



**A Compilation of the  
Major Keynote Addresses Delivered at the  
1999 and 2000 Justice Conferences Sponsored  
by Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education**

# **The Commitment to Justice in Catholic Higher Education**

## **Introduction**

This electronic volume documents the first systematic attempt to examine the effect of the commitment to justice upon the Jesuit institutions of higher education in the United States.

Twenty-five years ago, the Society of Jesus committed itself to the promotion of the justice that is an imperative of Christian Faith. Faith and justice were to inform its entire apostolic works. Leaders of the Jesuit Universities in the United States began examining that commitment to justice during a two-year process, which started in 1998 with a self-study at each university. They planned and implemented three regional conferences in 1999 to examine these self-studies and convened a national justice conference at Santa Clara University in October 2000.

The conference process had three objectives. First, to critically assess how the commitment to justice has been made on Jesuit campuses and determine what difference it has made. Academic and curricular aspects of campus life will be the focus. Second, to develop a better theoretical rationale of social justice as an essential part of higher education, particularly at Jesuit universities. Third, to articulate concrete steps for further implementation.

This volume contains nine papers: the three keynote addresses from the three 1999 regional justice conferences, three of the best papers presented at the 1999 regional conferences, and three addresses from the 2000 national justice conference. The papers vary in length from 16 to 30 pages typewritten, double-spaced. Most of them are 25 pages in length, including endnotes.

**Table of Contents**  
**Section I. Three Keynote addresses**  
**National Justice Conference, October 4-8, 2000**  
**Santa Clara University**

***The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education*** - by **Rev. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J.**, Superior General of the Society of Jesus

In this major and historic essay, Kolvenbach discusses the Society of Jesus' renewed commitment to the promotion of justice as an integral part of Jesuit Education and how that affects Jesuit Universities in the American context.

Page 7

***The Pursuit of Justice in Public Life*** - by **Leon E. Panetta**, Director of the Panetta Institute at California State University at Monterey Bay; former White House chief of staff under President Clinton, 1994-1997; and United States Representative from California's 16<sup>th</sup> (now 17<sup>th</sup>) congressional district from 1977-1993

Page 20

As a man of faith, Panetta explores how his Catholic faith and Jesuit education motivated his calling to pursue justice in public service. He approaches this issue of justice and defines it not as an academic but by his own experience, with the hope that it may help his readers in their quest to try to ultimately provide students with that commitment to justice that is so important.

***Academic Institutions as Citizens for Justice*** - by **Claire L. Gaudiani**, former president of Connecticut College and president of the New London Development Corporation.

Gaudiani believes and has demonstrated in her career that universities must serve the communities in which they exist. She argues that justice will be served only when universities commit to their work in the community the same knowledge, wisdom, and access to influence and expertise that they exert in pursuing the highest goals of their own institutions.

Page 25

**Section II. Three Keynote addresses  
Regional Justice Conferences, 1999**

***Of Kingfishers and Dragonflies: Faith and Justice at the Core of Jesuit Education—***  
**by Joseph Daoust, S.J.**, President, Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley. Keynote  
Address, Regional Justice Conference, Santa Clara University, October 15, 1999

Daoust argues that commitment to faith and justice must be at the very core of the Jesuit university's mission, intrinsic to its central activities, part of its very essence, at the heart of its educational character. If not, then the Jesuit University is not being true to its identity.

Page 35

***Justice in Jesuit Education Today: Integrating the Hunger for Truth and the Hunger for Bread—***  
**by Paul Locatelli, S.J.** President, Santa Clara University. Keynote Address,  
Regional Justice Conference, University of Detroit Mercy, June 4, 1999

Locatelli describes a new mission for Jesuit education, one that integrates the pursuit of educational excellence with the pursuit of justice. In our interconnected world, argues Locatelli, we must expand our intellectual inquiry to include the full range of human experience today: from technological progress and global economy to the hunger and frustration that plague over a billion and half people on this planet.

Page 46

***The Identity Debate, the Ministry of Justice, and Jesuit Higher Education—***  
**by Rev. Brian Hehir**, Dean, Harvard Divinity School. Keynote Address, Regional Justice  
Conference, Boston College, October 30, 1999,

In this essay, Hehir makes what he calls a synthetic statement of the “Catholic identity” debate as he sees it, its roots and character. Secondly, he talks about the ministry of justice as the emergence of an idea, which has become a movement in Catholicism. And thirdly, he talks about Jesuit higher education on the grounds of moving from Catholic and Jesuit identity to even deeper engagement in the pursuit of justice.

