative orientation that bears fruit, not a model or schema of leadership. We have detailed some aspects of this orientation (authenticity, friendship with God, freedom, humility), and fruits borne by it (helping souls, magnanimity, *discreta caritas*, discernment, operational wisdom, openness to change, and consolation). Certainly Ignatian leaders need to strengthen their technical and professional skills, but these do not have primacy. The famous Ignatian saying, “Work as if all depended on you, pray as if all depended on God”²⁶, is the meeting point of orientation and action. Any person of goodwill can grow in indifference, in humility and in magnanimity, but if not springing out of God-orientation, they are not Ignatian, but simply admirable qualities. Our friendship with God is the source that makes our leadership congruent, and from which our attitudes and actions flow.

Original English

²⁵ GC 36, Complementary Documentation [4.1]

²⁶ This is Joseph Munitiz SJ paraphrase (intro xvii) of Ribandaneira’s famous [6:14], Ribadeneira, Treatise



Leadership in Jesus' Style

Carlos Rafael Cabarrús Pellecer, SJ

Ignatian Movement for Integral Formation (MIFI), Guatemala

I. The Characteristics of Natural Leaders

In this presentation, we will discuss the ideal personality traits for project leaders in the Society of Jesus' works. We highlight the need for them to be pioneers as well as leaders; to pave the way. They must be leaders and pioneers in every area of work; from the administrative and operational aspects, to the essential questions. Their main characteristics are the following:

1. They should be an outstanding person:

The fields are diverse: intellect, sport, organisation, the arts...

They excel in:

- Kind-heartedness: affability, sensitivity, kindness, and integrity both in character and behaviour. They are a "good egg", positive and a unifier...
- The quality of cooperation.
- The ability to foster a team spirit and build bridges.
- Convening, rather than imposing, and being attentive to the feelings of others.
- Respecting dissent.
- Naturally caring.
- Enthusiasm. They offer creative solutions.
- Working on their negative personal aspects and boosting their positive ones.
- Matching their deeds with their words.
- Inspiring others to struggle for their dreams, showing what is possible through their achievements. As a manager they do good things, and do them well.

Typically, a leader has the character of a "salmon"; they know how to return to their origins and swim against the current. They know their wellspring, the combined qualities that form one's deepest identity - psychological DNA. They explore and develop their conscience - in moments of political responsibility - and give grace when God reveals Himself as the Living Water, the spiritual experience.

These people excel because they are free of prejudices, attachments and fears... They reject money, power, and personal interests. A good leader knows that their period in charge is temporary and they should live to serve: they are replaceable, but the institution endures.

They show deep empathy when dealing with other people. This gives them social skills. They become a “safe space” for others and have an optimistic disposition towards life.

Leaders stand against any exercise of bad leadership that drifts towards authoritarianism and total self-centredness, which breeds adulation and hypocrisy.

There are different branches of leadership. These diverse leaderships must work together for personal and institutional growth. Having said that, in the Society's works leaders must have political impact given that the institutions' charism is to advocate for transformation. In this way situations of chaos may change, promote and drive us towards a good place to live. Utopia.

It is important that a leader has moral authority: their leadership consists of making others grow. Characteristically, it “animates” people and encourages suggestions and proposals; it makes reflection a habit. Leaders do not exercise “power”, as this usually crushes people and projects. Instead, they exercise “authority” which is best translated as “animating” processes and people.

2. They must be a person who is instinctively indignant and struggles for the common good

They are outraged at anti-values: the deplorable condition that people are living in/the pillaging of the environment/racism/machismo/injustice/the lack of caring. They are truly outraged by these things. This drives them to fight against these situations and to seek structural solutions to them.

3. They must be a person who, even if they don't experience the faith, feels called to the way and work of Jesus, when it is presented to them

3.1 Jesus' most valuable teaching was sharing with us the true name of God: not the chastising god, or the god of the Exercises. Jesus taught us to give God the same name that a child uses with their father: Abba. This radically changes the image of God and the relationship that one can have with Him (Mt. 6:1, Rom. 8:15). Jesus experienced this in Mary's arms and in the long periods of silent prayer, alone and in the desert environment He devoted Himself to. He explicitly gave us this most intimate relationship in the “Our Father” ...

3.2 His constant and compelling insistence: He announces the Kingdom of God, which is best conveyed in the certainty that, despite everything, “another world is possible” (Lk. 4:18, Mt. 10:5-7).

3.3 His principle activity: curing hearts freeing them of evil (Mt. 11:28) and giving pardon (Jn. 8:10). Otherwise, healing bodies with His own body (Mt. 4:23, Mk. 5:25).

3.4 His fundamental joy: fellowship meals: This is clear when Jesus invites Himself to the Wedding at Cana (Jn. 2:1-12), a great symbol of His project of the Kingdom. He displays this

joy by encouraging dinners with friends: with Zacchaeus (Lk. 19), with Martha, Mary and Lazarus (Lk. 10:38), with a Pharisee called Simon: (Lk. 36-5); with publicans and tax-collectors (Mk. 2:16) ... all of these have His hallmarks and invitation: sharing, a key evangelical word. He also organised "fellowship meals" with the starving masses where He shared bread (Mk. 14:13-21), and Jesus spoke of his Project in parables: The Kingdom of God appears ...: as the Sower (Mk. 4:1-9), as the mustard seed (Mk. 4 30-32), as yeast (Lk. 13:20), as the wedding banquet (Lk. 14:15-24).

3.5 His strategy: creating followers, in various nuclei: the apostles, fundamentally twelve in number, who were sent out in pairs (Mt. 10:2), and the disciples who were greater in number, who walked with Him and accompanied Him, some of them even to the cross. Moreover, there was an array of collaborators who hosted the apostles in their homes when sent by Jesus to announce the Kingdom of God (Mt. 10:9-14).

3.6 His struggle. Opposing the powers that crushed people. He combatted religious power, the Sabbath law (Lk. 13:3-17), which Jesus systematically violates due to the inhumanity it provoked. This would result in the "death sentence". Against the sacralisation of the Temple, showing that one must adore God "in spirit and truth" and not in any temple (Jn. 4:23-24).

He fought against social power: He lived in Galilee of the Gentiles (Mt. 4:15) at the geographical margins of the Jews. He broke Jewish rules and customs: he accompanied women – which was frowned upon. Jesus wasn't married, and this was disreputable in Jewish culture, which earned him the insult of "eunuch" (Mt. 19:12). He spoke against the absolute patriarchal power of the family, urging the departure from this structure (Lk. 14:26). His most important healings were with non-Jews. Of the lepers he cured, the only one He acknowledged was not a Jew ... he cured the Centurion's servant, who was obviously Roman. In a later episode, when he met the Canaanite woman, not only did he allow himself to be questioned by a woman – something unheard of – who was not Jewish, but marvellously in this meeting the woman "evangelises" Him, and changes His opinion, and He then proclaims: "Woman, you have great faith" (Mk. 7:28).

He fought economic power. Overthrowing the tables of the tax-collectors in the Temple, and casting out these "bankers" at the end of a whip (Mk. 11:15-18).

He fought political power. The religious leaders commented that Jesus "stirred up the people" (Lk. 23:2). During an attempt to trick Him into revealing what He thought about taxes, Jesus desacralized the figure of the emperor by asking whose image was printed on the coin. With Jesus' answer: render unto Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what is of God, Jesus makes it very clear that Caesar is not God because he allows his effigy to be printed (Mk. 12:17). So, he returns the coin, having desacralized the Roman emperor, removing the basis of his theocracy... earning a death sentence with this act. He died on the cross, as was the Roman way of serving justice to those who subverted the Roman order.

Before his martyrdom, he passed on the most affectionate tradition – the Last Supper – that he ordered to be carefully prepared and shared with His closest friends. There, he bade farewell in a way true to the most outstanding aspects of His personality and way of life. In the Synoptics, he teaches us that we must divide and share the essential food in order to keep His memory alive (Mk. 14:22). While in John, who always spoke of the Bread that came down

from Heaven, the supper is described as a simple service that symbolised respect and welcome into the home: the washing of the feet (Jn. 13:1-15).

3.7 The end was predictable. They condemned Him, tortured Him and nailed Him to a cross, causing terrible suffering. His most faithful followers accompanied Him there: the women, His mother, Mary and John. In those moments Jesus was driven to exclaim, heartbreakingly: why have you abandoned me! (Mt. 27:46). Nailed to the wood was a placard describing the disaster of His life for everyone to see! Moreover, in a mocking tone “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews” ... everything was over! The worst malice of this injustice is to think that, in those moments of pain and anguish, the blame was not directed at the political and economic structures, rather it’s almost interpreted as if His Abba had betrayed Him!... Here we sense the most hurtful wickedness of the sin... But before passing Jesus left us in His Mother’s hands: in the last moments he came briefly to His senses and ended saying: “into your hands I commend my spirit!” (Lk. 23:46).

3.8 Yet, we know and have experienced that Jesus rose again. He is the Living which gives us hope, encourages us. He is present in many forms and in diverse occasions. He summons us to mark history with the sign of the Trinity: The Father, the Son and the Ruah. This Trinity, according to Ignatius, propels us to follow his drive to “redeem mankind” (EE. 107).

II. Teamwork in the Society’s Institutions

1. Relevant activities with concrete actions

The tasks that have been entrusted to us are the most sensitive of all formative work. Therefore, we must work on them personally, but more importantly in teams, with a series of key “actions”.

1. Work to build or strengthen the team: Strengthening the team is crucial. This is evaluated by reviewing to see if we are really achieving wholeness in people. We need our achievements to be replicated in other instances.
2. Generate a body: constantly review and evaluate the quality and not only the activity. Verify through results not only activities.
3. Define what should constitute a team.
4. The greater glory of God – a living humanity – should be our great criterion of action. This leads us to determine where to search for the Magis: the desire that if God asks or wishes for it “we will do more than we are able to”.
5. The need to educate more inclusively on the rights of humans and nature.
6. The great challenge is to contribute to a civilizational change.
7. The generation of the Social Fabric, the great strategy of socio-political cohesion and action.

III. Leadership for Social Transformation

The *raison d’être* of the works of the Society of Jesus doesn’t revolve solely around educating individuals; rather it contributes to the formation of people who are Conscious, Competent, Compassionate and Committed.

In these seedbeds, which are nurtured mostly through extracurricular activities, people can be found with something of the “pioneer spirit”; they pave the way. All of this contributes to the transformation of this chaotic, unequal society that gives rise to inequity and corruption, in pursuit of a good place to live: Utopia. This can only be achieved through structured interventions alongside other actors with whom there is harmony and the potential for strategic alliances.

Original Spanish
Translation Nils Sunderman



Governing in an Ignatian Spirit Today

Dr Sandie Cornish

Practitioner of Catholic Social Teaching, Australia

Governance and spirituality meet in the ordering of relationships, systems and processes for the sake of mission. The challenge for Ignatian governance is to ensure that it is driven by values, attitudes, motivations, and commitments that are expressive of our spirituality, that is our understanding of God, the world, and our place in it.

Corporate governance in Australian civil law is described as “the framework of rules, relationships, systems and processes within and by which authority is exercised and controlled within corporations. It encompasses the mechanisms by which companies, and those in control, are held to account.”¹ Typical governance duties include determining the mission and purpose of the organisation, setting strategic vision and objectives, overseeing organisational planning and review, selecting and monitoring the performance of the Chief Executive, financial oversight, ensuring adequate resources, ethical and reputational oversight, advocacy of the organisation, managing risk, ensuring compliance with relevant laws and regulations.² Meanwhile, Lucas *et al* point out that in church law governance “relates to the formulation of policy and the one who governs is responsible for policy. Administrators, by contrast, put into operation the policy so determined.”³

In Asia Pacific lay people often administer, lead, or undertake civil law governance of ministries established by religious institutes. In some places, religious institutes are transferring the ecclesial governance of ministries under canon law to new public juridic persons with lay people as Trustees. Those taking up ecclesial governance need to understand the spiritual nature of such governance. While not specifically addressing this phenomenon, GC 35 recognised that changing structures and circumstances “require a better articulation of

¹ Justice Owen in the HIH Royal Commission, *The Failure of HIH Insurance Volume 1: A Corporate Collapse and Its Lessons*, Commonwealth of Australia, April 2003 at page xxxiv. Cited in ASX Corporate Governance Council, *Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations*. (ASX Corporate Governance Council: 2014), p. 3. <http://www.asx.com.au/documents/asx-compliance/cgc-principles-and-recommendations-3rd-edn.pdf>. Accessed 6 December 2017.

² See for example Institute of Community Directors Australia, Women’s Leadership Institute Australia, and Our Community. *Get on a Board (Even Better - Become the Chair): Advancing Diversity and Women in Australia*. (North Melbourne: Our Community, 2011), 70 – 74; Fishel, David. *The Book of the Board: Effective Governance for Non-Profit Organisations*. 2nd ed. (Annandale: The Federation Press, 2008), 6-8.

³ Lucas, Brian, Peter Slack, and William D’Apice. *Church Administration Handbook*. (St Pauls, 2008), 50-51.

Ignatian values and ways of proceeding” and may “demand certain clarifications about how to exercise governance so that it might continue as genuinely Ignatian.”⁴ These reflections are an effort to assist in this task.

Spirituality & Governance

If we understand spirituality as a person’s or a group’s way of understanding God, the world, and one’s place in it, expressed in values, attitudes, motivations or dispositions, commitments and practices,⁵ governance and spirituality meet in the ordering of relationships and agreed ways of proceeding – in the *how* rather than the *what* of mission. While governance might be perceived as structural, procedural and impersonal, GC 36 describes governance in the Society as “personal, spiritual and apostolic.”⁶ It serves and supports mission through both *cura personalis* and *cura apostolica* – by attending to the mission itself and to the people involved in it. People are never mere instruments of mission, and must always be understood within the web of relationships that hold us in being. We will now consider some challenges for governance posed by the call to reconcile or put in right order our relationships with God, others and the rest of creation.

Reconciliation with God

In Ignatian governance we don’t actually decide our mission but rather discern how we are called to participate with Jesus in the *missio Dei* because “as servants of Christ’s mission we are invited to assist him as he sets right our relationships with God, with other human beings, and with creation.”⁷ Those in governance roles must cultivate the interior freedom to set aside pet projects, particular perspectives, or a sense of representing a certain constituency.

Discernment for mission is not just strategic planning using different language. An analysis of context will not alert us to the presence of sin and grace, or to God’s call to us, unless we actively seek to find God in the data. Discernment, as GC 36 explains, “begins in contemplation of God at work in our world and allows us to draw more fruit in joining our efforts to God’s designs” and it “serves as the foundation for decision making by the proper authority in our way of proceeding.”⁸

Discernment for mission is not a governance portfolio that can be delegated; it is the responsibility of everyone in a governance role. Hence laypeople in governance must be provided with formation and included in discernment processes rather than simply tapped for technical expertise. My doctoral research suggests that substantial formation in Ignatian spirituality for lay people in the social apostolate is needed in the Asia Pacific region if they

⁴ GC 35, D 5, n. 1 c.

⁵ Mason, Michael, Andrew Singleton, and Ruth Webber. *The Spirituality of Generation Y: Young People's Spirituality in a Changing Australia*. Mulgrave: John Garratt Publishing. pp. 39–41.

⁶ GC 36, D 2, n. 1.

