

41.

24 iunii 1985

*Provincia Angliae mutat nomen in Provinciam Britanniae.*

## AD PRAEPOSITUM PROVINCIAE

Dear Father,  
P.C.

Thank you for the further information on the proposal to change the name of the Province, in your letter 85/23 of 5 June.

In the light of your recommendation, I have decided to grant the request made as a postulatam by the Provincial Congregation of 1983. I decree that the name of the *English* Province (Provincia *Angliae*) be changed to that of the *British* Province (Provincia *Britanniae*). The new name will replace the old in all future official documents of the Society, and you may put it into effect immediately.

The name of the English *Assistancy*, however, will remain unchanged for the moment. Though it would have been logical for the names of Province and Assistancy to be changed together, the failure to find a satisfactory alternative to describe the Assistancy, in spite of a number of ingenious suggestions, has led me to decide against making a change, at least for the present.

With all good wishes,

Yours sincerely in Christ,  
PETER-HANS KOLVENBACH, S.I.  
*Praep. Gen.*

42.

5 novembris 1985

*Allocutio P. Generalis de Universitate S.I. hodie.*

## THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY TODAY

(Address of Father General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach to the Presidents and Rectors of Jesuit Universities and other Institutions of Higher Education, given at their meeting in Frascati, Italy, November 5, 1985, Feast of All Saints of the Society.)

To begin, I want to welcome you to Rome — actually to Frascati — and to this important meeting. Father John O'Callaghan formally welcomed you last night, but I want to repeat that welcome — in my own name and in the name of all of the members of the Curia. You are busy men; it is not easy to fit another meeting into your schedule. And yet the invitation to this meeting received an overwhelmingly positive response! I

thank you for that response, and I want to say simply that I am very happy and very grateful to be here with you.

I want to say a special word of welcome to the laymen who are present: present not as invited guests or observers, but because you are Directors or Presidents of Jesuit Institutions. You are indeed most welcome! I hope that you will feel very much at home — and that you will forgive us if we keep using the word “Jesuit” throughout the meeting!

You are the men in charge of the Jesuit apostolate of higher education; that makes you a very important group of very important men! I do not want to pass up this opportunity — your presence here together — to speak about the place of education, and especially higher education, within the range of priorities of the Society. I know that you represent a variety of different types of institutions of higher learning; for the sake of simplicity, I am going to refer to all of them as universities.

There can be no doubt that the first document of the 33rd General Congregation was much more reassuring and less of a threat to the universities than Decree Four of the 32nd General Congregation; nevertheless a kind of malaise remains. On the one hand, the Society proclaims that the service of faith and the promotion of justice is the priority among all priorities; on the other hand, the mission of many Jesuits, and the apostolic work in many Provinces, is still overwhelmingly oriented toward formation, education, and specialized research. Words are patient; however, it would be an abuse of the term to say that these works are explicit expressions of involvement in the social apostolate.

The introduction of new terminology — the preferential option for the poor, and especially a preferential (though not exclusive, and not excluding) love for and solidarity with the poor — has eased the tension and offered hope for a resolution; already in 1547, Father Polanco noted that a love for the poor comes naturally to a Jesuit. But the promotion of justice and a love for the poor are not the same. Promotion of justice connotes a certain activism or political immediacy or concrete struggle, none of which seems to be suggested by “a preferential love for the poor”. The “promotion of justice” is certainly contained in the full meaning of the word “love” or “charity”, but it could suggest a commitment to a kind of confrontation and radicality which would make a mockery of the new commandment of love.

On December 21, 1984, speaking to all those working in Vatican offices, John Paul II confirmed the option for the poor as something universal, thereby confirming all previous pronouncements on this topic — in Canada, and especially in Latin America. He said, “I have taken this option, and I repeat it now; I identify myself with it. I am convinced that it could not be otherwise, because this option is the perennial message of the Gospel. This is the way Christ acted; this is the way the apostles acted; this is what the Church has done throughout the 2,000 years of its history ... It

is an option founded essentially on the Word of God, and not on criteria put forth by human sciences or political ideologies.” This call of the Holy Father to the universal Church contains an appeal to the promotion of justice, but it also insists that we be careful not to give too narrow a sense to our preferential option for the poor: “reducing the evangelical message to the dimensions of the socio-political will deprive the poor of their supreme right, that of receiving the more comprehensive truth from the Church about what it really means to be human, about the presence of God alive in human history.” These words provide the reassurance that the preferential option for the poor is a part of the Church’s tradition; they insist that the expression be understood in a wider sense: that the option includes the whole of the truth about the human person. But they also insist on an apostolic orientation which the Society must respond to, without ambiguity and without delay.