Page 54

### SECTION III. THREE PAPERS FROM THE REGIONAL JUSTICE CONFERENCES

***Broadening the Vision of Justice in Jesuit Higher Education***— by **Patrick H. Byrne**, Philosophy Department, Boston College. Paper delivered October 30, 1999 at Boston College Justice Conference

Byrne argues that the notion of justice implicit in the Jesuit 32<sup>nd</sup> General Congregation's, Decree 4, is ambiguous, narrow, and especially problematic for the mission of higher education. Byrne discusses Aristotle's theory of justice as a step toward a broader and more refined vision of justice. And lastly, he suggests ways in which the work of Bernard Lonergan might be used to broaden still further this Aristotelian vision of justice in ways that are both more adequate to the demands of our contemporary world, and more inclusive of the work proper to a modern university.

Page 67

***Conversations About Distributive Justice: With the "There Isn't Enough Generation"***— by **Catharyn A. Baird**, Professor of Business, Regis University, Denver, Colorado. Paper delivered October 16, 1999 at Santa Clara Justice Conference

The Judeo-Christian prophetic tradition is rich with admonitions to those privileged to be attentive to the plight of the less fortunate. In this essay, Baird discusses how she introduces her students to concepts of economic justice and Christian social teaching (both in the Catholic and Protestant traditions.)

Page 81

***Justice and College Science Aren't Related ... or are they?*** — By **Trileigh Tucker**, Director, Ecological Studies Program, Seattle University, Seattle, Washington. Paper delivered October 16, 1999 at Santa Clara Justice Conference

During the search for a new Dean of the School of Science and Engineering at Seattle University, Stroh suggested to the science and engineering faculty that one of the interview questions should ask about candidates' interest in justice issues. The varied responses to her suggestion both surprised and motivated Stroh to explore whether, why, and how justice and college natural science should be interconnected, particularly at Jesuit universities.

Page 92

**Section I. Three Keynote addresses**  
**National Justice Conference, October 4-8, 2000**  
**Santa Clara University**

## **The service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education**

Rev. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J.  
Superior General of the Society of Jesus  
Santa Clara University, October 6, 2000

### Introduction

This conference on the commitment to justice in American Jesuit higher education comes at an important moment in the rich history of the twenty-eight colleges and universities represented here this evening. We also join Santa Clara University in celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding.

Just as significant as this moment in history, is our location. Santa Clara Valley, named after the mission at the heart of this campus, is known worldwide as "Silicon Valley," the home of the microchip. Surely when Father Nobili, the founder of this University, saw the dilapidated church and compound of the former Franciscan mission, he could never have imagined this valley as the center of a global technological revolution.

This juxtaposition of mission and microchip is emblematic of all the Jesuit schools. Originally founded to serve the educational and religious needs of poor immigrant populations, they have become highly sophisticated institutions of learning in the midst of global wealth, power and culture. The turn of the millennium finds them in all their diversity: they are larger, better equipped, more complex and professional than ever before, and also more concerned about their Catholic, Jesuit identity.

In the history of American Jesuit higher education, there is much to be grateful for, first to God and the Church, and surely to the many faculty, students, administrators and benefactors who have made it what it is today. But this conference brings you together from across the United States with guests from Jesuit universities elsewhere, not to congratulate one another, but for a strategic purpose. On behalf of the complex, professional and pluralistic institutions you represent, you are here to face a question as difficult as it is central: How can the Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States express faith-filled concern for justice in what they are as Christian academies of higher learning, in what their faculty do, and in what their students become?

As a contribution to your response, I would like to (I.) reflect with you on what faith and justice has meant for Jesuits since 1975 and then (II.) consider some concrete circumstances of today, (III) to suggest what justice rooted in faith could mean in American Jesuit higher education and (IV.) conclude with an agenda for the first decade of the years 2000.

### I. The Jesuit commitment to faith and justice, new in 1975

I begin by recalling another anniversary, which this conference commemorates. Twenty-five years ago, ten years after the closing of the Second Vatican Council, Jesuit delegates from around the world gathered at the 32nd General Congregation (GC), to consider how the Society of Jesus was responding to the deep transformation of all Church life that was called for and launched by Vatican II.