⁷ GC 35, D 3, n. 18.

⁸ GC 36, D 2, n. 4.

are to become real partners in, even governors of, Ignatian works.⁹ This brings us to challenges for Ignatian governance that fosters right relationship with others.

Reconciliation with Others

How might our governance systems themselves embody right relationships with others? Can they better express solidarity, enact an option for the poor, and respect the agency and vocation of co-workers?

Echoing Pope Francis' call for a globalisation of solidarity, recent GCs have called us to act more as one Society, for governance to look to the greater and more universal good, for a more effective sharing of human and material resources for mission.¹⁰ Globalisation demands a reassessment of the multilayered exercise of subsidiarity within the Society. Some decisions may now be more effectively made at the Conference and international levels, and at each level governance must be exercised in a spirit of communion not just technical coordination. Furthermore, the need for multi-level and multi-sectoral collaboration has seen the expansion of networking within and by the Society, especially in the Social Apostolate. GC 36 placed the potential of this approach and its achievements in the context of Vatican II's desire for greater synodality in the Church.¹¹ These developments are about an ecclesiology – who we are as church – as much as effective action – what we do.

The Society's option for the poor¹² locates people and communities who are poor as a central concern of Ignatian governance. Its roots can be found in Ignatius' desire to follow Jesus, poor and humble, and the confirmation of his mission in a vision at La Storta where he experienced being placed by the Father with Jesus carrying his Cross. It raises questions about how governance systems can meaningfully include the crucified peoples and their perspectives, and be transparent and accountable to the poor themselves, enabling their experience to challenge how we understand and live an option for the poor. The Christological basis of this Ignatian commitment too may present challenges for interfaith action in some contexts.

GC 35 and 36 addressed collaboration for both pragmatic and ecclesiological reasons.¹³ GC 36 rightly affirms progress in collaboration and names significant obstacles that remain.¹⁴ My research, which involved a case study of the praxis of the Jesuit Conference Asia Pacific Social Apostolate Network in relation to vulnerable migrants in Asia, revealed that Jesuit and non-Jesuit research participants had distinctly different perceptions of whether Jesuits and Jesuit organisations were collaborative or not, and different understandings of what collaboration

⁹ Cornish, S. J. (2016). How Catholic social teaching and Ignatian spirituality interact within the praxis of the Jesuit conference Asia Pacific Social Apostolate network in relation to vulnerable migrants in and from Asia (Doctoral thesis, Australian Catholic University). Retrieved from <http://researchbank.acu.edu.au/theses/624>

¹⁰ GC 35, D 5, n. 1a.

¹¹ GC 36, D 2, nn. 8-9.

¹² GC 35, D 1, n. 6.

¹³ For example, GC 36, D2, n. 5 sets the discussion on collaboration to follow in the context of declining numbers of Jesuits and n. 6 repeats GC 35's affirmation that collaboration and co-responsibility express the complementarity of different vocations within the Church.

¹⁴ GC 36, D2, n. 7.

is.¹⁵ The Society's self-understanding could be enhanced by listening more attentively to the experiences and views of co-workers. Are they treated as equals and included in governance or are they largely limited to administration and executing the decisions of others? Can they in fact be included in ecclesial governance under current structures? For example, while GC 35 acknowledged the leadership of Ignatian and Jesuit works by co-workers of other religious traditions,¹⁶ Canon law requires that Trustees of public juridic persons be Catholics.

Reconciliation with Creation

The third element of the right relationships is reconciliation with the rest of creation. Our governance can report against a 'triple bottom line', we can apply positive and negative ethical screens to our investments, and our systems and processes can be reviewed to reward reducing, reusing and recycling. All of this is good and necessary, but the big challenge here is to move beyond an ethic of stewardship or ecological sustainability, to an ethic of care and kinship as Pope Francis did in *Laudato Si'*.¹⁷ To understand ourselves as part of creation - not as managers or responsible users of creation- is more a question of spirituality than ethics.

Here Ignatius' pre-modern worldview speaks directly to the needs of our times. In the Second Exercise of the First Week, Ignatius invites us to reflect on our sins and to experience "wonder and deep feeling going through all creatures, how they have left me in life and preserved me in it ... the heavens, sun, moon, stars, and elements, fruit, birds, fishes and animals - and the earth, how it has not opened to swallow me up ..." ¹⁸ We are creatures too and God holds us in being through all the other creatures who are companions to us, helping us to know, love and serve God. The response this Exercise calls forth is not one of duty, but of gratitude and wonder. This is the space from which our governance must proceed if it is to truly promote reconciliation with the rest of creation.

Conclusion

The ongoing development of genuinely Ignatian governance calls for sophisticated reflexivity that casts our gaze back on ourselves as actors. The experience, thinking and action of others can challenge and enrich our praxis and sharpen our discernment. God is labouring in the world, and not just through the Society! People in governance need to be able to move between and integrate a variety of sources and resources, including faith sources. For example, we have seen that collaboration and networking are ways of structuring relationships with potential to promote right relationships. Ignatius and his first companions described their relationship as being 'friends in the Lord' and my research confirmed that accompaniment and friendship are core practices of the JCAP Social Apostolate Network. Placing them in dialogue with contemporary theologies such as Swinton's treatment of friendship as a redemptive practice, and with Bretherton's understanding of hospitality as a way of relating to neighbours with whom we may disagree about conceptions of the good

¹⁵ Cornish, op. cit.

¹⁶ GC 35, D 6, n. 11.

¹⁷ Francis, *Laudato Si'*, 2015, see especially chapter 4 which addresses integral ecology and chapter 6 which, among other things calls for a profound ecological conversion of a spiritual nature.

¹⁸ Sp Ex [60]

may enable us to better articulate how being friends and fellow pilgrims might inform Ignatian governance.¹⁹ More explicit connections could also be made with concepts from Catholic Social Teaching such as solidarity as a Christian virtue, subsidiarity, and the unity of the human family. Furthermore, linking reflection on governance to communion and synodality reminds us that we are part of an apostolic body within the Church, contributing to and learning from it.

To sum up, genuinely Ignatian governance will be: at the service of Christ's mission, discerning, attentive to the experiences and perspectives of others, especially the poor, flexible in adapting ways of proceeding to creatively interpret the demands of subsidiarity in a context of globalisation, and sophisticated in its reflexivity.

Original English

¹⁹ Swinton, John. *Raging with Compassion: Pastoral Responses to the Problem of Evil*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007; Bretherton, Luke. *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness Amid Moral Diversity*. London: Ashgate, 2006.



On Leadership in the Works of the Society of Jesus

David Fernández, SJ
Iberoamericana University, Mexico

Foreword

In this article I will present reflections on what I have learned in my time serving as a director of a work, specifically at the head of a Human Rights Centre, and later as a dean at three different universities. I must admit, my words have not always matched my deeds, past or present. As such, these are just recommendations.

Proposal

The Ignatian concept of leadership is no different to the idea of serving through governance: leadership comes from how one serves others; and one serves others best through leadership and governance that is personal, spiritual and apostolic in character. Serving and governing are one and the same. I serve others through governance, and for this to be authentic I must be conscious of the fact that I am their servant, in this specific calling of God.

Given the Ignatian nature of Jesuit leadership and governance, these necessarily have a charismatic or spiritual component alongside a practical or institutional one.

As St. Paul says: a body without spirit is a cadaver, but a spirit without a body cannot advance, it serves for nothing, it has no soul. Both things are required: charism and institution. Without charism the institution becomes bureaucratic and loses track of its objectives; without institution the charism is lost in history, it cannot endure, it cannot operate in reality.

The charismatic part is supposed to align the institution with the objectives and ends proposed by the Society of Jesus, with the Mission of the Universal Society. The primary task of the director is, then, to align or make coherent the ends of the work with the Common Apostolic Project, the General Congregations, and the order's sectoral, regional and universal plans. The aims of leadership are always apostolic.

The institutional part is supposed to manage resources, create a structure and supervise staff so that these apostolic aims can be achieved. For example, it puts controls in place so that a work's plans are brought to fruition. If we were angels, we wouldn't need rules or controls. However, human beings are fallible and contradictory: so, we need norms and mechanisms of supervision.

The Charismatic Aspect

The first thing to bear in mind is that the Work exists to carry out the mission entrusted to it by the Society of Jesus: it is, then, as was said before, an apostolic work. It does not exist for the benefit of those involved, but to carry out its mission. Each collaborator, in this sense, is called to add their richness to the institution, not to look for ways to profit from it. Often, we who are in positions of leadership muddle this and allow some collaborators to stay in the institution “for their personal well-being”, or we tolerate inefficiencies. This is equivalent to confusing an apostolic work with a shelter or a charity centre for the very employees or collaborators that run it.

With leadership one tries to mobilise those involved in the institution to personally adopt the Jesuit mission: to hoist them up onto the moving cart of the mission of reconciliation through justice, in intercultural and interreligious dialogue. Consequently, it is necessary to encourage the collaborators to dream big, to be generous, to forego small personal projects so as to pursue the ambitious common project. It also means showing with evidence how advancing on the path paved by the great institutional project is achievable: the realisation of a just, equitable, happy society where the Father of all people reigns.

As the work is there to carry out the mission of the apostolic body, it means that my job as director is not for others to love me, or to benefit my friends or acquaintances, or for personal gain. My job is for the work to carry out the mission entrusted to it. In this sense the director must be, or aim to be, totally free from constraints: attachment, interests, pressures, pre-formed decisions, so as to focus on the work’s apostolic mission and the Jesuit Body.

An important task as director is not to spoil our collaborators with preferential treatment, excessive pampering, or unearned distinctions. The task is to support them to be loyal to the Society of Jesus and not to the Jesuit on duty; to the work as a whole and not to a particular hierarchy. Very often, the most Ignatian collaborators or colleagues are not those who say, “toe the line”, rather those who “couldn’t care less”; those who work intensely to carry out the faith-justice mission wherever they find themselves, be they at the top, middle or bottom of the organogram. They may not have a greater Ignatian formation, but they effectively carry out the Jesuit apostolic task and do so “according to our way of proceeding”. As a Latin-American novelist said: one mustn’t forget that to write means to write, and not proclaim that one is writing.

Governance also involves communicating... An Ignatian leadership knows how to pass information across all areas of the institution, as well as expectations, manners and behaviours that are desired in the work. In this way people will be duly aware of what is wanted of them, how they should carry this out, with whom and when.

In the same way, directors in our works must encourage the participation of everyone involved in the institutional discernment and planning: pray collectively, form teams, consent to the general process, review the mission and vision in light of what we understand as God’s will, make assessments of the work, identify the strategic processes and their targets, etc. All of this must be developed across all levels of the organogram and compiled by the institution.

The Institutional Aspect

This component of Ignatian leadership requires professional administration and management tools to be adequately developed. It involves rigorous and constant planning and evaluation. The first thing that must be done is to define the organisational structure.

Perhaps top of the list when considering the structure of any organisation is whether the structure in question is responding to the aims set out by the institution's mission and vision. In other words, the structure depends on the activities arising from the mission and the aims informed by the work's vision.

A university for example, whose mission is focused on teaching, will need to have a structure where most of its staff are in areas dedicated to teaching requirements, and it is likely that there won't be many postgraduates. On the other hand, a university whose mission is mostly focused on research should have a structure where most of its departments and staff are in areas that cater for research requirements. It is likely most of the teaching will be focused on postgraduate studies and it will certainly have more work to do in circulating information and networking than in the former case.

So, I'll repeat the obvious: the structure depends on the functions that one means to carry out. In other words, the ends, aims and results that the institution pursues.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge thereafter that achieving success in a structure is the product of the interaction between the people that occupy positions in the structure, the structure itself, and the environment.

In a given environment, it is possible for a bad structure to produce positive results due to the people in executive positions; or vice versa, a good structure can be unproductive if the people are inappropriate. As seen above, we can conclude that there is no one structure that produces positive results. There are various structures capable of achieving results.

The structure should be, then, dynamic, self-critical, and adaptable to changes in the environment; but above all, it should modify itself if it doesn't achieve the awaited results.

Therefore, there is a need for evaluation. Both the structure and the employees that occupy positions within it should be evaluated in terms of the results they produce. Modification and re-evaluation should follow, thus producing a virtuous cycle that achieves results in an efficient manner.

The working environment affects the interaction between the people within the structure. One should therefore foster an environment conducive to achieving results. The environment may vary depending on whether the focus is on the task or on people's wellbeing. A desirable climate is one where there's an appropriate balance between the direction of the task and the satisfaction of the employees. The best results are realised when the institution's objectives are aligned with the collaborators' objectives or life projects.

Managing the interaction between structure, individuals and environment is one of the challenges that any director or dean must face, be they in a university or work of ours.

The situation can appear very complicated, and it is. Therefore, the technical requirements for those who occupy managerial positions are very high if the desired results are to be not only good, but the best ones possible.

Not all structures are financially viable. Depending on the local conditions, some structures can generate the income needed to cover their costs, but others cannot. For example, in many Latin-American countries, the primary source of income for our universities is through tuition fees. In this manner, the costs of funding research, networking and communication must be covered from income derived from undergraduates. This means that the structure must allow for teaching to be the largest area.

Currently, the Society of Jesus' final goal in its pastoral, social and educational works is the transformation of society into one more humane, more united, more just, more equitable, and more aligned to the Gospel values. Achieving this transformation is the principal challenge of Jesuit universities and, therefore, their structures.

This purpose determines the actions that we must carry out, the structure we must adopt, and the working culture and environment that we must establish and share.

Working in Collaboration and as a Network

The Pope insists that the world's problems are interconnected. We want to respond to the caring for our common home, the global migration crisis, the ethno-religious conflicts and poverty in the world. This drives the Society towards new frontiers and requires the Society to join its forces with many others, inside and outside the Church, who want to contribute to a solution to these problems.

In fact, in education, in particular, our network has widened greatly and access to education has been extended to the most disadvantaged people. We are coordinating new initiatives which serve the marginalised, especially in the educational field. On top of this, we have increased our work in ecological areas, communications, higher education and social advocacy. We are more sensitive to the universal issue of migration. We offer a variety of responses to refugees and migrants. I truly believe that there is a deeper feeling for the global mission.

That being said, we don't always know how to operate as a network. We have few intellectuals and experts in intercultural and interreligious dialogue. Critical reflection is required on the impact of the crisis on our institutions. Our social and ecological advocacy must be more efficient and collaborate with networks alien to the Society. We recognise that we are overstretched, and we must pull back from some of our traditional institutions or have them run exclusively by laypeople. The attachment to current structures can be an obstacle. Working with young people has enormous potential, but we find it difficult to make headway.

Undoubtedly, something intrinsic to the work of institutional leadership in the present day consists of fostering collaboration and promoting apostolic networks. This implies improving the use of digital technology and social media, as well as responding in a more coordinated way to the global migration crisis. We must support, strengthen and deepen our networks in the intellectual apostolate.

Regarding collaboration with Others, I think this is an essential part of the mission of directing any of the Society's institutions. I sincerely believe that there are signs of progress in this area. To mention a few aspects, many non-Jesuits have been successfully integrated into our institutions, taking on responsibility for motivating, driving and inspiring them. Looking outwards, the Society networks on a global level with like-minded institutions, like NGOs. The CLC now numbers twenty thousand members. Likewise, the Apostleship of Prayer and the Eucharistic Youth Movement have been regenerated and have grown significantly. We have a process of discernment shared with many collaborators. There is, then, modest progress.