During the recent meeting of the Moderators of Provincial Conferences, it was comforting to learn about an impressive number of changes in life style and in choice of ministries throughout the Society. At the same time, it became evident that in many Provinces the promotion of justice, taken in a narrow sense, cannot be regarded as the most pressing problem; this is most especially true in countries that are facing a crisis in Christian faith, and countries under communist rule. It was also obvious that many bishops and lay people are still urging us to dedicate ourselves to the educational and intellectual apostolate, which is a work less obviously oriented toward the promotion of justice or the preferential option for the poor. In their conversations with me, many bishops tell me that we should be doing University work, and leave the option for the poor to others.

For a better understanding of our present situation, I would like to look at the history of the early Society. I ask for the indulgence of historians who are specialists in this field, for I have no doubt that what I am about to say needs to be nuanced and needs verification. But I think that we can rediscover the true apostolic nature of the educational sector through a study of the Ignatian charism.

The Society of Jesus was born and grew up in a university milieu. Our archive in Rome carefully preserves the diploma which attests that, exactly 450 years ago, “Master Ignatius of Loyola, of the Diocese of Pamplona, has attained, with praise and honor, the grade of Master of Arts in the distinguished Faculty of Arts of Paris, having passed the rigorous examinations.” In their correspondence, the first companions freely referred to one another by their university titles: Bachelor Hozes, Master Simon Rodriguez, Licensed Anthony of Araoz, Doctor Peter Canisius. We still do the same thing today in the Society when we use a university expression in speaking about the “scholastics”.

Nevertheless, their university environment seems to have had little effect on the apostolic thinking of the first companions. In his spiritual journey, Ignatius often went against the culture of the time; and the early Society was somewhat anti-intellectual. But when they recognized the need for a "title" as a universal testimony of competence, and when they came to appreciate the value of university studies as a means "to help souls", then the university became an instrument of the apostolate, although a passive one: Ignatius had his first followers take advantage of existing universities to receive an education. It was not until some years later, and at first only in mission countries, that the Society became involved in teaching as an active apostolic instrument; and it was later still, as a consequence of these early experiences, that the Society recognized the apostolic effectiveness of education, and established secondary and university institutions of its own, where lay students and scholastics both studied. Education had become an apostolic priority.

Just as the promotion of justice is changing the life of the Society today, so the preferential option for founding colleges and universities had a profound effect on the newly-born Society. The fact that increasing numbers of Jesuits were sent to the education sector meant that the missionary efforts of the Society were weakened; the lives of Francis Xavier and of our recently beatified Diego de San Vitores bear witness to this tension between apostolic priorities. And the internal life of the Society was itself affected by this apostolic choice. In basic areas such as our apostolic poverty, and the fact that our ministries were to be gratuitous, and also in our government, which became more clearly institutionalized and centralized, this apostolic priority — new in the Society — profoundly changed our life.

The promotion of justice as an apostolic priority today is having the same effect but in the opposite direction. It absorbs a growing proportion of Jesuit activity, depriving our universities — already affected by the lack of vocations and by a multiplicity of complex changes — of valued Jesuit collaborators. There are Jesuits who want to refuse to work in educational institutions, though, ultimately, such a refusal is inadmissible in the Society. For others, the evangelical poverty required by the promotion of justice, by an insertion into the lives of the poor and a solidarity with them, seems to be incompatible with, or at least to call into question, the apostolic poverty of the universities. The promotion of justice leads to a denunciation of the unjust structures of contemporary society; this inevitably has an effect on the educational sector of the Society because it is claimed that educational institutions would rather avoid conflict: because of their clientele, or because of their reputation. In some countries it is claimed that the educational system is itself a part of these unjust structures, because it helps to perpetuate the present division between the

privileged and the excluded. To the extent that our institutions are a part of the prevailing educational system, our own universities are denounced! Each individual Jesuit is beginning to realize that the promotion of justice raises serious questions about his religious commitment, and also questions about the practical details and concrete choices of his life. For, even though there is great variety in works and in life style, no Jesuit can ignore this dimension. Whatever he is doing, it must include an involvement in the promotion of justice; no one can be exempted from solidarity with the human community.