After much prayer and deliberation, the Congregation slowly realized that the entire Society of Jesus in all its many works was being invited by the Spirit of God to set out on a new direction. The overriding purpose of the Society of Jesus, namely "the service of faith," must also include "the promotion of justice." This new direction was not confined to those already working with the poor and marginalized in what was called "the social apostolate." Rather, this commitment was to be "a concern of our whole life and a dimension of all our apostolic endeavors."<sup>1</sup> So central to the mission of the entire Society was this union of faith and justice that it was to become the "integrating factor" of all the Society's works,<sup>2</sup> and in this light "great attention" was to be paid in evaluating every work, including educational institutions.<sup>3</sup>

I myself attended GC 32, representing the Province of the Near East where, for centuries, the apostolic activity of the Jesuits has concentrated on education in a famous university and some outstanding high schools. Of course some Jesuits worked in very poor villages, refugee camps or prisons, and some fought for the rights of workers, immigrants, and foreigners; but this was not always considered authentic, mainstream Jesuit work. In Beirut we were well aware that our medical school, staffed by very holy Jesuits, was producing, at least at that time, some of the most corrupt citizens in the city, but this was taken for granted. The social mood of the explosive Near East did not favor a struggle against sinful, unjust structures. The liberation of Palestine was the most important social issue. The Christian churches had committed themselves to many works of charity, but involvement in the promotion of justice would have tainted them by association with leftist movements and political turmoil.

The situation I describe in the Near East was not exceptional in the worldwide Society at that time. I was not the only delegate who was ignorant of matters pertaining to justice and injustice. The 1971 Synod of Bishops had prophetically declared, "Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the gospel, or, in other words, of the church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation,"<sup>4</sup> but few of us knew what this meant in our concrete circumstances.

Earlier, in 1966, Father Arrupe had pointed out to the Latin American Provincials how the socio-economic situation throughout the continent contradicted the Gospel, and "from this situation rises the moral obligation of the Society to rethink all its ministries and every form of its apostolates to see if they really offer a response to the urgent priorities which justice and social equity call for."<sup>5</sup> Many of us failed to see the relevance of his message to our situation. But please note that Father Arrupe did not ask for the suppression of the apostolate of education in favor of social activity. On the contrary, he affirmed that "even an apostolate like education - at all levels - which is so sincerely wanted by the Society and whose importance is clear to the entire world, in its concrete forms today must be the object of reflection in the light of the demands of the social problem."<sup>6</sup>

Perhaps the incomprehension or reluctance of some of us delegates, was one reason why GC 32 finally took a radical stand. With a passion both inspiring and disconcerting, the General Congregation coined the formula, "the service of faith and the promotion of justice," and used it adroitly to push every Jesuit work and every individual Jesuit to make a choice, providing little leeway for the fainthearted. Many inside and outside the Society were outraged by the "promotion of justice." As Father Arrupe rightly perceived, his Jesuits were collectively entering upon a more severe way of the cross, which would surely entail misunderstandings and even opposition on the part of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, many good friends, and some of our own members. Today, twenty-five years later, this option has become integral to our Jesuit identity, to the awareness of our mission, and to our public image in both Church and society.<sup>7</sup>

The summary expression "the service of faith and the promotion of justice" has all the characteristics of a world-conquering slogan using a minimum of words to inspire a maximum of dynamic vision, but at the risk of ambiguity. Let us examine, first the service of faith, then the promotion of justice.

#### A. The service of faith

From our origins in 1540 the Society has been officially and solemnly charged with "the defense and the propagation of the faith." In 1975, the Congregation reaffirmed that, for us Jesuits, the defense and propagation of the faith is a matter of to be or not to be, even if the words themselves can change. Faithful to the Vatican Council, the Congregation wanted our preaching and teaching not to proselytize, not to impose our religion on others, but rather to propose Jesus and his message of God's Kingdom in a spirit of love to everyone.

Just as the Vatican had abandoned the name "Propaganda Fidei", GC 32 passed from propagation to service of faith. In Decree 4, the Congregation did use the expression "the proclamation of faith," which I prefer.<sup>8</sup> In the context of centuries of Jesuit spirituality, however, "the service of faith" cannot mean anything other than to bring the counter-cultural gift of Christ to our world.<sup>9</sup> But why "the service of faith"? The Congregation itself answers this question by using the Greek expression "diakonia fidei,"<sup>10</sup> It refers to Christ the suffering Servant carrying out his "diakonia" in total service of his Father by laying down his life for the salvation of all. Thus, for a Jesuit, "not just any response to the needs of the men and women of today will do. The initiative must come from the Lord laboring in events and people here and now. God invites us to follow Christ in his labors, on his terms and in his way."<sup>11</sup>

I do not think we delegates at the 32nd Congregation were aware of the theological and ethical dimensions of Christ's mission of service. Greater attention to the "diakonia fidei" may have prevented some of the misunderstandings provoked by the phrase "the promotion of justice."