Nevertheless, we must recognise that there still exists, among certain Jesuits, the incapacity to collaborate, be it with other Jesuits or with laypeople. The dichotomy of "us-them" still runs deep.

Conclusion

The charismatic and institutional aspects are the two legs on which every Jesuit work must walk. They are, therefore, the elements that every Ignatian leadership must integrate at the top of our works. One without the other causes imbalance. Our works – all of them – should be sustainable enterprises, from an economic and organisational point of view. Thus, they require efficiency and effectiveness. Otherwise, they are destined to perish. On the other hand, a merely efficient or lucrative administration has no reason to be included in the framework of the Society's objectives in the world and in our countries. The works don't exist to make money (for this we could be shareholders in a multinational corporation). Of course, they exist to realise the apostolic mission. However, without economic efficiency, without sustainability, they cannot exist and cannot carry out their fundamental mission. Taking care of both dimensions is the task.

*Original Spanish
Translation Nils Sunderman*



Perspectives on Collaboration, Networking, and Discernment in Apostolic Planning: Rediscovering Collaboration as a Grace

Sandra Chaoul

Ignatian Leadership Project, Europe

From the day I was asked to submit a piece on collaboration, there was a hesitation as to expanding on what has already been written on the subject. GC 35 mentioned that “to respond today to the pressing needs of our complex and fragile world, many hands are surely needed”¹. Many other articles and decrees carried the same invitation and I was struggling with finding a pertinent and authentic approach to the subject. Drawing from my coaching practice and offering some perspectives on the attitudes that support collaboration seemed relevant. Nonetheless, I was aware that between understanding what collaboration theoretically entails and living collaboratively lies a gap that was often frustrating. I was wondering how we can start applying what we know, in light of the rich Ignatian tradition and discernment.

Amidst all this and despite a certain feeling of exposure and vulnerability linked to this writing exercise, given that my involvement in apostolic planning has been recent, there was a deep desire to recognize God’s call; and a growing belief that the collaboration that is relevant to our mission today is not only an effective one but an affective and discerning encounter that we are called to rediscover as an opportunity for grace.

Emerging Collaborative Themes

Interest in the topic of collaborative competencies has considerably grown in recent years within business circles and requests for formations became frequent. Having been involved in similar discussions in the context of developing learning workshops on the topic, I am including below some of the themes that have emerged from our work².

¹ GC 35, D 6, n. 30

² These workshops have been developed for a number of organizations in the Middle East in collaboration with Ms. Nicole Abboud Bakhache and were based on the research work of Chrislip, David (2002), Archer, David; Cameron, Alex (2008), Jonathan Clark (2008) and Hank Rubin (2009).

A recurrent trend in the discussion was that organizations' interest goes beyond collaborating for the sake of it. Challenges are getting too complex to be solved individually and the ability to generate adaptive solutions depended more and more on the capacity to collaborate³. Conversations therefore focused more on promoting collaboration for a clear purpose, to capture opportunities and solve problems that cannot be solved alone rather than just encouraging team spirit or adopting a style that promotes positive relationships.

The reality of our interdependence has also put forth the need to develop a new personal and organizational relationship to power; as well as a new understanding of information, contacts, and resources as collective means to reach a common purpose rather than individual possessions.

There was also the realization that the knowledge we detain today runs the risk of becoming obsolete in a few years' time, which accentuated the need to look beyond our current expertise and reach out to others.

With all the complexity and challenges that this new direction brings, collaboration also promises to add depth, creativity, and innovation to the workplace. In this context, institutions were interested in identifying skills and competencies needed to create more collaborative cultures. In summary, and without being extensive, the list included:

- Being committed to collaboration as a way to redefine the future together (staying connected to the reason and desired outcome of collaboration)
- Developing the ability to generate innovative solutions (creativity and resilience in the face of resistance)
- Being engaged in a continuous development of self and others (ongoing learning, availability and willingness to coach collaborators, openness to feedback, viewing mistakes as learning opportunities)
- Self-awareness (attentiveness to own emotions and reactions)
- Interpersonal understanding (empathy, perspective taking, acceptance of the difference) and ability to manage complex relational situations
- Positive regard (confidence in our own ability) and capacity to generate trust
- Sharing power and credits of the results (recognizing the limit to one's authority and opening spaces for others)
- Spreading energy and communication in the group (developing dialogue skills and facilitative approaches)
- Developing diverse and integrated networks (building connections, linking ideas, people and resources)

While the above perspectives provide relevant insights, they seem to inform only our mind on what collaboration involves. Beyond the technical skills and processes that support it, the task of promoting real collaboration within our external environment seems to require an internal work that is not easy to engage in. Building trust involves creating authentic

³ Solutions to current challenges no longer reside in the hands of one individual in a position of authority but in the collective intelligence of stakeholders at all levels. For more details, refer to the work of Ronald Heifetz (Adaptive Leadership)

connections and developing emotional safety for people to show up fully, take appropriate risks and expose vulnerabilities. It is an interpersonal effort that requires taking the time to form relationships and get to know others with whom we cooperate, seeing them as equally capable, approaching them with openness and without arrogance, and relying on our ability to inspire rather than pressure them using our status or title. Giving power consciously means renouncing to the control we have over the project and trusting the group and its ability to function without us steering its course.

Even the seemingly more technical skills, such as developing facilitative approaches or networking, carry their own challenges. What seems more relevant than building our dialogue techniques for collaboration is growing our awareness to the traps we can easily fall into when our communication skills become tools of manipulation and control. Similarly, while personal networking may not be a challenging task in itself for some of us, growing in generosity to put this powerbase in the service of our shared mission is more demanding.

For all these perspectives to change our organizations' culture and foster a new way of collaborating and networking within our apostolic works, the focus ought to be more on expanding our capacity to collaborate rather than simply acquiring skills. The Ignatian spirituality offers in discernment a relevant practice that is able to help us integrate these attitudes and renew our partnerships for mission.

Discernment and Collaboration: An Altering Encounter with Others

This discerning approach to collaboration is less of a ritual we participate in to better function together, and more of an ongoing openness to recognize God's active presence throughout our collective work. It conveys an invitation to enter the process while having before ourselves God, and try to view our experiences of collaboration as He would see them; going into the process in a generous disposition that is seeking to find a part of the divine in others. Through this presence and receptivity to God, who is inviting us to collaborate with Him, and through our openness to others, collaboration becomes an altering encounter.

Looking at recent experiences of apostolic collaboration⁴, I can share how much an attitude of discernment and the experience of the spiritual exercises have been valuable in helping us shift from a mere understanding of what collaboration demands to attempting to live collaboratively. Without generalizing this to every type of partnership, I am sharing below some of the learning and graces that these experiences carried.

A place for a challenging personal renewal. I have learned much more about collaboration by practicing it rather than by reading about it. Through discernment, working with others became an opportunity to learn more about ourselves. As we became more present to others and to our interior motions, we started recognizing personal fears, prejudices, and resistances. With Christ in the center of this process, we also found graces of strength, courage, and compassion towards others and ourselves.

⁴ I am referring to my work within the Near East Province, my collaboration with JRS Syria on leadership development for their teams, and my work with the CEP and Discernment and Apostolic Planning on Ignatian Leadership and Discernment in common

It was not always comfortable. Each experience carried its own set of tensions and temptations which have not always been easy to recognize or manage. The traps of control, image, and judgment are always in sight. The temptation to shrink and silence our individual perspectives under the excuse of better collaborating with others is also real; just as the risk of becoming self-sufficient, disregarding others and operating independently. As Pope Francis observed: for Ignatius, discernment was “an instrument of struggle in order to know the Lord and follow him more closely”⁵. Bringing an attitude of discernment and keeping our focus on Christ helped our struggles to bear fruit. Collaboration became both a chance to affirm ourselves and show-up fully, sharing with others what we know and who we are while remaining open to what they individually bring to this relationship.

The Grace of Spiritual Conversations

Taking the time to pray together and engage in spiritual conversations helped to set a foundation for trust that facilitated our work when tension arose. The level of freedom in being seen in our authenticity relied on putting in time to listen, offering safe spaces free of judgment, running the risk of revealing to others both our gifts and imperfections and a deep desire to find God. The experience of creating openings for sharing and being present to what was moving within each of us was often energizing, *not only because sharing connects* (I am saying this because there were times where conversations were draining and frustrating, but those too carried their own learning). What made some experiences quite reviving was, from one side, the fact that in discernment and our personal openness, our moments of prayers were a place to experience God; and from the other side, the spiritual conversations that followed were an opportunity for us to share our consolations. In these experiences, the process released an energy and creativity that made our work not only more effective but deeply more consoling.

The grace of sharing the mission. Being commissioned as a lay woman by a Jesuit superior or an institution to be involved in apostolic projects often involves less authority in one’s hands and more boundaries to work with. However, remaining connected, through discernment, to the common call that brought us together created an enthusiasm, and I will risk saying, a positive sense of entitlement that made each one an integral part of the mission. The desire to carry the same mission, in a wider and more profound way, was our key joining connector from which sprang all the networking and integrating work that followed.

A Bold Proposal

Beyond developing our technical skills and adapting our structures to facilitate collaborative work, joining collaboration, networking, and discernment in apostolic planning puts forward a new way of living our mission. Our response to this call may well renew the way we do things, and possibly change us internally, because in addition to the invitation to let go, humble ourselves, and embrace the ambiguity of discernment, living collaboration with an open mind and heart promises us to obtain the graces of working with God.

Original English

⁵ From an exclusive interview with Pope Francis conducted by Antonio Spadaro S.J



Leadership in the Works of the Jesuit Social Apostolate: Learning at the Heart of Commitment

Élisabeth Garant

General Director of the Centre of Justice and Faith & Journal 'Relations', Canada

The thoughts presented in this article are rooted in my twenty-two-year commitment to the Society of Jesus, in particular in the last ten years as Director of a centre for social analysis in the Province of French Canada, the Justice and Faith Centre. In this article, I will attempt to give an account of the processes and conditions required to encourage the development of leadership in the service of the mission.

Over the years, within the mandate entrusted to me by the Provincial, I have been able to take part in or observe the way in which various decision-making bodies of the Society function: for example, as a delegate to the social apostolate, as a sponsor with the French-Canadian Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), or as a member of the Support Committee for our Province's discernment. I visited places and environments where the Society's mission develops and plays out, particularly in the context of the social apostolate. This allowed me to discover and adapt my own way of proceeding, unique in its spiritual grounding and interpersonal processes, which makes practicing "shared leadership" possible.

By living and exercising authority in this way, within the Jesuit works, it becomes part and parcel of achieving the mission. It becomes a testament to our spirit of reconciliation - our guide for how to be present at the heart of the world - and to our approach of co-creating (with other people or with the Creator) which we are trying to spread. This is our daring response to the new signs of the times.

The Desire of Shared Leadership

By collaborating in one of the Society's works, Jesuits and non-Jesuits alike can measure the rich scope of this undertaking of co-creation and shared leadership: a novel journey of collective exploration. This method is based on discernment, collaboration and networking - as the 2nd Decree of the 36th General Congregation reminds us - and it serves to achieve the mission.

Directors must, of course, take on diverse responsibilities and make decisions on a certain number of questions to guarantee the success of the work with which they are entrusted. Most important, however, is to ensure that the mission is the team's bedrock, while allowing all of those involved to contribute to its development: firstly, by facilitating crossover and synergy

of the team-members' expertise; then, by developing an atmosphere of listening, where paying attention to the thoughts of colleagues and fellow citizens ensures that suitable measures are implemented. This type of *leadership* must ensure that each person can make their humble contribution to a project that is larger than the individual, and inevitably leads them elsewhere; where needs are most urgent.

Moreover, it is in this genuinely collaborative experience that the desire to assume a "shared *leadership*" can be sown and developed. One must attempt this way of proceeding, benefit from the commitment, and witness its prophetic power, to want to repeat it. This *leadership* model can then be implemented for the duration of the activity, and in the subsequent evaluation of the experience through individual or group accompaniment.

Discernment

A person must benefit from discernment in their personal development, from the combined forces of movement and confirmation that this practice brings to life, and the deep freedom it provokes, for them want to implement the practice in the context of a work. It is never easy to lead and implement a process of communal discernment. We are often confronted with a stressful work rhythm punctuated by timetables, organisational challenges, difficult mediation between characters, clashing ideologies, etc. We must succeed in creating moments and spaces for collective reflection to disrupt this rhythm and take the time to listen to one another. Then, we can be more attentive to things that escape us in the usual turnover of tasks.

Nor is it easy to carry out communal discernment in a context where teams are often made up of people from different backgrounds of belief. In a place like the Centre of Justice and Faith, social justice is the common denominator and not the Christian faith. The situation therefore poses particular challenges in communicating the way of proceeding, as one must translate the wealth of spirituality into secular language. Team members must be given space to train themselves to be more aware of things that escape their attention. Reflection is required on how to facilitate experiences of confirmation and freedom for them within the decision-making process. The mission's continued development and its relevance depend on this.

Collaboration

In recent decades, the teams in charge of carrying out the mission's works have diversified. Collaboration has therefore become essential for the mission to progress: collaboration between Jesuits and non-Jesuits, collaboration between men and women, collaboration between people of different religious beliefs, etc. The development of a culture of collaboration won't happen by implementing theoretical principles; on the contrary, this culture is the result of a learning process that thrives when it is embedded in the heart of the mission. In this way, it leads us to be more aware of the power dynamics that may harm people's contributions, of prejudices that assign predetermined roles to certain people, and of the looming obstacles that appear when trying to navigate individuals' daily lives.

Certain ecclesiastical contexts can also colour or influence the way we experience collaboration. Therefore, the Quebec Church has to its credit taken courageous positions, despite suffering tensions and some setbacks in recent years. Lay and Christian feminist

movements have likewise kindled several institutional changes in favour of more active female and male participation. The Quebec Church has favoured a pastoral strategy of closeness, an option also shared by French-Canadian Jesuits. This has undoubtedly facilitated collaboration within the works and the beginning of a “shared *leadership*”.

Working as a Network

The complexity of our world’s challenges prompts us to work more and more with others, to play an active role within coalitions and to gather actors around a common project where they can discover the benefits of their complimentary contributions. “Shared *leadership*” and *leadership* of service are not topics confined to the internal governance of works. They can allow us to establish links with other civil society bodies so that social transformation can be the result of active collaboration between diverse organisations and of improved consultation: in this way, the risk of overlapping and of parallel initiatives is minimised.

Quebec’s network of community organisations, well-known for their dynamism, creativity and capacity for advocacy, facilitates the implementation of this way of proceeding. A Jesuit work of social analysis such as ours is in a position to lead thorough reflection and is often even avant-garde on certain complex questions. Therefore, we are in a position to rally public opinion, working in close collaboration with the diverse coalitions we are involved in. However, once shared, the reflection no longer belongs to us. Thus, we enter, Jesuits and non-Jesuits alike, into a process of solidarity that forms and transforms us to better serve the mission.