It is clear from this brief historical sketch of the educational involvement of the early Society that, for Ignatius, an apostolic priority — to establish educational institutions — was not an end in itself. Similarly, social involvement cannot become an end in itself. It should also be stressed that the promotion of justice cannot be separated from the new commandment, in which the love of God and the love of neighbour find their unity. The 33rd General Congregation boldly declared that “We have not always recognized that the social justice we are called to is part of that justice of the Gospel which is the embodiment of God’s love and saving mercy.” (I, 32)

Ignatius was well aware of the fact that a school is a school; a university is a university. It has its own finality; it is not simply an opportunity for evangelization or the defense of the faith. Because the spread of the reformation was partly the result of a decline in studies, Ignatius — in search of the integral human person, “virtuous and wise” (Const IV, 308) — embraced the values and the transformation of values which the college or university could guarantee and develop. Dominique Bertrand, in his book *La Politique de S. Ignace de Loyola*, notes that Ignatius must have felt as though the ground was being taken out from under him when he opted for education. Similarly, more than one Jesuit, after the 32nd General Congregation, must have had the feeling that he belonged to a different Society of Jesus, one that was groping for its way. But just as it is wrong to say that the spiritual experience of St. Ignatius was fatally abandoned in the decision to found educational institutions, so it is equally wrong to believe that the Spiritual Exercises cannot be truly realized today except in one or another aspect of the social apostolate. If he is open to the call of the Spirit, a Jesuit can never commit himself unconditionally, either to university work or to a social ministry. His spiritual attitude must reflect the attitude of the Church, which has no specific program in the political, economic, or social order; its purpose is a religious one (*Gaudium et Spes*, 42); its concern is for the fullness of human life, to announce the mystery of salvation, so that all things can be brought together in Christ (Eph 1:10; *Gaudium et Spes*, 42), sharing in the griefs and anxieties of the poor (*G & S*, 1), which are also the griefs and anxieties of the disciples of Christ (cf. *Gaudium et Spes*, 31).

In brief, the Second Vatican Council is inviting us to contemplate humanity as Ignatius taught us to do in the Spiritual Exercises; and the Society, faithful to the experience of Ignatius, continues to dedicate itself, through means that are always being renewed, to work with men and women "in their griefs and anxieties". These are fundamentally spiritual, but they always include a material dimension. Our apostolic work must help people to become more truly human, with full human dignity: active participants in the process of building a better world.

A change in the priorities of the Society in no way calls into question the value of education as such, any more than the change in the early Society called into question the missionary spirit. Decree 4, in spite of erroneous interpretations, actually asked that the educational apostolate be intensified! The decree describes the power that the educational apostolate has to contribute to the formation of multipliers for the process of educating the world itself (60), in order to be a powerful leaven for the transformation of attitudes, humanizing the social climate.

It is not, therefore, education itself that is questioned, but whether it is integrated into the whole apostolic thrust of the Society. Father Arrupe declared very clearly that our purpose in education is to form men and women for others, in imitation of Christ, the Man for others; and he challenged us to work out the pedagogical implications of this objective (AR 18, 238ss).

Economics, for example, while it has its own methods and rules, when taught and studied from the perspective of the promotion of justice, will refuse to be locked into a concept of economy which only deals with "things", but will see that it has to consider the relationships among persons; in this perspective, economics will see material things as instruments for the service of individual people. Medicine, with all of its technical advances and changed methods, when taught and studied from the perspective of the promotion of justice, will give priority to finding cures for the diseases that afflict the poor. Similarly, all other science and technology, when taught and studied from the perspective of the promotion of justice, will be conscious that all research must ultimately promote the dignity of the human person.

Each discipline within the realm of the humanities and social sciences is well aware that the values transmitted depend on the inevitable assumptions about the ideal human person which are used as a starting point. It is here especially that the promotion of justice in the name of the gospel can become tangible and transparent. It must guide and inspire the jurist and the politician, the sociologist and the philosopher and — in a particularly explicit way, because of a more profound knowledge of the faith — the theologian.