#### B. The promotion of justice

This expression is difficult to translate in many languages. We delegates were familiar with sales promotions in a department store or the promotion of friends or enemies to a higher rank or position; we were not familiar with the promotion of justice. To be fair, let us remember that a general congregation is not a scientific academy equipped to distinguish and to define, to clarify

and to classify. In the face of radically new apostolic needs, it chose to inspire, to teach and even to prophesy. In its desire to be more incisive in the promotion of justice, the Congregation avoided traditional words like charity, mercy, or love, unfashionable words in 1975. Neither philanthropy nor even development would do. The Congregation instead used the word "promotion" with its connotation of a well-planned strategy to make the world just.

Since Saint Ignatius wanted love to be expressed not only in words but also in deeds, the Congregation committed the Society to the promotion of justice as a concrete, radical but proportionate response to an unjustly suffering world. Fostering the virtue of justice in people was not enough. Only a substantive justice can bring about the kinds of structural and attitudinal changes that are needed to uproot those sinful oppressive injustices that are a scandal against humanity and God.

This sort of justice requires an action-oriented commitment to the poor with a courageous personal option. In some ears the relatively mild expression, "promotion of justice," echoed revolutionary, subversive and even violent language. For example, the American State Department recently accused some Colombian Jesuits of being Marxist-inspired founders of a guerilla organization. When challenged the U.S. government apologized for this mistake, which shows that some message did get through.

Just as in "diakonia fidei" the term faith is not specified, so in the "promotion of justice," the term justice also remains ambiguous. The 32nd Congregation would not have voted for Decree 4 if, on the one hand, socio-economic justice had been excluded or if, on the other hand, the justice of the Gospel had not been included. A stand in favor of social justice that was almost ideological, and simultaneously a strong option for "that justice of the Gospel which embodies God's love and saving mercy"<sup>12</sup> were both indispensable. Refusing to clarify the relationship between the two, GC 32 maintained its radicality by simply juxtaposing "diakonia fidei" and "promotion of justice."

In other decrees of the same Congregation, when the two dimensions of the one mission of the Society were placed together, some delegates sought to achieve a more integrated expression by proposing amendments such as the service of faith through or in the promotion of justice. Such expressions might better render the 1971 Synod's identification of "action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world [as] a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the gospel."<sup>13</sup> But one can understand the Congregation's fear that too neat or integrated an approach might weaken the prophetic appeal and water down the radical change in our mission.

In retrospect, this simple juxtaposition sometimes led to an "incomplete, slanted and unbalanced reading" of Decree 4,<sup>14</sup> unilaterally emphasizing "one aspect of this mission to the detriment of the other,"<sup>15</sup> treating faith and justice as alternative or even rival tracks of ministry. "Dogmatism or ideology sometimes led us to treat each other more as adversaries than as companions. The promotion of justice has sometimes been separated from its wellspring of faith."<sup>16</sup>

On the one side, the faith dimension was too often presumed and left implicit, as if our identity as Jesuits were enough. Some rushed headlong towards the promotion of justice without much

analysis or reflection and with only occasional reference to the justice of the Gospel. They seemed to consign the service of faith to a dying past.

Those on the other side clung to a certain style of faith and Church. They gave the impression that God's grace had to do only with the next life, and that divine reconciliation entailed no practical obligation to set things right here on earth.

In this frank assessment I have used, not so much my own words but rather those of subsequent Congregations, so as to share with you the whole Society's remorse for whatever distortions or excesses occurred, and to demonstrate how, over the last twenty-five years, the Lord has patiently been teaching us to serve the faith that does justice in a more integral way.

### C. The ministry of education

In the midst of radical statements and unilateral interpretations associated with Decree 4, many raised doubts about our maintaining large educational institutions. They insinuated, if they did not insist, that direct social work among the poor and involvement with their movements should take priority. Today, however, the value of the educational apostolate is generally recognized, being the sector occupying the greatest Jesuit manpower and resources, but only on condition that it transform its goals, contents, and methods.