Nourishing Leadership

Taking on responsibility in the works or assuming *leadership* on important issues in the Society is certainly challenging. The teams we lead are subject to stress and tension. Added to this are the risks of burnout and exhaustion, and the difficulties encountered in carrying out our mission. In my own journey, what essentially nourished me over the years can be split into three levels: firstly, the personal level, by drawing on my spirituality; secondly, on an inter-works level, through meeting directors; and finally, in the life of the Society, through open participatory spaces.

On a Personal level

Early on in my socially engaged Christian life, I identified with Ignatian spirituality, because of the emphasis it places on incarnation and action. The latter were nourished by my deep confidence in a higher power, which is at work at the heart of the world. I always found this to be a powerful channel for inner life and commitment. I had been introduced to the *Spiritual Exercises* in my everyday life prior to my involvement in the Society of Jesus. However, as a director of the Centre of Justice and Faith, I felt the need to revisit the thought process of the exercises and nourish my inner life. This allowed me to passionately devote myself to the mission that I was entrusted with, while regularly reminding me that I don’t own the mission, nor does it depend on my efforts alone. Thus, it prepares me to welcome the unexpected, which inevitably arises when working with others. This is an essential part of the mission, although it is challenging and can be unsettling. By returning to my spiritual sources, I find

the desire to welcome and let myself be moved by others. Nourishing *leadership* therefore involves making support resources available within the Society or to partners of the Ignatian family, and making this part and parcel of the responsibility which we entrust to people. This matter will no doubt seem more evident to a Jesuit whose life in the community is punctuated by various moments of rejuvenation. However, we must find methods adapted for non-Jesuits to make such a rejuvenation possible. In this way, the bodies (Province, board of directors and teams) must provide support.

On an Inter-works level

In the Province of French Canada, many non-Jesuits have been appointed as directors of works. This new situation has provoked the need for regular meetings with the Provincial to share experiences and help one another in our respective responsibilities. In response, a Board of Directors of Works was created, and it meets twice a year. One of its priorities has been the proposal to start a conversation on Ignatian leadership. Each meeting revolves around a text or an account shared by a director of a work regarding the challenges they face in the practice of Ignatian leadership. This has helped us to review our procedures and to broaden the possible solutions to relieving common challenges facing leaders in Jesuit works, and it has brought us closer to the life of the works and their teams.

In the Life of the Society

Finally, it seems to me that *leadership* formation in the works and in the mission of the Society is best realised through a pedagogy of companionship. In French Canada, the Society is coming to terms with a certain weakness due to the decreasing number of Jesuits. This gave us an opportunity to experience another way to breathe life into the Jesuit Province, by inviting non-Jesuits to actively participate in the reflections, meetings and processes which give life and thought to the mission. Paradoxically, the decrease in Jesuit numbers in the works motivated many of us to be more attentive to the life of the Society, its spirituality and its heritage. We have therefore had to create new relationships between Jesuits and non-Jesuits and we have dared to tread unfamiliar paths. Both Jesuits and non-Jesuits have learned enormously from this “shared *leadership*”. In my opinion, this has certainly been the best school.

Original French
Translation Nils Sunderman



Ten Years of Formation in Ignatian leadership

José M. Guibert, SJ

Rector – Deusto University, Bilbao, Spain

In the year 2008, the discernment carried out as an evaluation of the apostolic project of a European Jesuit province highlighted the need for “formation in Ignatian leadership” as one of its strategic objectives. In this article we will briefly explore why this initiative was undertaken, what did it involve, and what consequences or learnings can we extract.

Why It Happened: It All Started with a Provincial Project

The Jesuit province in question was geographically small, with a large number of apostolic initiatives, and with a high average age among the Jesuit population: it was one of the oldest Jesuit provinces of the Universal Society (due to lack of vocations in a very secularised context, the number of Jesuits fell from five hundred in 1980, to two hundred, thirty years later). On the other hand, it was a province with many institutions and almost two thousand lay-collaborators employed by these institutions. The province in question was the Province of Loyola, created in 1962, which merged with four others in 2014 to create the current Province of Spain.

How do we think about the future? Five years earlier, a process took place to develop a provincial project, following the inspiration of GC 34: “Each Province should evaluate its apostolic planning using the Ignatian criteria found in the Constitutions read in the light of our mission today.” (Dec. 3, n. 22). The initiative was ambitious. More than four hundred people (Jesuits and lay-people) participated in its development. The revitalisation of Jesuit communities was considered. A program of formation in identity and mission was created, with three rigorous years of Ignatian formation, for lay-people above all. The themes of the formation were: knowing oneself; social, political and economic context; spirituality (above all Ignatian); the Society of Jesus’ history and way of proceeding (including the current apostolic plans); theology.

Moreover, documents were created which laid out the identity of the Jesuit institutions in explicit terms, and a method for the apostolic evaluation of the works was designed. There were new commissions held to generate intersectoral apostolic projects, analysing side-by-side problems like working with young people, the vocations, migration, social justice, reconciliation, inculturation, etc. Some Jesuit communities were closed and some new institutions in the social apostolate were created.

This apostolic project involved an important renewal in the spirit of people and institutions. Five years after its commencement, with a new provincial in place and a pool of experience, an evaluation of the project took place. The previous initiatives were approved, and some more were added. Among the new ones founded in this second phase of the project was a “plan of formation for Ignatian leadership”. The intention was to explicitly cater for people in leadership positions. These are the very people, Jesuits and lay-people, who must advance the Provincial Project.

What was Done: People, Teams, Mission

The formation plan consists of three sessions over the course of one year, each taking place over four days, with three tasks between the sessions. They are held in the Sanctuary of Loyola, as a residential course. People from different apostolic institutions participate: pastoral, education, social, university, cultural, etc.

Each session aims to address one of three fundamental focuses: the leader, building a team, advancing a vision. In what order? Some suggested that first and foremost is to know the vision/mission; secondly, to think about the people required to advance this mission; and, thirdly, to think about what kind of person can lead this team towards this vision. However, this order was not followed. Why? For the simple reason that we are very accustomed to “talking” and “debating” about the Jesuit mission, but sometimes with little discernment or personal emotional involvement. We can slip into theoretical exercises, ideological debates or plain and simple planning. On the contrary, if we begin with “the leader”, we invite everyone to explore personally how they understand the task of leadership, what are their strengths and weaknesses, what is their motivation, what is their experience of the spiritual exercises, etc.

Therefore, the first session is an invitation to get to know oneself, as the starting point. Find your own style of leadership. Explore aspects of emotional intelligence, to be aware of what you are and what you can be, how you experience what you do, how you reflect on experiences, etc. Explore elements of Ignatian formation: being the subject of discernment, working on elements of human maturity, of vocation of service, of freedom and generosity, etc. These are some elements from the first week of the *Spiritual Exercises*.

The second session is centred on the ability to build a new team for the mission. Competencies are developed like choosing team-members, communication skills, conflict management, etc. Aside from these more-or-less commonly known tools, there are explicitly Ignatian elements that are worth exploring. Leading communal discernments or processes of Ignatian deliberation. Accompanying people in real life, in this context, in a life of mission. Promoting personal values and a mystique that goes beyond specific tasks. Introducing people to a new corporate dimension, and knowing how to delegate responsibilities.

Finally, the third session involves presenting the current mission of the Society in the environment where the people and institutions find themselves. Here, the broad aims that define the Society’s mission are presented, from its origins to today: faith, justice, dialogue, inculturation, reconciliation, etc. The Society’s leadership will also be there to present the current apostolic projects, intersectoral initiatives, the situation of the apostolic works, the

requirements of collaboration, etc. Participants are invited to ready themselves to become agents for change and discernment, to carry out apostolic planning, etc. This is an introduction into the real life and governance of the Society, inviting the participants to take on new responsibilities.

The plan of formation ends with the implementation of a specific project that lasts for one and a half years in which the participants are required to apply some of the lessons they learned in their work area.

In summary, what we have is a plan of formation that started in 2001. In January 2018, the eighth edition will begin with a new group. Over the course of more than a year, over three weekends, groups of 25-30 people will gather together who are thinking about taking on governance responsibilities in the institutions, at their own level. They will participate as individuals embedded in their personal situations, with Ignatian instincts. Everyone has something of what it takes to be a leader. It is a matter of developing this potential and uniting it with the Ignatian charism and the specific and historic commitment to advancing the institutions in service to the mission of the Society of Jesus.

Learnings: The Need for the Apostolic Governance of Institutions

Having described what we did and why we did it, we can look at some considerations on this experience. The journey we are undertaking provokes relevant questions about our future. Taking the process as a whole, we can come to the following conclusions:

- A “theoretical” plan for Ignatian leadership is one thing; an “integrated” plan in a provincial project is another. The concerns of this plan are not academic. It isn’t a formation exercise devoid of context, environment, or application. It seeks to serve the specific context and to be part of the governance strategy of a Province. There is no Ignatian leadership plan if there is no apostolic project to implement.
- While the concerns aren’t “academic”, we are faced with a new concept that is worthwhile exploring. The challenge is to articulate Ignatian values and ways of proceeding within the institutions. This requires a change of mentality: we aren’t Ignatian “now” and managers, directors or workers “later”. It is difficult for leaders to include explicitly Ignatian criteria in their management. It is difficult for *Ignatianistas* to open themselves up to spiritually nourish “profane” work, as management can be. It is a matter of applying old ideas to institutional and working environments: contemplation in action, and seeking and finding God in all things.
- This experience is one of governance. Apostolic planning is an endeavour in which institutions and tasks are aligned with common ends and processes. It involves a certain level of transparency in the processes and decisions, structured participation, consultation, communal discernment. It entails clarity on the part of the Society: what do we want to offer the collaborators, and what are we asking of those with whom we share our mission.
- The future of the Jesuit institutions is up in the air. Not the future of the institutions *per se*, as there are very worthy people who can carry on their work as private entities; rather, the future of the Jesuits within these institutions. If we don’t know how to

translate our charism in the specific workplaces of our many collaborators, if we don't work together in shared projects... we have no future. The future of the strategy of "maintaining" the institutions is tied to the physical presence of Jesuits, dwindling in number. On the contrary, a strategy of "recreation" or "revitalisation" and of a new form of leading the institutions, with lay-people, has a brighter future.

- The Jesuit works have great potential – that's why they were created – but they also carry a risk. They may cease to serve the objectives for which they were created, as circumstances change. Sometimes they consume vast resources and become an end in and of themselves. Maintaining them for their own sake can be symptomatic of the lack of adequate governance. Ways must be found to evaluate and improve their contribution to the global mission of the Society.
- The other temptation, as regards the institutions, is the very opposite: that the Society doesn't commit itself sufficiently to them. In some contexts, the Jesuits are growing ever older, which provokes a lack of ideas and resources. Or, they are too individualist to work with others in an institution. It may seem like the only sensible thing is to abandon the institution and commitments. Certainly, sometimes that's just the way it is; nothing lasts forever. But this may sometimes be symptomatic of the lack of apostolic spirit, a sign of neglect or the lack of a real interest in carrying out a good service. We must think of the lay-people, not just the Jesuits. Thinking only of the Jesuits would lead us to close most of our institutions. The Church would lose an important social and apostolic presence. If Jesuit leadership is failing, the mission may require newly fostering a lay-Ignatian leadership. This is also a sign of the times.
- Therefore, this is a real exercise of collaboration between Jesuits and lay-people, and others. "Collaboration in mission has resulted in abundant blessings for the apostolates and the Society of Jesus." (GC 35, Dec. 6, n. 15). It is an activity that makes sense from the perspective of belonging and shared identity. For Jesuits as well as lay-people, it is an exercise of moving from an individualist vision to a corporate vision. Moving beyond the individual work of each person to see the commitment to a global and universal mission, is a lovely exercise. The *Spiritual Exercises* have always been shared with many lay-people. Perhaps now is the time to spread the intuitions of the *Constitutions of the Society* and to translate these values to the lay and institutional world, in a multi-cultural and multi-religious context. There is much to do.
- In the projects of Ignatian formation we must care for the emotional dimension. It's not a matter of just working more and more. We must take care of the union of hearts and minds. The formative process doesn't only have a cognitive goal: it's not about knowing more, rather emotionally involving oneself in a project. There is an element of seduction, attraction, excitement and motivation. At the end, this is a vocational dimension. All of this is already taking place in creative ways in many places.

Original Spanish
Transaltion Nils Sunderman



Governance at the Service of Mission: The Role of Conferences

Mark Raper, SJ

Myanmar Mission Superior, Yangon

Governance in the Society is constantly renewed, both in General Congregations and through the guidance of Fr General, in order to “better serve and support the Society’s mission, the *Missio Dei*”. Jesuit governance, GC 36 reaffirmed, is “personal, spiritual and apostolic”, thus it is about guiding the body of the Society, in discerning and fraternal ways, to achieve its mission. It is now understood that the Society’s structures of governance must continually develop in order to meet current challenges. Some of the factors influencing how the Society is structured today include the increasingly interdependent world in which we live, the significant demographic diminishment of the Society in some places, the noticeable vitality brought to the Society’s apostolic life by collaborators and the increased desire and effectiveness found in networking with others. GC 36 responded to many questions raised after GC35, reviewed governance at each level, and gave new orientations and tasks for each: the General and his council, presidents and conferences, major superiors and all the way to local superiors.

This article reflects on what has been learned in the Jesuit Conference of Asia Pacific in the last ten years since GC 35 and further clarified in GC 36. It speaks about how the role of the Conference has developed in order to facilitate co-responsibility among the major superiors in serving the universal mission of the Society, the efforts for promoting leadership among Jesuits and collaborators and the relevance of networking to the Society’s normal governance.

Governance and Leadership

Governance normally refers to the ways an organisation discerns its directions and priorities in a given context, ensuring effective implementation, building cohesion, exercising care for personnel and resources, and safeguarding the integrity of the body. It also includes ensuring that appropriate structures, policies and systems are put in place and adhered to, so that the Society will pursue its mission effectively. While good governance demands good leadership, it would be misleading to confuse leadership with authority. Leadership in ministry in the Society is not confined to those in authority, nor even exclusively to Jesuits. Both GC 35 and GC 36 have encouraged flourishing leadership and initiative throughout the Society and among companions in mission.

Conferences Facilitate Universal Mission

The six Conferences of Major Superiors, whose role was highlighted in GC 35 and further developed in GC 36, have been a notable development in the governance structures of the Society. They reflect a growing desire to respond to the global nature of many of our apostolic challenges. Already when General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach produced new Guidelines for Provincials in 2003, he had introduced an emphasis on the international and supranational character of the Society's mission and governance. "It is evident that", he explained, "in an increasingly interdependent ... world, the Provincials cannot govern their provinces as isolated entities but in union and solidarity with the 'entire body' of the Society and with the General."

GC 36 asked Conferences to "undertake a study on their way of proceeding" using the guidelines of GC 35, D 5, nn. 17-23 as "the foundation for their self-assessment." The desired outcomes of the self-assessment include: (i) Greater consistency among the six Conferences' statutes, especially with regard to decision-making and co-responsibility; (ii) Processes of discernment that include the President's involvement in Provinces' apostolic and personnel planning in order to facilitate universal mission; (iii) Clarification of Conferences' capacity for holding resources for apostolic and formation purposes; and (iv) Ways of engagement between the Presidents and Fr General in order to facilitate universal mission.