Therefore, the option for the poor, or the promotion of justice in the name of the gospel, is not in conflict with the educational apostolate. Our universities, if they are truly Catholic, must bear witness to this priority.

It is in this context that we should read the concern of the Holy See to develop a more comprehensive definition of the Catholic university. It should receive a positive response from all of us; it is a call from the Holy Father. And it is a concern that we need to make our own: to ensure that the Gospel is transparently evident in our universities. All of us need to dedicate ourselves to the search, both loyal and creative, for those elements that specify the Catholic nature of our institutions. Rather than simply object or criticize, we should propose to the Holy See those formulas that best express how we see ourselves. Our focus should not be exclusively on juridical problems, even though they also have their importance within the global vision of the Catholic University.

Each Jesuit apostolate, whether it be in the educational sector or in the social sector or the pastoral sector, has the same rights and the same duties within the one priority of the promotion of justice in the name of the gospel, the preferential option for the poor as a *diakonia fidei*. A Jesuit must be open to all these forms of apostolic work, in full availability. The competence that is necessary for pastoral or social ministry, a knowledge that is broad and deep and constantly being updated, can only come from serious and disciplined university studies; on the other hand, the university will truly live in an ivory tower, divorced from the realities of the country and the people, unless it has close contact — both on and off campus — with pastoral ministries and directly social activities. We have so many possibilities for collaboration among the ministries of the Society that we are not taking advantage of; I am convinced that more active collaboration among the different ministries can make our apostolic work more effective, and that we need to find the concrete means that will make this collaboration possible!

Therefore, instead of seeing the promotion of justice in the name of the gospel as a threat to the educational sector, this apostolic priority that we have received from the Church should be seen as a pressing commitment to re-evaluate our institutions, our teaching priorities, our programs and the people we attract to our schools. A university which does not see the necessity of that evaluation should not be surprised if it is left in splendid isolation, without anything very worthwhile to offer to the world and the people of today. Evaluation of apostolic effectiveness ought to be an ongoing element in the internal life of each university.

On this point, the Jesuit community at the university ought to exercise — not its power, but its authority: that is to say, it should be a principal “author” of the task to be accomplished by all the members of the educational community. Its role is that of guaranteeing, with and for all of the members of the educational community, the transmission of Gospel values and the discovery of an evangelical life-orientation, which is the

distinctive mark of the Catholic university. Too often, this “animation” of the universities is something tacked on, off to the side of the teaching and the research: one has the feeling that teaching and research is at the center of the enterprise, and any question of evaluation or animation is a sort of superfluity; it is overtime work, something that can be sacrificed easily, for lack of time or motivation or energy. But unless it energizes the very heart of the university, the whole enterprise will be snuffed out and become simply a diploma mill. Just as a Jesuit ought to have the courage to “waste time for the Lord in personal prayer” as Father Arrupe desired, so also the scholarly establishment has to dare to “waste time” in self-renewal, in preparing itself for its future service. What we are talking about here is the life or death of the universities.

Before concluding, I want to touch briefly on a few other important points.

It is obvious, and has been obvious for many years, that our educational institutions could not survive without the presence and assistance of many dedicated lay people; given their size, both in the number of students and the number of professors, this is most especially true at the university level. And we have been blessed by God with lay people who have shared our vision and our principles and have worked in our institutions with real dedication. As time goes on, however, we need to do more — in the selection of both professors and administrative staff, but especially in ongoing formation, and in a change of attitude, for both Jesuits and lay people, that will help to create one single educational community.

Perhaps our concept of the university has to change. We used to think of the institution as “ours”, with some lay people helping us — even if their number was much greater than the number of Jesuits. Today, some Jesuits seem to think that the number of lay people has so increased and the control has been so radically transferred, that the institution is no longer really Jesuit; even though it still has the name “Jesuit”, it is really a university at which some Jesuits happen to be working; the apostolic instrument is the Jesuit community. I would insist that the university itself remains an apostolic instrument: not of the Jesuits alone, but of Jesuits and lay people working together. And the head of the institution — whether he be a Jesuit or a lay person — is, in addition to being the professional director of a university, also the apostolic leader of an apostolic instrument. I will not go into this in detail, because you will be discussing this yourselves during this week. But I do want to say that each of you has received a mission from the Society of Jesus, explicitly or implicitly, even though your actual appointment may have been made in other ways, even though the Society exerts no direct juridical influence on the activities of your universities. That mission is apostolic.