Even before GC 32, Father Arrupe had already fleshed out the meaning of "diakonia fidei" for educational ministries when he told the 1973 International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe: "Today our prime educational objective must be to form men for others; men who will live not for themselves but for God and his Christ - for the God-man who lived and died for all the world; men who cannot even conceive of love of God which does not include love for the least of their neighbors; men completely convinced that love of God which does not issue in justice for men is a farce."<sup>17</sup> My predecessor's address was not well received by many alumni at the Valencia meeting, but the expression, "men and women for others," really helped the educational institutions of the Society to ask serious questions that led to their transformation.<sup>18</sup>

Father Ignacio Ellacuría, in his 1982 convocation address here at Santa Clara University, eloquently expressed his conviction in favor of the promotion of justice in the educational apostolate: "A Christian university must take into account the Gospel preference for the poor. This does not mean that only the poor study at the university; it does not mean that the university should abdicate its mission of academic excellence - excellence needed in order to solve complex social problems. It does mean that the university should be present intellectually where it is needed: to provide science for those who have no science; to provide skills for the unskilled; to be a voice for those who do not possess the academic qualifications to promote and legitimate their rights."<sup>19</sup>

In these two statements, we discover the same concern to go beyond a disincarnate spiritualism or a secular social activism, so as to renew the educational apostolate in word and in action at the service of the Church in a world of unbelief and of injustice. We should be very grateful for all that has been achieved in this apostolate, both faithful to the characteristics of 400 years of

Ignatian education and open to the changing signs of the times. Today, one or two generations after Decree 4, we face a world that has an even greater need for the faith that does justice.

## II. A "composition" of our time and place

The twenty-five year history we lived through and have briefly surveyed, brings us to the present. Ignatius of Loyola begins many meditations in his Spiritual Exercises with "a composition of place," an exercise of the imagination to situate prayerful contemplation in concrete human circumstances. Since this world is the arena of God's presence and activity, Ignatius believes that we can find God if we approach the world with generous faith and a discerning spirit.

Meeting in Silicon Valley brings to mind, not only the intersection of the mission and the microchip, but also the dynamism and even dominance that are characteristics of the United States at this time. Enormous talent and unprecedented prosperity are concentrated in this country, which spawns 64 new millionaires every day. This is the headquarters of the new economy that reaches around the globe and is transforming the basic fabric of business, work, and communications. Thousands of immigrants arrive from everywhere: entrepreneurs from Europe, high-tech professionals from South Asia who staff the service industries as well as workers from Latin America and Southeast Asia who do the physical labor - thus, a remarkable ethnic, cultural and class diversity.

At the same time the United States struggles with new social divisions aggravated by "the digital divide" between those with access to the world of technology and those left out. This rift, with its causes in class, racial and economic differences, has its root cause in chronic discrepancies in the quality of education. Here in Silicon Valley, for example, some of the world's premier research universities flourish alongside struggling public schools where Afro-American and immigrant students drop out in droves. Nation-wide, one child in every six is condemned to ignorance and poverty.

This valley, this nation and the whole world look very different from the way they looked twenty-five years ago. With the collapse of Communism and the end of the Cold War, national and even international politics have been eclipsed by a resurgent capitalism that faces no ideological rival. The European Union slowly pulls the continent's age-old rivals together into a community but also a fortress. The former "Second World" struggles to repair the human and environmental damage left behind by so-called socialist regimes. Industries are re-locating to poorer nations, not to distribute wealth and opportunity, but to exploit the relative advantage of low wages and lax environmental regulations. Many countries become yet poorer, especially where corruption and exploitation prevail over civil society and where violent conflict keeps erupting.

This composition of our time and place embraces six billion people with their faces young and old, some being born and others dying, some white and many brown and yellow and black.<sup>20</sup> Each one a unique individual, they all aspire to live life, to use their talents, to support their families and care for their children and elders, to enjoy peace and security, and to make tomorrow better.

Thanks to science and technology, human society is able to solve problems such as feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, or developing more just conditions of life, but remains stubbornly unable to accomplish this. How can a booming economy, the most prosperous and global ever, still leave over half of humanity in poverty? GC 32 makes its own sober analysis and moral assessment: "We can no longer pretend that the inequalities and injustices of our world must be borne as part of the inevitable order of things. It is now quite apparent that they are the result of what man himself, man in his selfishness, has done ... Despite the opportunities offered by an ever more serviceable technology, we are simply not willing to pay the price of a more just and more humane society."<sup>21</sup>

Injustice is rooted in a spiritual problem, and its solution requires a spiritual conversion of each one's heart and a cultural conversion of our global society so that humankind, with all the powerful means at its disposal, might exercise the will to change the sinful structures afflicting our world. The yearly Human Development Report of the United Nations is a haunting challenge to look critically at basic conditions of life in the United States and the 175 other nations that share our one planet.<sup>22</sup>

Such is the world in all its complexity, with great global promises and countless tragic betrayals. Such is the world in which Jesuit institutions of higher education are called to serve faith and promote justice.