The Experience of Jesuit Conference of Asia Pacific (JCAP)

In the ten years since GC35 there has been significant growth in understanding how the Conferences do and can work. In the Jesuit Conference of Asia Pacific (JCAP), the sharing of experiences at the conference level has helped each unit (province, region and mission) to enhance its own governance. Regular gatherings of Major Superiors, Socii, Treasurers, Formators, Development Officers and other local office-bearers facilitate the exchange of expertise, experiences and information; discussion and better understanding of various guidelines from the General Congregations and the General Curia; peer-mentoring; communal learning; mutual support and fellowship. New office-bearers especially appreciate such platforms. In addition, they can discuss a range of common issues such as safeguarding, environmental awareness, Ignatian pedagogy, to name a few, which greatly help the representatives to deal better with challenges back home and to update each other on planning.

Conversely, the conference has served as a vehicle to aid governance at the universal level. The conference is a locus for fraternal discernment of apostolic priorities. This means that time must be allocated for the conference members to develop a true sense of solidarity, through sharing the fruit of their prayer, their joys and concerns in personal and confidential ways. The main factors which have enabled the conference to bear fruit include: time and resources for regular meetings; the way in which these meetings are conducted as occasions to share wisdom, reflect, discern and decide; the availability and attention of the relevant conference office-bearer to prepare and follow-up well and to provide competent support to individual units; having a core group with whom to plan has helped in preparations and follow up; a culture of openness, sharing and trust among all.

The conference has also served as a platform to consider the needs of smaller regions and mission territories, to coordinate support for their governance, and to support them in terms of financial resources, expertise, personnel, and leadership.

Networking within the Conference

Networking at the Conference level has catalysed greater sharing of resources among units and greater engagement in collaborative projects at both bilateral and multi-lateral levels. For example, new education projects in Timor-Leste, Thailand, Cambodia and Myanmar have benefited from support from other units of the Conference. Conference networks provide platforms where experience, resources, expertise and information are shared. Benefits from regular networking include the solidarity and encouragement gained from the fellowship of peers, which help reduce the isolation or burn-out that some members feel in their demanding ministries. The international networks offer a more universal perspective of the Society.

The role of coordinators is essential: to facilitate the networks, organize well-structured and meaningful programs at meetings, as well as the availability of financial resources for regular gatherings and other activities. Participation by the members makes a network fruitful. The support of major superiors is crucial for participation of both Jesuits and lay collaborators. The enhancement of the communications function at the conference is also clearly a factor that promotes international awareness and solidarity.

Going a step further, Fr Nicolás insisted that each conference discern and adopt common apostolic priorities among the conferences member provinces and regions. Despite difficulties, having common conference priorities enabled JCAP to carry out projects which individual units could not do alone. For example, in Reconciliation with Creation, an online training program for school sustainability officers was designed and launched, benefitting participants from various countries. The migrant ministries network is engaging in joint research and seeking collaboration with the Jesuit Colleges and Universities Asia Pacific network.

Formation – A Priority at the Universal Level

It is increasingly recognized that formation in the Society has an international dimension. In general, the study of theology is seen as the responsibility of conferences, while early studies remain the responsibility of provinces. Decisions with respect to formation of individual Jesuits of course fall to their respective major superiors. In between, the conference plays several roles. International tertianships are clearly important common works that enhance international formation. JCAP has one common formation house, Arrupe International Residence, closely attached to the Philippine Province's school of theology which has an international clientele and seeks to have an international faculty. The Asian Theological Program, whose objective is cooperation among the theology faculties across Asia Pacific, has been a welcome move by the conference, although the engagement by the various faculties in this cooperative approach has been sluggish.

The conference is enabling a pooling of resources for formation funding for the benefit of younger regions with fewer resources. Projects coordinated by the conference, such

development of the 'Profile of a Formed Jesuit in Asia Pacific', as well as regular gatherings of formators, helped to address common concerns. The conference has helped in capacity building and developing a common language and understanding, for example through workshops for formators, superiors, school educators, development officers, emerging leaders and scholastics and brothers in formation.

Challenges for International Mission

It is now widely recognized in the Society that the challenges of identifying and responding to international mission are increasingly beyond the ability of individual provinces and regions. So long as the attention of each unit remains focused on its existing local works and institutions, these broader challenges, especially new and emerging ones, naturally fall through the cracks. In Asia Pacific, such challenges include religious fundamentalism, inter-religious conflict, environmental concerns, natural disasters, migration, displacement, rising militarism, income inequality and economic injustices, to name a few. If governance is about steering an organization towards its mission, then it follows that a mission transnational in nature requires governance vehicles that are similarly transnational.

Classically the province is the repository of the Society's resources for mission. So decisions about ministries, personnel, resources and institutions are until now mainly made at the local level. The conference is the platform for spotting and responding to apostolic concerns that are primarily regional or international in nature. If this capacity is weak in the conference, these issues slip off the radar screen of local major superiors. Moreover, where the conference does identify common apostolic priorities such as migration, reconciliation with creation or attention to the needs of young adults, it is important to ensure that individual units will uphold these priorities back home.

GC 35 and GC 36 both attempted to identify the changes needed so that the Society will respond effectively to regional and international challenges. They ask that apostolic planning and implementation, including decisions on the allocation of resources, the assignment and preparation of personnel, and the establishment and maintenance of relevant apostolic ministries and institutions, be effective at the regional level. The conferences have a major role in ensuring this effectiveness at a regional level.

Allocation of Resources

The fruitful sharing of resources across a conference now requires that each province or region consider the needs of other units before committing resources to its own institutions and works. A province may not independently sink funds and personnel into yet another new school when another unit desperately needs resources for basic education. Yet to compare needs across borders is a most difficult governance exercise. A major element is to take personnel planning to the conference level, identifying the key positions for conference roles and common works and even for major local works of international significance, and put succession planning in place.

GC 36 strengthened the role of the conferences and thus of the presidents in intervening in province and region planning. The president's authority may seem to be only moral suasion

but it has weight when it carries the shared authority of major superiors who together accept their corporate responsibility. The president's authority is not another level that interferes with a major superior's access to Fr General. Rather his role is to facilitate the engagement of major superiors in the universal mission, while also assisting Fr General to contact and engage the whole Society in discerning and animating its mission. The steps being taken by the General Counsellor for Discernment and Planning, offering recommended processes or templates for apostolic discernment in common is a great help towards making planning a shared conference and Society wide activity.

This paper has summarised the recurrent points that have been raised in discussions about the role of the conference in governance. Nonetheless, it is helpful to bear in mind that beyond structures and systems, it is often the underlying culture and spirit of an organization that enables its people to work together and discover fruitful and creative arrangements. In this light, the friendship and communion experienced when Jesuits and collaborators meet to discern and implement their common mission will provide much fuel for creativity, patience and openness.

Original English



Leadership Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of the US Jesuit Conference

David McCallum, SJ

Vice President, Le Moyne College, Syracuse, New York

What is the prophetic audacity that is asked of us today? We must discern this. That is, where should this prophetic audacity be channeled? It is an attitude born of the magis."

- Pope Francis' address at GC 36

The universal vocation of members of the Society of Jesus, the readiness to go anywhere in the world where there is hope to give God greater glory through the proclamation of the Gospel and the promotion of justice, has always faced significant external challenges by social, economic, political, and at times, even ecclesial forces. Yet, as the number of Jesuits diminishes in many parts of the world, including the United States, an internal challenge that must be addressed is the growing need for the leadership capacity necessary to serve the Jesuit mission effectively and with spirit of the *magis* to which the Society is called. This capacity includes the ability and competence as well as the readiness to respond to the growing demands and necessities of that apostolic mission, especially in times of increased volatility, uncertainty, and social, economic, and political disruption. Without question, an important development in the past thirty years is the increasing level of collaboration with lay colleagues who are also deeply invested in the service of the Society's mission; however, while our lay colleagues are more than equipped to lead many of our apostolates and in many cases, are better qualified than Jesuits to do so, lay leadership is not the answer when it comes to questions of internal governance and matters reserved to members of the Society alone. In particular, such matters include the leadership of Jesuit communities, provinces, and conferences.

While there are a few voluntary opportunities in the US for Jesuits to learn managerial skills, there has not been a program that provides substantive leadership formation in an Ignatian way of proceeding. Nor do orientations or colloquia for new superiors or provincials address many of the key issues that men face in these roles. As a leadership educator, I have surveyed many superiors and provincials in order to better gauge some of the specific challenges they face in their leadership at the local and regional levels with an eye to how the Society might respond. Inspired by His Holiness, Pope Francis' address to the gathering at GC 36, I suggest that we face these challenges rooted in a spirit of consolation, and with the restlessness, depth, and attention to quality characteristic of the *magis*.

The Five Categories of Leadership Challenges in the Context of the US

Despite the extensive resources of our institutions and the relative advantages of our economic and political context, the diminishing numbers of Jesuits in the US poses a critical challenge to our ability to meet increasing demands for our service. In particular, recent reorganizations and mergers of provinces and the overall decrease in the numbers of Jesuits available have generated particular challenges for provincials, local superiors, and directors of works. These challenges as described by provincials and local superiors (by no means an exhaustive list) fall into five categories:

1. **Capacity:** the ability and sufficient resources to address challenges and opportunities;
2. **Competence:** skill and effectiveness in addressing particular needs;
3. **Structure/organization:** the organizational and governance resources, policies, procedures and means to meet needs effectively;
4. **Social/Environmental Justice:** external and internal struggles in addressing our mission;
5. **Mindset:** the attitudes and mental models that affect our ability to address challenges in an effective manner

In the five sections that follow, I list the challenges as they were described in recent conversations and correspondences with provincials and superiors, including some verbatim remarks.

1. Issues of Capacity

- **“Courage to make difficult decisions:** about the allocation of scarce Jesuit personnel resources, to discern the closure of apostolates when necessary”
- **Vision and commitment:** “helping younger and mid-life Jesuits open their apostolic horizons so that their apostolic “repertoire” does not become too narrow”
- **Capacity to fill all the Jesuit seats on the various boards of entities that we sponsor:** “Jesuits can play valuable, distinctive roles on boards, but we will not have the men to occupy all these seats in the years ahead. How should we prioritize where we continue to mission Jesuits to serve on boards?”
- **Vigor and availability:** aging communities, in particular where members are especially resistant to change
- **Flexibility and freedom of Jesuits:** “Willingness to adjust mission to be more flexible for a greater good;” “Jesuits’ inability to let go of roles or responsibilities to which they are attached.”
- **Financial capacity to meet threats,** e.g. Legal claims from sex abuse cases (in our province, multimillion dollar claims are out there); also decrease in salary income overall for our communities
- **Scale, in other words, the balance of *cura personalis* with management of large provinces:** “There are many related issues, including the challenge of so many apostolates in reconfigured provinces; this requires renegotiating the boundaries/expectations of the provincial’s availability.”

- **Bureaucracy and paperwork:** “With many demands on provincials to relate to so many, reports and requests consume considerable time.”
- **Cura Apostolica by superiors:** “With more lay directors of works, superiors are being asked to do more *cura apostolica*, which both creates more responsibility for them and requires different skill sets. As more communities become multi-apostolic, superiors have *cura apostolica* responsibilities for multiple apostolates.”
- **Strategic planning for leadership formation and succession:** “Though we offer numerous formation programs for lay leaders in our apostolates, we have done little collective strategic planning to make sure sufficient Jesuit and lay leaders are being formed for the future of our apostolates”
- **Formation of Jesuits for mission and identity roles in our apostolates:** “we have not thought systematically about the kinds of formation that is needed to do this role well, nor have we made sure Jesuits are preparing for those critical roles.”
- **Inadequate time and resource for team building of province staffs:** the travel demands now incumbent upon the provincial and his key cabinet and staff members make this difficult- “how does the provincial form and sustain a sense of team with his leadership?”
- **Formation for discernment is lacking:** “while we have plenty of excellent rhetoric about discernment, in practice, we are not using discernment in common and in many cases, don’t know how to do it. Some of us have seen it misused or used badly, and so, have some degree of cynicism.”

2. Issues of Competence

- **Facilitation skills: for strategic planning:** to foster the type of honest, trusting, spiritual conversation that leads to well-discerned decision
- **Delegation:** “Some superiors do not recognize that they can delegate and draw on the skills of the group or community to plan, facilitate, and lead meetings.”
- **Community Building:** fostering unity, mutual support and healthy intentional “community time” in multi-apostolic communities with different rhythms and schedules.” “More of our communities are becoming multi-apostolic – the intentionality in leading these communities is important, not just letting the largest apostolate associated with the community determine everything.” “Delegation to superiors was lost - local leadership has waned, both in leadership and prophetic tasks. We need to rebuild at the local level, and rebuild a vision for the role. We give in to administrative bureaucracy... do we have truly Ignatian leadership at the local level?”
- **Supervision:** lay employees, finances, food service – some superiors have little experience in doing this
- **Forming positive, supportive relationships with directors of works:** “There are different challenges with Jesuit directors of works than lay directors of works. These lay directors of works need competent Jesuit local superiors as partners.”
- **Calendar management:** “This seems nearly impossible at times and raises important questions about boundaries, limits of expectations, scope of work, etc.”

- **Lay/Jesuit Collaboration:** “A challenge that the provincial has is how to respect the differences in vocation among members of the provincial staff, Jesuit and lay, and yet also foster warm, collegial, mutually supportive relationships.”
- **Fundraising for the province:** “I have good people underneath me, but there is still a role for the #1 to play in that area.”

3. Issues of Social/Environmental Justice

- **Race and Identity:** “In the US, the issues of race are a priority- yet even the issue of race in the Society is not without its tensions, including micro aggressions of many types. Until we can address these issues in our own communities, how can we lead on these issues?”
- **Refugees and migrants:** “How well are we serving our mission on behalf of victims of forced migration, refugees... the dreamers facing potential deportation?”
- **Witness:** “Our willingness to live simply, to truly accompany the poor in solidarity.”
- **Environmental Justice:** “*Laudato Si* - while it may not have the same degree of urgency as the current social issues, it is necessary that we mobilize ourselves and lead the Church.”

4. Issues of an Organizational/Structural Nature

- **Excessive subsidiarity:** “The Society of Jesus suffers from an excess of subsidiarity – at least that is my experience in the USA. We need more vigorous central leadership to help us deal with challenges which cross province boundaries on a regional/national/international level.”
- **Inadequate subsidiarity:** “We need to empower local superiors to serve their communities and support their apostolates with greater effectiveness.”
- **Slowness of decision-making processes** at a Conference level, especially regarding higher education here in the USA: “In what sense is higher education a national apostolate other than certain protocols we have about the assignment of men when they are first available after doctoral studies or ordination (if they already have a terminal degree)?”
- **Expectations from the Jesuit Curia** that the USA “help the global Society, especially in regions where the Church is flourishing in the developing world, yet this creates significant strains on our ability to administrate within the provinces we serve.”
- **Need for global planning that leads and supports conferences:** “I have high hopes that Fr. General’s “enlarged council” at tempo forte three times a year (with the six conference presidents plus the apostolic “secretaries” in education, social justice/ecology, etc.), will help invigorate and focus global planning at the level of the Curia in Rome, and that that, in turn, will redound to a more vigorous engagement between our Curia and the six Conferences around the world.”
- **Executive decisions/centralized mandates:** “As a related matter, I believe that our Curia in Rome, especially the Treasurer and Fr. General, could play a bigger role in advising about conference-to-conference resource sharing around the world. Making decisions in this area can be stressful and confusing for many of us provincials.”