In spite of the size of our universities, we must never lose sight of the *cura personalis*, the individual care and concern for the individual student — and also the individual teacher! The number of Jesuits is small; if this traditional Jesuit characteristic is to remain effective, lay people must share our concern for each individual student, and must help us in our efforts to be more than simply a massive institution of mass education. To my knowledge, this has been true in the past; I would only urge you to do whatever is necessary that it remain true today and in the future.

In spite of the difficulties, we must continue to do everything possible to make sure that our universities are institutions of high academic quality. The Church needs quality research and quality formation, and it looks to us for help. We must respond, to the best of our ability.

If our Jesuit Universities are to be true to their tradition, then they must serve the Church in its mission of evangelizing the world. This implies close collaboration with the hierarchical Church, even when that collaboration may seem to create difficulties. The university is not a parish or a Religious Congregation; it has its own way of being and acting, it has its own specific nature. But it cannot be Catholic and at the same time completely autonomous! I am not using that word in any juridical sense, but only insisting that there has to be a close relationship with the Church. The document “The Catholic University in the Modern World” of 1972 tried to define the nature of this relationship in terms that could be applied to the vastly different situations throughout the world. And I have already mentioned our need to make positive contributions toward the development of what will eventually be a more official document. There will always be conflicts between faith and reason. But, if we believe that there is no conflict between them that is insoluble, and if we insist that the search for truth in academic freedom is a genuine service to the Church, then we must also find ways in which the enlightened supervision of the magisterium can be of genuine service to the university.

When Cardinal Garrone, then Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, spoke to the participants of the 1975 meeting of Jesuit Universities, he said that the Catholic University is for the Church today what the Jesuit secondary school was for the Church at the time of the Reformation. I think that today we are coming to see the truth of that statement more clearly. Cultures are changed and societies influenced by the intellectual formation, the communication of values, the research, and the service to the community that takes place in universities. The institutions that you represent have the opportunity — and are given the challenge! — of entering that intellectual world and having an influence on it: working for a better world through the type of students you form and the formation that you give them, through your research activities, through the witness that you offer. It is not an empty phrase to say that your institutions can help to bring about a more just society; that they can

influence governments and business; that they can serve the Church directly through evangelization and theological research and, perhaps just as importantly, indirectly in working for the kingdom of truth, of justice, and of peace. The Jesuit collèges of 1600 were, in a certain sense, more free to develop as they wished. There were outside pressures, but at least they were not subject to strict supervision by accrediting agencies or public authorities. And they were almost alone in offering educational opportunities to people. You are hampered by a multitude of regulations, and you form a small minority in the university world. That makes your work much more difficult, but no less important!

Perhaps everything that I have been saying can be summed up in the one Ignatian word that is so familiar to you: *magis*. You are doing many things well; I am asking you to do better, for the greater glory of God. To seek academic quality, and also Christian service; to form students who are professionally competent, and also concerned for others. I am asking each of you to be professionally excellent executives, and also apostolic leaders.

Father Pedro Arrupe spoke to some of these same concerns at the last meeting of this kind, in August, 1975. I will end by recalling what he said then.

“The characteristic of your work is that of being Jesuits” [... and I would add, ten years later, “that of being men who, though not all Jesuits, value the spirit and tradition of Ignatius of Loyola” ...] “and that of being in your office in order to see to it that the University, as far as is possible and in keeping with its Statutes, correspond to Ignatian ideals. This, in fact, is the spirit that will enable the University as such to best realize its ideal. There is no question here of giving up what is good or essential to the University so that it may be “Jesuit”; it is rather a conviction that applying Ignatian spirituality and principles is the best way to make our Universities truly characteristic, for it enables us to adapt to human society the best that we have to offer it”.

43.

7 novembris 1985

*De apostolatu apud christianos orientales in U.S.A. degentes.*

#### AD PROVINCIALEM NEO EBORACENSIS

Dear Father,  
P.C.

In a letter of 29 December, 1981, Very Rev. Father Dezza, then Delegate of the Holy Father, approved the “Guidelines for a Jesuit Apostolate for Eastern Christians in the United States” (AR XVIII,