### III. American Jesuit Higher Education for faith and justice

Within the complex time and place we are in, and in the light of the recent General Congregations, I want to spell out several ideal characteristics, as manifest in three complementary dimensions of Jesuit higher education: in who our students become, in what our faculty do, and in how our universities proceed. When I speak of ideals, some are easy to meet, others remain persistently challenging, but together they serve to orient our schools and, in the long run, to identify them. At the same time, the U.S. Provincials have recently established an important Higher Education Committee to propose criteria on the staffing, leadership and Jesuit sponsorship of our colleges and universities.<sup>23</sup> May these criteria help to implement the ideal characteristics we now meditate on together.

#### A. Formation and learning

Today's predominant ideology reduces the human world to a global jungle whose primordial law is the survival of the fittest. Students who subscribe to this view want to be equipped with well-honed professional and technical skills in order to compete in the market and secure one of the relatively scarce fulfilling and lucrative jobs available. This is the success which many students (and parents!) expect.

All American universities, ours included, are under tremendous pressure to opt entirely for success in this sense. But what our students want - and deserve - includes but transcends this "worldly success" based on marketable skills. The real measure of our Jesuit universities lies in who our students become.

For four hundred and fifty years, Jesuit education has sought to educate "the whole person" intellectually and professionally, psychologically, morally and spiritually. But in the emerging global reality, with its great possibilities and deep contradictions, the whole person is different from the whole person of the Counter-Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, or the 20th Century. Tomorrow's "whole person" cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world. Tomorrow's whole person must have, in brief, a well-educated solidarity.

We must therefore raise our Jesuit educational standard to "educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world." Solidarity is learned through "contact" rather than through "concepts," as the Holy Father said recently at an Italian university conference.<sup>24</sup> When the heart is touched by direct experience, the mind may be challenged to change. Personal involvement with innocent suffering, with the injustice others suffer, is the catalyst for solidarity which then gives rise to intellectual inquiry and moral reflection.

Students, in the course of their formation, must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn to feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering and engage it constructively. They should learn to perceive, think, judge, choose and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed. Campus ministry does much to foment such intelligent, responsible and active compassion, compassion that deserves the name solidarity.

Our universities also boast a splendid variety of in-service programs, outreach programs, insertion programs, off-campus contacts and hands-on courses. These should not be too optional or peripheral, but at the core of every Jesuit university's program of studies.

Our students are involved in every sort of social action - tutoring drop-outs, demonstrating in Seattle, serving in soup kitchens, promoting pro-life, protesting against the School of the Americas - and we are proud of them for it. But the measure of Jesuit universities is not what our students do but who they become and the adult Christian responsibility they will exercise in future towards their neighbor and their world. For now, the activities they engage in, even with much good effect, are for their formation. This does not make the university a training camp for social activists. Rather, the students need close involvement with the poor and the marginal now, in order to learn about reality and become adults of solidarity in the future.

## B. Research and teaching

If the measure and purpose of our universities lies in what the students become, then the faculty are at the heart of our universities. Their mission is tirelessly to seek the truth and to form each student into a whole person of solidarity who will take responsibility for the real world. What do they need in order to fulfil this essential vocation?

The faculty's "research, which must be rationally rigorous, firmly rooted in faith and open to dialogue with all people of good will,"<sup>25</sup> not only obeys the canons of each discipline, but ultimately embraces human reality in order to help make the world a more fitting place for six

billion of us to inhabit. I want to affirm that university knowledge is valuable for its own sake and at the same time is knowledge that must ask itself, "For whom? For what?"<sup>26</sup>

Usually we speak of professors in the plural, but what is at stake is more than the sum of so many individual commitments and efforts. It is a sustained interdisciplinary dialogue of research and reflection, a continuous pooling of expertise. The purpose is to assimilate experiences and insights according to their different disciplines in "a vision of knowledge which, well aware of its limitations, is not satisfied with fragments but tries to integrate them into a true and wise synthesis"<sup>27</sup> about the real world. Unfortunately many faculty still feel academically, humanly and I would say spiritually unprepared for such an exchange.

In some disciplines such as the life sciences, the social sciences, law, business, or medicine, the connections with "our time and place" may seem more obvious. These professors apply their disciplinary specialties to issues of justice and injustice in their research and teaching about health care, legal aid, public policy, and international relations. But every field or branch of knowledge has values to defend, with repercussions on the ethical level. Every discipline, beyond its necessary specialization, must engage with human society, human life, and the environment in appropriate ways, cultivating moral concern about how people ought to live together.