- **Provincial Assistants:** “Thank God for them – I have an outstanding group –about half Jesuit and half lay. Maintaining this quality of staff will be essential in the years ahead.”
- **Balance and alignment of divergent processes of planning at different levels:** local / provincial / Conference / universal.
- **Relationship with global Society:** “International Jesuits who show up on our doorstep without going through the proper procedure. It puts us in a bind as we want to help, but the costs can be high.”
- **Chain of command:** “Jesuits who go around local superiors and provincial assistants to work directly with the provincial.”
- **The scope and expectations of the provincial:** “There is still a challenge to “right size” the role to the scope of the needed visitations and work in support of the provincial. In my own experience, this manifests as an increasing (not improving) difficulty to meet all the expected “maintenance” visits of works entrusted to me, with “vision/creativity” projects to craft, discern, resolve in a timely and helpful manner.”

5. Issues of Mindset

- **Default to corporate forms of decision making/lack of Ignatian principles for decision-making:** “directors of works who subscribe to survival of the fittest rather than working harder and more imaginatively toward greater collaboration.”
- **Ideological differences/ecclesiological Tensions:** “Potential conflict with some bishops on theological vision and ecclesial structure;” “Ideological and political divisions in a community.”
- **Resistance to collaboration in some contexts:** “we have so many dynamic lay people and we need to involve them more.”
- **Compliance around matters related to protecting children rather than mission driven attitude:** “Outside supervision by third parties and concern over boundaries and assets take over—compliance driven. Where is discernment, vision, or the prophetic?”
- **Lack of attention to the greater good:** “When discernment of a man, his desires and abilities does not consider the wider needs of the province, conference, etc.”

While each of these five sets of challenges might seem daunting enough without even taking stock of all of them, GC’s 34, 35, and 36 each provide helpful guiding mandates calling for structural changes in governance models and procedures, as well as for leadership formation suited for each level of internal governance. Further, in GC 36, the members of the congregation were especially attentive to priorities such as capacity for discernment, collaboration, and networking. Indeed, it has become apparent in practice that the ability to do discernment in common, a key theme in GC 36 and a priority of both Pope Francis and Fr. General Sosa, depends on the personal and interpersonal maturity addressed by more comprehensive leadership formation programs. In fact, there are several conferences who have already responded with carefully designed, cohort based programs that include Jesuit and lay leaders in leadership formation rooted in Ignatian spirituality and ways of proceeding. These programs, for instance in the African and European conferences, have yielded considerable fruits not only in terms of the personal

and professional development they provide for individuals, but also in the ways they have supported the collective capacity at the level of leadership teams and apostolic organizations. It seems now that the US conference would benefit from translating these mandates into its own programs to ensure the robust capacity needed to serve the Society's mission into the future.

Original English



Leadership and Governance: Typology and Issues for a Sustainable, Stable and Prosperous Society

Paulin Manwelo, SJ

Professor of Philosophy, Kinshasha, D.R. Congo

The concept of leadership implies two things at once: the ability to have a good and just vision of society and, in turn, the ability to persuade others to work to achieve said mission. Meanwhile, the concept of governance is more practical in nature: it covers institutional, legal and moral arrangements and mechanisms that should bring about a good and just vision of society.

1. Leadership and governance thus represent **two twin concepts**. One cannot exist without the other. Without good leadership, that is to say without a good and just vision, governance is blind. Inversely, without effective governance, that is to say without adequate arrangements and mechanisms, leadership becomes misleading.

2. In the following discussion, we want to examine **several classic conceptions of leadership and governance** and identify the strengths and weaknesses of each conception, before proposing a model that is likely to promote leadership and governance of quality and excellence.

3. Skimming through the literature associated with leadership and governance, one can distinguish five related conceptions, namely: **“monist”, “liberal”, “collectivist”, “institutionalist”, and “proceduralist”**.

4. The monist conception of leadership and governance should be understood as a conception whereby leadership as well as governance are essentially the prerogative of an individual or group of individuals, capable of securing, shaping and fulfilling the fortunes of the multitude. The “monist” aspect here should not be confused with selfishness or a tendency towards individualism. It has more to do with the exceptional, great, heroic undertakings of an individual who, thanks to their talents, vision, skills and know-how, becomes a guide for others. In return, the individual is considered a model or a reference for society. This conception of governance and leadership was at the heart of classic socio-political-religious theories whose roots can be traced from Plato to Niccolo Machiavelli via Hobbes, Kant and Hegel.

5. In Plato, for example, one can find the monist conception of governance and leadership in the celebrated socio-political theory, *The Republic*, and more precisely, in one of the famous

articles that Plato himself named a “good constitution” (L V., 449, p. 203). Having listed more than 12 articles concerning the good management of the *Res Publica*, Plato outlines his fundamental viewpoint in his final article of the Constitution, in almost solemn terms, and summarises quite well the essence of his monist conception of leadership. He states “*Unless either philosophers become kings in our states or those whom we now call our kings and rulers take to the pursuit of philosophy seriously and adequately, and there is a conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophic intelligence, while the motley horde of the natures who at present pursue either apart from the other are compulsorily excluded, there can be no cessation of troubles, dear Glaucon, for our states, nor, I fancy, for the human race either. Nor, until this happens, will this constitution which we have been expounding in theory ever be put into practice within the limits of possibility and see the light of the sun. But this is the thing that has made me so long shrink from speaking out, because I saw that it would be a very paradoxical saying. For it is not easy to see that there is no other way of happiness either for private or public life.*” (L. V. 473 a-474a, p. 229).

6. There is equally a case to be made that this monist conception of leadership has roots in the Bible stories with the figures of **Abraham, Moses** and the **Prophets** (Amos, Elisha, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, ...). Not to mention the Prophet *par excellence*, **Jesus Christ**, who exercised a leadership of quality, excellence and invaluable service to the advent of a society of justice and dignity for all humanity.

7. Equally in this vein, we can mention, *mutatis mutandis*, the saints and other virtuous characters who left a lasting mark on their era. **St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Dominic, St. Benedict, St. Teresa of Ávila...** are in this category of people one could, justifiably, call heroic leaders “*sui generis*”.

8. The monist conception of leadership is distinct from the “**liberal**” **conception**. The difference is in their respective ends. The liberal conception is based on the individual’s idiosyncratic characteristics, dreams, individual projects, etc.; meanwhile the monist conception pursues the common good through personal or individual heroism. The difference between the two conceptions is teleological in nature, but the two conceptions are founded on the individual dimension of leadership.

9. Thus, the “**liberal**” **conception of governance and leadership** should be understood as one where the management of power, perhaps the management of life in general, be it political, intellectual or moral in nature, is the prerogative not of one sole individual, who must guide the multitude, but more so the business of each and every individual, taken in isolation. Each person is the primary master of their own destiny and should, for this reason, define themselves according to their interests, their tastes, and their own life vision.

10. In contrast to the “liberal” conception, we find the “**collectivist**” **conception of leadership and governance**, advocated by thinkers such as Karl Marx *et al*. The collectivist conception is a criticism of the “monist” and “liberal” conceptions of leadership and governance – conceptions considered bourgeois which only profit a minority, the bourgeoisie, at the expense of the majority, the proletariat. The “collectivist” conception therefore puts an emphasis on the “people” as the heart of leadership and governance. In other words, bringing about a good society depends on neither “*Philosopher-king*”, nor “*Leviathan*”, nor “*Prince*”, nor

"Master", nor "Emperor", nor "Prophet"; rather on all people who should act as one. This was, for example, the Marxist or Communist credo which can be found in gold letters in the ten commandments of the Communist Party, outlined in the famous *Communist Manifesto*.

11. Like the "collectivist" conception, **the institutional conception of leadership and good governance** presents itself as an antidote to the abuse of the "monist" and "liberal" conceptions of the administration of the *res publica*. However, the approach is different: the emphasis is not on the "people" but on the "institutions". The fundamental idea here is that the emergence of a good society doesn't depend on the capacities of individuals as such; rather it depends on the justice (valid and legitimate) of political, social, economic, and other institutions. It is in this context that "**Rule of Law**" is spoken of as the sole guarantor of a good society. In other words, nothing but the rule of law can guarantee each individual's interests and the common good. The principle here is the following: we don't need "strong individuals", but "strong institutions" (Barack Obama).

12. One of the defenders of the institutional conception of leadership and governance, the American philosopher, John Rawls, highlights the merits of this approach as the following: "Everyone recognises that the institutional form of society affects its members and largely determines what type of people they wish to be as well as the type of people they are. The social structure equally limits in different ways people's hopes and ambitions; because the idea that they have of themselves, with reason, depends in part on their place in society and considers the means and possibilities that they can reasonably aspire to. Thus, an economic regime is not solely, let's say, an institutional framework to satisfy existing hopes and aspirations, but also a manner to create future hopes and aspirations. More generally, the basic structure influences the way in which the social system produces and reproduces over time a certain form of culture shared by people and certain conceptions of what is good for them"¹.

13. The "**proceduralist**" or "**communicational**" conception of leadership and good governance is a relatively recent approach. The basic thesis here supports a broader conviction according to which the realisation of the common good is only possible with the promotion of a communicational society, that is to say, one which cultivates the art of rational discussion on subjects important to social life. A leader is not someone who imposes their views on others, rather someone who submits their views to the *rational discussion* of everyone with the aim of reaching a consensus on what specifically should be done for the good of all. Indeed, **in a decentralised, pluralist, polyarchal world**, prescribing a monist conception of leadership and governance is inadequate. Legitimate and valid leadership can only be professed by one who accepts what the author of this approach, Jürgen Habermas, calls "**principle D**", that is to say, the principle of rational discussion, which states: "Only those norms can claim to be valid that meet (or could meet) with the approval of all affected in their capacity as participants in a practical discourse"².

¹ John Rawls, *Libéralisme politique*, Paris, PUF, 1993, p. 322. Here it is also worthwhile to include another of Rawls' famous affirmations: "Justice is the primary virtue of social institutions, as truth is for systems of thought" (Cf. John Rawls, *Théorie de la justice*, Paris, Seuil, 1987, p. 29). In other words, according to Rawls, justice is not the business of individuals, but of structures, which should lead the former to practice justice.

² Jürgen Habermas, *Droit et démocratie. Entre faits et normes*. Paris, Gallimard, 1992, p. 123.

14. These are, succinctly presented, the five main conceptions of leadership and governance that can help us to determine, somewhat, the issues regarding the approach to be taken when promoting sustainable, stable and prosperous societies today. **What learnings can we draw from this for a leadership and governance of quality and excellence today?**

15. If it is true that the monist conception of leadership and governance harbours the seeds of elitism or bourgeois individualism and above all the seeds of unwelcome authoritarianism, it must be recognised that it can also lead one to develop a heightened sense of individual responsibility, the sense of emulation and heroic creator of a new world. Indeed, in a society where each person wants to be a model of virtue, wisdom, courage, tenacity, perseverance, intelligence, diligence, etc.; social life could not but advance towards well-being.

16. The liberal conception of leadership and governance where each person is their own “master” and thus assumes responsibility for themselves brings two virtues. Firstly, it respects the status of each person in their rights to define themselves as they wish. Secondly, it promotes cultural, religious and political differences between individuals. On the contrary, such a conception of leadership and governance, which emphasises the need for each individual to do as they see fit, runs the risk of creating a society that is fragmented, relativist and in the end not very inclined to building the common good and justice for all.

17. The collectivist conception of leadership and governance is an ideological falsehood in that it makes one believe that all human beings can achieve the same things in the same way, without any differentiation whatsoever. Everyone is like everyone else. This levelling of identities and capacities is basically utopian and generally leads society, if not to stagnation, at least to soul-destroying totalitarianism. The collapse of collectivist or communist regimes since 1989 laid bare the incoherence of the conception of collectivist leadership and governance.

18. The institutionalist conception of leadership and governance offers several advantages. Among these, we can mention the following: just institutions offer a framework within which there is equality of opportunity in the pursuit of happiness. Each person is the master of their destiny, but within an institutional framework that respects and promotes the liberty and destiny of each and every person. So much so that the personal interest is united with the common good. However, one of the weaknesses of the institutionalist conception of leadership and governance is the fact that in the long run the individual finds themselves trapped in the institutional machine in such a way that their ability to create fresh things, to escape from the well-trodden path, can be affected, reduced or outright subdued by the institutional constraints which are often difficult to challenge.

19. The proceduralist conception of leadership and governance also provides certain advantages: for example, the ability to bring others to accept a way of life or a vision of things, not through imposition, but through persuasion, rational dialogue; and, in turn, the ability to act together following a rational and inclusive dialogue. However, the proceduralist conception is an ideal that may be difficult to realise in a context plagued by illiteracy and the absence of a culture characterised by an “ethic of rational discussion”.

20. In any case, **the present typology of leadership and governance** sufficiently demonstrates that there is no straightforward recipe. It instructs us to be wary of fashionable discussions on

leadership and governance which unfortunately reduce the question to one sole conception, in this case the “monist” conception. In fact, the “monist” conception of leadership and governance which intends to promote the wellbeing of all through the “heroism” of one individual or group of individuals can merely be an illusion. Already in the 4th Century ad., Aristotle the Wise had already stated, justifiably, that leadership and governance by one person can only be by the divine. It is not within the realm of humankind, it being mortal and fallible in essence. Later, in the 18th Century, Montesquieu made this uncompromising statement: The leadership of one person alone corrupts. Absolutely. Sooner or later!

21. The experience of the recent 36th General Congregation speaks to the belief that the model of leadership and governance desired by St. Ignatius is found at the crossroads of the aforementioned conceptions: it is a combination of individual talents and capabilities (monist conception); rational discussion or “communal discernment” with a view to determining the Society’s most universal good (communicational or procedural conceptions); respect for our cultural differences (liberal conception); sharing the same vision and charism and way of proceeding (collectivist conception); and above all, respect for our founding texts – the Constitutions and other texts (institutional conception).

22. I’ll say, clearly, that any piecemeal and monolithic approach to the question of leadership and governance always runs the risk of soul-destroying reductionism. Only a “holistic” approach allows us to encompass the concepts of leadership and governance in their entire existential abundance.

*Original French
Transaltion Nils Sunderman*



Governance and Leadership in Today's Context

Stany Pinto, SJ & Erwin Lazrado, SJ

JESA members, Gujarat, India

The last two General Congregations expressed the importance of leadership and “governance at the service of universal mission” (GC 35, D 5). The present leadership in the world and within the Society of Jesus, poses a challenge to develop a collective leadership and democratic governance. In this article, we share the JESA Gujarat experience in developing a concrete model of governance and leadership, which has gone through a long and gradual process of development. We are confident that it will enlighten and enrich the larger Society.

Background of South Asia

South Asian countries are facing challenges like, widespread inequality, ethnicity, sectarianism, terrorism, illiteracy, poverty, class, caste, which are challenging governance and leadership. Issues of violence, corruption, flawed systems of representation, the role of money and dynastic family-centred politics seem to be eroding the initial democratic gains in most of these countries. India is no exception to these problems and more so, after the change of regime at the Centre; right-wing and fascist ideology, in practice and promotion is becoming stronger and more aggressive. In India, we have the emergence of a right-wing fundamentalist Government, backed by a Hindu nationalist social organization, whose track-record does not indicate much adherence to the Constitution of India, in their scheme of things. At risk are the citizen's rights of the subaltern groups, the minorities, and the marginalised.