All professors, in spite of the cliché of the ivory tower, are in contact with the world. But no point of view is ever neutral or value-free. By preference, by option, our Jesuit point of view is that of the poor. So our professors' commitment to faith and justice entails a most significant shift in viewpoint and choice of values. Adopting the point of view of those who suffer injustice, our professors seek the truth and share their search and its results with our students. A legitimate question, even if it does not sound academic, is for each professor to ask, "When researching and teaching, where and with whom is my heart?" To expect our professors to make such an explicit option and speak about it is obviously not easy; it entails risks. But I do believe that this is what Jesuit educators have publicly stated, in Church and in society, to be our defining commitment.

To make sure that the real concerns of the poor find their place in research, faculty members need an organic collaboration with those in the Church and in society who work among and for the poor and actively seek justice. They should be involved together in all aspects: presence among the poor, designing the research, gathering the data, thinking through problems, planning and action, doing evaluation and theological reflection. In each Jesuit Province where our universities are found, the faculty's privileged working relationships should be with projects of the Jesuit social apostolate - on issues such as poverty and exclusion, housing, AIDS, ecology and Third World debt - and with the Jesuit Refugee Service helping refugees and forcibly displaced people.

Just as the students need the poor in order to learn, so the professors need partnerships with the social apostolate in order to research and teach and form. Such partnerships do not turn Jesuit universities into branch plants of social ministries or agencies of social change, as certain rhetoric of the past may have led some to fear, but are a verifiable pledge of the faculty's option and really help, as the colloquial expression goes, "to keep your feet to the fire!"

If the professors choose viewpoints incompatible with the justice of the Gospel and consider researching, teaching and learning to be separable from moral responsibility for their social repercussions, they are sending a message to their students. They are telling them that they can pursue their careers and self-interest without reference to anyone "other" than themselves.

By contrast, when faculty do take up inter-disciplinary dialogue and socially-engaged research in partnership with social ministries, they are exemplifying and modeling knowledge which is service, and the students learn by imitating them as "masters of life and of moral commitment,"<sup>28</sup> as the Holy Father said.

### C. Our way of proceeding

If the measure of our universities is who the students become, and if the faculty are the heart of it all, then what is there left to say? It is perhaps the third topic, the character of our universities - how they proceed internally and how they impact on society - which is the most difficult.

We have already dwelt on the importance of formation and learning, of research and teaching. The social action that the students undertake, and the socially-relevant work that the professors do, are vitally important and necessary, but these do not add up to the full character of a Jesuit university; they neither exhaust its faith-justice commitment nor really fulfill its responsibilities to society.

What, then, constitutes this ideal character? and what contributes to the public's perception of it? In the case of a Jesuit university, this character must surely be the mission, which is defined by GC 32 and reaffirmed by GC 34: the diakonia fidei and the promotion of justice, as the characteristic Jesuit university way of proceeding and of serving socially.

In the words of GC 34, a Jesuit university must be faithful to both the noun "university" and to the adjective "Jesuit." To be a university requires dedication "to research, teaching and the various forms of service that correspond to its cultural mission." To be Jesuit "requires that the university act in harmony with the demands of the service of faith and promotion of justice found in Decree 4 of GC 32."<sup>29</sup>

The first way, historically, that our universities began living out their faith-justice commitment was through their admissions policies, affirmative action for minorities, and scholarships for disadvantaged students;<sup>30</sup> and these continue to be effective means. An even more telling expression of the Jesuit university's nature is found in policies concerning hiring and tenure. As a university it is necessary to respect the established academic, professional and labor norms, but as Jesuit it is essential to go beyond them and find ways of attracting, hiring and promoting those who actively share the mission.

I believe that we have made considerable and laudable Jesuit efforts to go deeper and further: we have brought our Ignatian spirituality, our reflective capacities, some of our international resources, to bear. Good results are evident, for example, in the Decree "Jesuits and University Life" of the last General Congregation and in this very Conference on "Commitment to Justice in

Jesuit Higher Education"; and good results are hoped for from the Higher Education Committee working on Jesuit criteria.