Challenges for Church Groups & Jesuits in Social Action (JESA)

With the new policies of the government, many church groups would rather prefer it safe by working or aligning with the government, rather than take the side of the poor and the marginalized. There is a fear of backlash if they preach social justice. The Church does not seem to offer a spirituality which can heal and liberate, but seeks instead to desperately preserve the status quo.

In contrast JESA has been at the forefront in implementing GC 32, Decree 4 - the service of faith and the promotion of justice. In the South Asian Conference, the Jesuits involved in social action had taken up this dictum as a based on a deep-rooted conviction that the Spirit of the Lord was their guiding principle. Their lifestyle was attuned to the poor as they had immersed themselves among those who were on the fringes of society amid great human suffering.

Today there is a fear that this JESA ideology and vision will be at risk. The fundamentalist forces do not tolerate any dissent or questioning. Some of the social activists have opted for other ministries which are less challenging and which subscribe to the status quo. Hence, instead of following the right based approach, there are some who are satisfied with a charity-based project approach.

It is time for us to reflect and to join hands or forge alliances with men and women of goodwill who are ready and committed to challenging the unjust oppressive structures. As GC 35, D 3, n. 27 emphatically says that we are invited to see the world from the perspective of the poor and the marginalized, learning from them, acting with and for them. The Lord invites us with a prophetic call to renew our mission “among the poor and for the poor.”

Jesuits in Social Action (JESA) at National Level – A Response

The Society of Jesus has responded to the challenges of poverty and discrimination through welfare and charity approach for many years. Then the need was felt to adopt a developmental approach through education and empowerment programmes to make people self-reliant. There has been a shift in our approach over the years. The different phases are operating simultaneously today. What we need today is a liberative approach where governance is taken care of and people are empowered to take leadership, which would bring about social transformation.

The Society of Jesus is throwing a challenge to shift from mere developmental approach to a strong democratic governance structure. The Society is responding to the emerging needs of good governance and leadership at the service of universal mission in the last few years through the General Congregations. This model is believed to be dynamic and it is open, constantly learning, discerning and acting. *Lok Manch* (People’s Forum) is one such initiative where collaboration and governance is the focus to develop leadership at the grass-root level. We give our maximum in terms of net-working and collective participation.

a) What is helping us

Our desire is to promote our Jesuit identity through collaboration and ownership at the zonal and state level among JESA centres. We have adapted a strategic change of perspective from project to movement oriented – a paradigm shift. We sensed a growing support and appreciation of JESA among many in the Province. We have also been able to outreach to other apostolates and promote a socio-pastoral approach. JESA is seen as a role model by other commissions. Our openness to network with other like-minded civil organizations is our major strength.

b) What is hindering us

It is a slow unlearning and relearning process among us, JESA members. We are too used to our individual and institutionalized style of functioning. The life style of other social activists is perceived as too materialistic and secular resulting in young scholastics not getting attracted to the social apostolate. The Jesuit Social Centres of Gujarat whilst doing outstanding work as independent Centres hardly come together on any serious common issues and it showed very

little outcome. There was no collective and serious reflection till all the members felt together that “enough is enough!”.

c) Collaboration - The way forward

The JESA Centres of Gujarat are well known both in the State and in the other parts of the country for their high degree of commitment to the poor and marginalized. However, over the years, it was strongly felt that though much of the work was really very good, lack of collaboration among the various social centres was an obstacle in creating the desired impact. It was, therefore, unanimously felt that JESA-Gujarat needed to work in a more collaborative way.

d) Our Response

In January 2010, at a JESA meeting, the group went through a very significant exercise. Each member attempted ‘to listen to the cry of my people ...’ This cry was shared with one another. The cry of the people was for justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. It was a cry for dignity and for respect to one’s identity. It was a cry for genuine access to what is rightfully theirs: food, clothing, shelter, clean drinking water, primary health care, education, employment and to be treated as equal citizens of the country. The people cry out when they are marginalized, humiliated, discriminated, alienated and exploited. Above all, their cry is for meaningful accompaniment for a more just and humane society.

JESA-Gujarat: A Paradigm Shift of Vision - Mission

These cries in many ways challenged the JESA members and necessitated that there be a paradigm shift in their response. Among the key questions which emerged were:

- a) Can JESA-Gujarat work together in order to ensure that the basic rights of the poor actually become a reality in Gujarat?
- b) In keeping with the spirit of the MAGIS, can we do more and better, transcending the narrow confines and limitations of our own individual works?
- c) Can we accompany our people meaningfully towards their empowerment?

These questions challenged us to come up with vision-mission that visualises a society that is more humane based on freedom, justice, equality and fraternity irrespective of caste, creed, race or gender. In other words, to be human would entail to live a life of human dignity as enshrined and based on the values of the Constitution of India. In order to achieve this JESA commits itself to the empowerment (self-identity, self-respect, self-reliance and self-governance) of the marginalized, the poor and other vulnerable sections of society with a preferential option for the Dalits, Adivasis, Women, Children, Unorganized labour and Minorities in rural and urban areas, especially, those subjected to forced displacement and migration. Therefore, JESA Gujarat engages itself as a catalyst to accompany the marginalized in their struggles by conscientizing and organizing (priority groups) through the formation of people’s movements for their social, economic, political and physical (health and environment) development to fight against injustice, oppression and exploitation, to promote, propagate and protect human rights and dignity and to foster religious freedom and preserve cultural identity. And JESA Gujarat joins hands with Jesuits and other Church personnel;

other religious and secular groups / individuals sharing similar concerns and takes a stand at local, national and international levels for constructive and creative collaboration, networking and forging alliances in order to influence policy making and implementation at all levels. For which besides grassroot-level involvement, research, documentation, publications, training and Advocacy remain an integral part of the people-centric process empowerment.

Promoting Effective Organizations, People's Leadership for Equity, Solidarity and Justice (PEOPLESJ)

The vision-mission spontaneously gave rise to PEOPLESJ, a unique collaborative programme and perhaps the first of its kind in the Jesuit Conference of South Asia. It was a new Chapter of JESA, Gujarat.

In June 2010, after going through a process of common reflection, JESA-Gujarat embarked on a massive campaign in order that the Right to Food (RTF) becomes a reality for the poor and marginalized in 900 villages and 50 slum settlements across Gujarat. Eleven Jesuit Social Centres (including two Parishes) were involved in this collaborative venture.

One of the key lessons which emerged from the RTF campaign was the urgency and importance of strengthening the local people's organizations and to prepare and strengthen local leadership.

The three years plus engagement in the RTF campaign was an unbridled success. There were shortcomings but more than that was the fact that we JSCs were able to shed individualism, to forget (at least for one collaborative project) our own "babies" (Social Centres). Acknowledging several positive points of this important initiative, JESA-Gujarat as a group had already begun seriously engaging in more meaningful ways with the people's movements of the State. We therefore embarked on a paradigm shift in the re-visioning and articulation of our mission and we were convinced that collectively we needed the courage in keeping with our Jesuit way of proceeding to, *"promote, strengthen and accompany people's organisations and movements towards realisation and enhancement of democracy, citizens' rights and people's participation in governance and management of local, state and national political bodies through critical and qualitative engagement in Panchayati Raj Institutions / Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas (PESA). This process will include taking up issues and programmes such as capacity building, Natural Resource Management (NRM) and ecology, Forest Rights, Right to Information (RTI), Right to Food (RTF), gender justice and women's empowerment."* (Province Sammelan [meeting], 2013, P. 80)

PEOPLESJ Programme 2016-19

The proposed programme envisages the following theory of change:

Local self governance institutions and constitutional committees (*constituted under various laws*) are primarily responsible for basic rights (*access to basic amenities, primary education, primary health, subsidized food, housing, sanitation etc.*) of people at the grass root level. These institutions / committees also have to **function as local democratic, inclusive and accessible by all**. Strong, effective and value-based leadership from the marginalized communities and

People's Organizations (POs) / Community Based Organizations (CBOs) can influence the functioning of local self-governance institutions and constitutional committees and they can also facilitate people's access to their rights. The proposed programme focuses on empowering the change agents (*Animators, value-based community leaders, Women leaders, members of working groups and POs/CBOs*). Empowerment of change agents will follow the process of periodic trainings (Knowledge & Skill based), day to day handholding process, motivating them through their recognition and appreciation, and support them to establish their leadership.

Strategic programmes to achieve objectives are:

- i) developing capacity building of leaders, POs/CBOs,
- ii) promoting and strengthening POs / CBOs,
- iii) setting up and strengthening village / slum level working group of leaders and elected representatives,
- iv) promoting and strengthening women's participation and their leadership
- v) enhance collaboration as integral and indispensable part of Jesuit Social Centres (JSCs) and between Jesuits and non-Jesuits at various levels.

Major Highlights of this Process

We can highlight the process in seven inter-related dimensions which also goes by the acronym **PROCESS**:

People-centred – we have consistently indicated that this initiative centres on people; the local people who live in our villages and slums; they are marginalised, poor and vulnerable and are systematically denied access to what is rightfully theirs. They belong to the tribal (*adivasis*), dalit and OBC communities.

Research is foundational to this initiative. We took up mapping exercise as a mechanism to collect, collate, analyse and share factual data. The conclusion arrived at were meant to provide us with a direction on the 'whys' and 'how' of the accompaniment of our people towards their own empowerment.

Organisational: *We must decrease and they must increase'* is one of the key objectives of this initiative. Therefore, the Jesuit Social Centres are no longer meant to be '*the be-all and end-all*' but as we move towards the development of People's Organisations, we need to ensure a devolution of authority with a view towards a capacitated strong and sustained People's Movement.

Collaboration at every single step, PEOPLESJ initiative has been focussed on the collaborative dimension. Collaboration among the JSCs, with our colleagues, with other like-minded individuals and groups. Our collaborative endeavour has also meant working and networking on campaigns and platforms locally and also at the State and National levels.

Evaluation: There have been constant interactions, feedback and review meetings, planning and monitoring sessions. Monthly reports of the work / activities from each JSC are being recorded and submitted to documentation team. Detailed written reports are in place after

every meeting. Monitoring and Implementation System (MIS) has been developed and implemented. This helps us to have checks and balances of indicators set to achieve the objective.

Systems: The regular meetings of the Programme Management Team (PMT) and the other teams, CLPT (common learning and process), DART (documentation) and FINT (finance), have been meant to put an effective system in place. Our Point Persons and lay Directors are part of these teams which monitor the functioning of the whole initiative and also of the specified team. The Finance Team (FINT) has put in place appropriate systems that have made it easy for greater transparency and accountability.

Sustainability is the key. Our experience throughout the process very clearly indicates that slowly but surely the people we accompany are able to take their rightful place in society. **18,366** direct beneficiaries are being trained and capacitated for the future sustainability. **108,750** families (indirect beneficiaries) are being influenced to demand and access their rights.

Therefore, the PROCESS as we have said earlier in keeping with our vision and mission has been a very important dimension of our journey as JESA in Gujarat for promoting democratic governance and leadership from the grassroots.

Original English



Challenges for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology in the Church and the Society

Ludovic Lado, SJ

Visiting Jesuit Chair, Georgetown University, Washington DC

“You know that those who are recognized as rulers lord it over them, and their superiors act like tyrants over them. That’s not the way it should be among you.” (Mk. 10, 42-43)

The purpose of leadership and governance in the Church as in the Society of Jesus is to carry out the mission (GC 36, D 2, n. 1). Today, the mission’s apostolic priorities are the promotion of social justice and ecology. These issues are also a central concern for the international community which is ever more conscious of the extent of social inequality and ecological crises, as well as the risks they pose to sustainable development. But while these issues have a universal dimension, the problems surrounding social justice and ecology always manifest locally, and they call for solutions that create a fruitful relationship between the local and the global. This, in my opinion, is the main challenge for leadership and governance in the promotion of the common good in the Church and in the Society. The Society of Jesus correctly underlines the need to “live a healthy balance between authority and local initiatives” (GC 36, D 2, n. 36)

However, it is evident that the institutional Church’s credibility as a moral authority in the world has been severely tarnished by the recent sexual abuse crisis. Nowadays, it is recognised that sexual abuse and its mishandling are manifestations of the perversion of clericalism. It is up to the Church to learn all the lessons it can from this. Therefore, the opinions outlined in this article support the following thesis: in terms of leadership and governance, the primary task for the Church and the Society – promoting the common good¹ – is a challenge in a globalised world where individualism often goes hand in hand with individual or collective egotism. This concern for the common good requires an institutional governance where those governed are encouraged to have real control over the exercise of power. Church hierarchies must learn again to be aware of the faithful, who are affected by the management of the common good that is the Church, all the while working to make it more inclusive and participatory. Leading by example is precisely how the Church will regain

¹ Pope Francis’ *Laudato Si* uses the joyful expression “Our common home”. Nature is perceived here as a common good.

the necessary moral authority to play its prophetic role in the improvement of governance in society.

A Church that Embodies Society

The key paradigm of this reflection is the mystery of the incarnation which expresses the Trinitarian God's interest for humanity's wellbeing. The Contemplation of the Incarnation in St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises invites us to see "how the Three Divine Persons looked at all the plain or circuit of all the world, full of men, and how, seeing that all were going down to Hell, it is determined in Their Eternity, that the Second Person shall become man to save the human race, and so, the fullness of times being come" (Spiritual Exercises, 102). The Word, by making itself flesh, by uniting itself with the human condition, endorses the model of closeness in matters of leadership. In this perspective, the Church, as such "the Body of Christ", can only realise itself and authentically fulfil its redemptive mission as a church embodied in society.

So, when we speak about leadership and governance in the Church and in the Society, our starting point is the assumption that the Church is embodied in a society that it hopes to transform through evangelical values. Indeed, as a historical community and social body, the Church does not exist outside society but within it; its members always belong to a society to which they are summoned to transform and bear witness to the evangelical values. According to Jesus, as a community of His disciples, the Church is best situated in the world, in society (Jn. 17:14-16). However, this incarnation, this rooting of the Church in society as prescribed by the redemptive mission, does not come without risks. By being in the world, the Church risks being like the world. Christ invites His community of disciples, the Church, to set itself apart from the practice of domination in the world, by serving, self-sacrificing for others (Jn. 10:42-45). The mystique of service as self-sacrifice for others emerges as a cardinal value of the model of leadership and governance that Jesus recommends to the Church.

That being said, in order to take up the challenge of an ethical and evangelical leadership capable of establishing the Church as the "salt of the earth" (Mt. 5:14), the institutions must not only exorcise the disease of clericalism as the template for exercising power in its ranks, but also adopt a perspective of governance hinged on accountability in the management of the common good, in the Church as well as in society.

The Challenge of Clericalism in the Church

Clericalism is a perverted form of clerical governance. Governance here involves governors and governed, institutions and norms that define a model and style of leadership. On a political level, Aristotle distinguishes three possible forms of government: the government of one royal person (monarchy) where the perverted form is tyranny, aristocracy (the government of a few people) which can degenerate into oligarchy, and finally republic (government of the people) where the perverted form is democracy. The Catholic Church is one of the oldest institutions in the world and therefore has a broad experience of different types of government. While it may be true that its organisational model appears to be primarily inspired by the hierarchical structures of the earthly kingdoms it came into contact

with over the centuries, it was also early in allowing essentially democratic spaces to flourish in its ranks, primarily in the religious orders.²

Nevertheless, it is still the case that the dominant model of governance in the Church is not democratic, but based on a sort of decentralised monarchy where parishes and diocese function as decentralised units. Given that Canon Law states that usually only priests can lead a parish, only bishops can lead a diocese, and only cardinals can become Pope, there is a de facto clerical monopoly on the exercise of leadership in the Church, even if the extent of this monopoly varies from one local church to another. One might as well say it is a form of clerical aristocracy or oligarchy, given that the clergy governing the Church constitutes only a tiny minority of its members.

The pathological form of clerical power is clericalism which occurs when the church hierarchies lose sight of the Church's redemptive mission, becoming obsessed with the objective of self-preservation by any means. It is then tempted to adopt worldly attributes, forms and methods. In a monarchic model, clericalism takes the form of a disordered relationship with power and money which leads to all manners of abuse. These greatly damage the Church's moral authority. Pope Francis regularly challenges the Catholic Clergy on its inclinations towards clericalism and careerism, love for money and other worldly things lurking in everyday life.

In recent decades, the Catholic Church has become more conscious of the fact that certain scandals are symptomatic of defective clerical governance, primarily related to the crisis of a monarchy-style leadership that encourages abuse. Issues like paedophilia and financial mismanagement at different levels of ecclesiastic governance have seriously eroded the Church's credibility. Pope Francis, following his election, has not hidden his desire to reform the Roman Curia – the pinnacle of the Catholic Church's pyramid of governance. As a two thousand year old institution, the Catholic Church is no stranger to scandals. However, the reason it has managed to survive the many twists and turns that speckled its history is because the Church knew to reform itself in decisive moments of history. A more transparent, collegial and responsible governance seems to be on the horizon.

The Challenge of Collegiality and Accountability

Observing that there is a clerical monopoly over ecclesiastic governance and leadership doesn't mean to say that lay-people are without responsibility. Rather, it is recognition that they are often structurally excluded from positions of leadership and, because of this, do not participate proportionally in important decisions on the life of the Church. This exclusion affects all lay-people, but women in particular, given that the clergy is exclusively male in the

² The example of Saint Ambrose who was elected by popular acclamation as the Bishop of Milan in 374 while he was still a catechumen shows clearly that there was a time when God's people chose their ecclesiastical leaders democratically. Still today the Bishop of Rome is democratically elected by the cardinals representing the entirety of Christendom. In the Society of Jesus, as in a number of Religious Congregations, the General Superior is democratically elected by the delegates of the Universal Society. On the topic of governance, the 35th General Congregation stated that the Society's law strongly encourages a "participatory and discerning approach" (GC 35, D 5, n. 28).

Catholic Church. In this model, where there's a clerical monopoly over power, the decrease in vocations to the priesthood becomes a serious concern for the governance of the Church. This raises the question of a more collegial and inclusive management of the Church which is a precondition for accountability.

The principle of collegiality should no longer be confined to relations between bishops and the Pope, but to the entire Church which is called to welcome a more participatory governance that empowers lay-people. As Pope Francis emphasises: "It must be remembered that when we speak of sacramental power 'we are in the realm of function, not that of dignity or holiness'. The ministerial priesthood is one means employed by Jesus for the service of his people, yet our great dignity derives from baptism, which is accessible to all. The configuration of the priest to Christ the head – namely, as the principal source of grace – does not imply an exaltation which would set him above others. In the Church, functions 'do not favour the superiority of some vis-à-vis the others'" (*Evangelium Gaudium*, 104). However, expecting the clergy to spontaneously exercise its power in a true form of service is nothing short of utopian. The Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) states: "Ignorance of the fact that man has a wounded nature inclined to evil gives rise to serious errors in the areas of education, politics, social action and morals" (CCC 407). Effective counter-powers will be necessary for improved pastoral governance. Establishing reformed regulations will strengthen the structures controlling clerical power.

Challenges regarding the Church's Contribution to Governance in Society

First of all, the Church should meet this challenge through leading by example. In the apostolic exhortation *Africae Munus* (AM) in 2009, addressed to the Church in Africa, Benedict XVI insists that the service of reconciliation, justice and peace should begin within the Church itself: "The Church, for her part, is committed to promoting within her own ranks and within society a culture that respects the rule of law." (AM, 81). Pope Benedict particularly invites bishops to be "exemplary in life and conduct. The good administration of your dioceses requires your presence. To make your message credible, see to it that your dioceses become models in the conduct of personnel, in transparency and good financial management. Do not hesitate to seek help from experts in auditing, so as to give example to the faithful and to society at large." (AM, 104). In other words, the Church will not understand how to give lessons on good governance if it is not exemplary in this respect.

As for the Church's public role, *Gaudium et Spes* (GS) favours lay-people as leaders in the governance of society, discouraging direct intervention from members of the clergy: "Secular duties and activities belong properly although not exclusively to laymen. (...) Laymen should also know that it is generally the function of their well-formed Christian conscience to see that the divine law is inscribed in the life of the earthly city; from priests they may look for spiritual light and nourishment. Let the layman not imagine that his pastors are always such experts, that to every problem which arises, however complicated, they can readily give him a concrete solution, or even that such is their mission. Rather, enlightened by Christian wisdom and giving close attention to the teaching authority of the Church, let the layman take on his own distinctive role" (GS 43, §2). So, Pastors are not "political guides" but religious ones, and thus

should devote themselves primarily to the spiritual training of lay-people, so that the latter may contribute their faith to sanctify the temporal order. According to Pope Benedict XVI, “one of the tasks of the Church (...) consists in forming upright consciences receptive to the demands of justice, so as to produce men and women willing and able to build this just social order by their responsible conduct.” (AM, 22). However, the visibility of lay-people’s commitment in political and public life is a challenge to overcome in today’s world.

It appears from these reflections that while governance in the Church is dominated by clerical leadership and its associated risks, in society the Church gives priority to lay-people in matters of political participation. Both in the Church and in society, we are living in a world where the development of new information and communication technologies obliges institutions to be more transparent, inclusive and accountable in their governance and exercise of leadership. It is time to adapt to this!

*Original French
Transaltion Nils Sunderman*



Challenges and Obstacles for Leadership and Governance in the Promotion of Social Justice and Ecology

Yolanda González Cerdeira
ERIC-Radio Progreso, Honduras

A Glance at One Corner of Latin-America

In recent years, inspired by the last General Congregations and by reality itself, we in the region of Latin-America have shared experiences, trials, errors and lessons, about the changes required to respond to the shared mission we are called to in these times. Diverse layers and contexts feed into the perspectives and reflections on the challenges and obstacles discussed in the following: we have our feet firmly rooted in the real world of a social work in Honduras (*ERIC-Radio Progreso*), all the while standing shoulder-to-shoulder with others in the Social Apostolate Committee of the Province of Central-America, and simultaneously working with the Jesuit Network with Migrants of Latin-America and the Caribbean in a broader sphere.

The Track is Beaten by Walking Towards a Horizon: The Audacity of the Improbable

The first and necessary starting point is to recognise that this track is already being trodden and there can be no step backwards. In many works, dimensions, provinces, networks and Conferences, the search is in progress to find the best way for structures and leaderships to respond to their respective contexts and missions, and to overcome the temptation of keeping to the comfort of rigid and static structures.

There can be no better horizon for this track than the phrase spoken by the Dominican Father Bruno Cadoré in the inaugural mass of the 36th General Congregation, which was revisited by the Father General in his first homily: *"have the audacity of the improbable, of seeking what is difficult, what seems impossible!"*. This is a summons to be audacious in our way of thinking, living, dreaming and re-imagining ourselves in a more radical form. How do we envision ourselves driving social justice and ecology in our dreams? What does the social dimension of the Society of Jesus look like? What changes must we make in ourselves, in our way of doing things, in the structures, to achieve this?

The audacity of the improbable also involves understanding that the track is beaten by walking, and we must have the courage to take risks, to shed the fear of failure, and to dare

to advance on the basis of trial and error; leaving our houses, our institutions, our “same old” ways of doing things. We must go out into the street, into the neighbourhood, and into the community, and from these realities rethink and renovate the identity of our apostolic mission and the Ignatian charism, whether in intellectual, social, spiritual or pastoral work. Pope Francis is clear about this path in the *Evangelii Gaudium* (EG 42): “I prefer a Church which is bruised, hurting and dirty because it has been out on the streets, rather than a Church which is unhealthy from being confined and from clinging to its own security”.

What Challenges are Posed by the Reality of Poor and Excluded People?

The starting point of this journey is clear: the preferential option for the poor. Therefore, the question to ask ourselves is: what kind of leadership and governance do we need in order to promote justice and ecology rooted in the experiences of poor and excluded people? This question, phrased in such a way, makes us alert to temptation, and causes us to take on challenges and define priorities:

We must be wary of the temptation to live in seclusion, in the wilderness, wrapped up in ourselves and the security of our comfort zones. The temptation to see ourselves “in the vanguard” of the Church while closing our eyes to the signs of the times. The temptation that involves remaining locked away in vast structures, bureaucracy, strategic planning, as if they were an end in and of themselves, while continuing to stray, involuntarily, from the violent, uncertain and painful reality of the poor. The danger of trying to marry these ever changing and diverse realities of our peoples together with our works and apostolic plans, is that we forget that the very meaning of the latter is to adapt to give their utmost in service in every moment of history.

We must take up the challenge of understanding and modelling ourselves to be the Church in its simplest possible form, and of knowing how to be a critical and purposeful conscience in a pluralist, destabilised and complex society. What characteristics must the Church have in order to know how to situate itself simply, but firmly, at the heart of the social, political and cultural storms of our times?

We must take decisions and define priorities that promote the preferential option for the poor, as this causes us to think about the sustainability of the works that are close to and deeply rooted in these communities. Is this just “a problem” with individual works? Is it a problem with rural parishes, works in marginalised areas, projects in excluded areas, which are usually the ones that receive the least economic and human resources and the least support? Or is this a challenge that should be taken up by the entire Society of Jesus, and be cemented in its priorities as something to support and encourage from the governance structures? How do we fulfil the social dimension of all the works, Universities, and schools of the Society of Jesus? Do we sufficiently prioritise being close to and integrating the poor in our formation plans, in our goals, in our planning, in our resources...?

What are the Obstacles to Our Desire to Contribute to Changing this Reality?

The first obstacle is one of depoliticization or fear of “the political”. How do we redefine the role of the Society of Jesus in calling for and proposing transformation? This requires redefining the relationship of faith with politics and power; the relationship with social movements and political parties. What should our place and behaviour be within social and political struggles for transformation? What channels currently exist for our political commitment, within our commitment to building the public sphere? What spaces can we use to ask ourselves these questions?

We can't transform by ourselves; we need to open ourselves up to other sectors, people, organisations. We must approach this with humility, listening and in the spirit of service, shirking the limelight while being decisive. We must pay attention to the inertia that can trap us, of thinking that transformation can be realised by associating ourselves with leaders. While we can't overlook the importance of being impactful in the spaces where big decisions are made, we cannot forget that legitimacy and direction are provided by being close to suffering, where we reflect, build proposals with others, and seek to act on them.

Body, Subject, Collaborators... We are Companions on this Journey

One of the priorities of the Common Apostolic Plan (CAP)¹ of the Conference of Latin America and the Caribbean Provincials (CLAP)² is precisely to strengthen the apostolic body and collaboration in the mission, the central idea being the following: *“to adjust our structures, styles of governance and management for the mission in collaboration with others”*. In the review carried out by the PAC this March, it was acknowledged that we are progressing in the construction of this new apostolic body. Various challenges were also identified: the need for greater and clearer reflection on the meaning of “collaboration” in the different vocations, identities and realities; the need to delve deeper into caring for people, the sense of community and discernment in common; and the need to progress collective responsibility in institutional management.

In my day-to-day experience, as a lay-person and a woman, the crux of the matter is this: how do we make companions on this journey, no more no less. Then we, men and women, Jesuits and lay-people, young and old, may put our diverse and complementary talents and charisms at the service of the Shared Mission. Then, from the outset, we can agree that no-one knows more than anyone else about life in community, spirituality and commitment, but that each person experiences it from their particular context. Then, we may share our life projects, and challenge one another in our shared mission. All of this matters, because in this diversity we are unified by our commitment to the poor and excluded.

In this sense, we are called to ask ourselves, Jesuits and lay-people: are we a testament of commitment, mystique, in our response to the historical challenges emerging from the victims

¹ Translation from Spanish: *Plan Apostólico Común (PAC)*

² Translation from Spanish: *Conferencia de Provinciales de América Latina y Caribe (CPAL)*

of marginalisation? Does our formation of young people, Jesuits and lay-people, awaken this spirit and testament? Does this formation and accompaniment help to comprehend power and office from the perspective of service, humility, competency and responsibility? Do the processes that guide young Jesuits promote the strengthening of the apostolic body, through close and equal relationships in diversity? On the other hand, it's a fact that we have seen increasing involvement of lay-people in the response to the apostolic challenges. However, this collaboration, which seeks to be horizontal, has not always matched well with traditionally vertical structures and dynamics.

That being said, one of the most pressing tasks, often invisible, is recognising that the Society of Jesus, as part of a patriarchal society, should progress its search for internal means to build new gender relations. There have been positive and promising experiences, like the process underway in the Province of Central-America to identify the internal changes and improvements required to achieve gender justice, which started in the best possible way: listening to women.

The CLAP's Commitment: Let's Weave our Net

One of the clearest commitments by the CLAP regarding ways of proceeding refers to the need to deepen collaboration between works to continue tackling apostolic challenges that are ever more complicated and that require joined-up, complementary responses with comprehensive apostolic models. In this sense, for some time now the drive towards intersectoral and network activities has been prioritised, and there has been progress in the creation and consolidation of networks and alliances.

This road is a long one, in that we must reflect on the exercises and lessons to improve and overcome the challenges that present themselves. Specifically, one of the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation of the CAP was the need to continue reviewing the governance structures, so as to creatively manage the logical tensions between the local level (provincial) and regional/global level (CLAP). This will continue to facilitate vibrant contexts at the same time as improving network coordination.

The commitment to collaboration and working as a network also requires a change of logic in leaderships, beginning with changes to terminology. For example, we can replace "directing" a work, where there's a clear line of authority, with "coordinating" a network or intersectoral project, which implies acting on proposals without a clear line of authority. This is based on achieving consensus, collegial coordination and teamwork, with the ability to balance the local and global levels and identify shared apostolic challenges and, therefore, collective success and failure. The goal is to break with the logic of the individual, to think in collective terms.

A Change of Style, in Every Way

It is said to leave the best until last, so perhaps none of the above is of any use without stating clearly that this condition of possibility is based on the assumption that a change of direction is required, from the heart and the mind. Moreover, this is not easy. We are accustomed, in our societies, and in the Society of Jesus, to thinking "in an individual way, vertical and from

top to bottom". The great challenge is to transform ourselves in feeling and thought. We cannot seek societies of democracy and solidarity without moving towards works founded on democracy and solidarity. We cannot seek transformation if we fear change within.

Original Spanish
Transaltion Nils Sunderman



Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat

Borgo Santo Spirito, 4
00193 Rome
+39-06689 77380 (fax)
sjes@sjcuria.org