Paraphrasing Ignacio Ellacuría, it is the nature of every University to be a social force, and it is the calling of a Jesuit university to take conscious responsibility for being such a force for faith and justice. Every Jesuit academy of higher learning is called to live in a social reality (as we saw in the "composition" of our time and place) and to live for that social reality, to shed university intelligence upon it and to use university influence to transform it.<sup>31</sup> Thus Jesuit universities have stronger and different reasons, than many other academic and research institutions, for addressing the actual world as it unjustly exists and for helping to reshape it in the light of the Gospel.

IV. In conclusion, an agenda

The twenty-fifth anniversary of GC 32 is a motive for great thanksgiving.

We give thanks for our Jesuit university awareness of the world in its entirety and in its ultimate depth, created yet abused, sinful yet redeemed, and we take up our Jesuit university responsibility for human society that is so scandalously unjust, so complex to understand, and so hard to change. With the help of others and especially the poor, we want to play our role as students, as teachers and researchers, and as Jesuit university in society.

As Jesuit higher education, we embrace new ways of learning and being formed in the pursuit of adult solidarity; new methods of researching and teaching in an academic community of dialogue; and a new university way of practicing faith-justice in society.

As we assume our Jesuit university characteristics in the new century, we do so with seriousness and hope. For this very mission has produced martyrs who prove that "an institution of higher learning and research can become an instrument of justice in the name of the Gospel."<sup>32</sup> But implementing Decree 4 is not something a Jesuit university accomplishes once and for all. It is rather an ideal to keep taking up and working at, a cluster of characteristics to keep exploring and implementing, a conversion to keep praying for.

In *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, Pope John Paul II charges Catholic universities with a challenging agenda for teaching, research and service: "The dignity of human life, the promotion of justice for all, the quality of personal and family life, the protection of nature, the search for peace and political stability, a more just sharing in the world's resources, and a new economic and political order that will better serve the human community at a national and international level."<sup>33</sup> These are both high ideals and concrete tasks. I encourage our Jesuit colleges and universities to take them up with critical understanding and deep conviction, with buoyant faith and much hope in the early years of the new century.

The beautiful words of GC 32 show us a long path to follow: "The way to faith and the way to justice are inseparable ways. It is up this undivided road, this steep road, that the pilgrim Church" - the Society of Jesus, the Jesuit College and University - "must travel and toil. Faith and justice

are undivided in the Gospel which teaches that 'faith makes its power felt through love.'<sup>34</sup> They cannot therefore be divided in our purpose, our action, our life."<sup>35</sup> For the greater glory of God.

Thank you very much.

1 G.C. 32, D.4, n.47.

2 GC32, D.2, n.9.

3 See GC 32, D.2, n.9 and D.4, n.76.

4 1971 Synod of Bishops, "Justice in the World."

5 Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "On the Social Apostolate in Latin America," December 1966 (AR XIV, 791).

6 Ibid.

7 Cf. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., "On the Social Apostolate," January 2000, n.3.

8 "Since evangelisation is proclamation of that faith which is made operative in love of others (see Galatians 5:6; Ephesians 4:15), the promotion of justice is indispensable to it," (GC32, D.4, n.28).

9 Cf. GC 34, D.26, n.5.

10 For example, GC32, D.11, n.13.

11 GC 34, D. 26, n.8.

12 GC 33, D.1, n.32.

13 1971 Synod of Bishops, "Justice in the World."

14 Pedro Arrupe, *Rooted and Grounded in Love*, 67 (AR XVIII, 500).

15 GC33, D.1, n.33.

16 GC34, D.3, n.2.

17 Pedro Arrupe, S.J., *Address to the European Jesuit Alumni Congress, Valencia, August 1973, in Hombres para los demás*, Barcelona: Diafora, 1983, p. 159.

18 Cf. *The Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Secondary Education Association, 1987.

19 Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J., "The Task of a Christian University," Convocation address at the University of Santa Clara, June 12, 1982; "Una universidad para el pueblo," *Diakonía* 6:23 (1982), 41-57.

20 See "Contemplation on the Incarnation," Ignatius of Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises*, nos. 101-109.

21 GC32, D.4, nn.27, 20

22 United Nations Development Program, *Human Development Report, 1990-present* (annual).

23 In February 2000, the Jesuit Conference established a five-man Committee on Higher Education to prepare recommendations regarding 1) sponsorship by the Society of U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities; 2) assignment of personnel to these institutions; 3) selection of Presidents (particularly non-Jesuit Presidents) for these institutions.

24 John Paul II, *Address to Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, May 5, 2000*, n.9.

25 Ibid. n.7.

26 Cf. GC34, D.17, n.6.

27 John Paul II, *op.cit.*, n.5.

28 John Paul II, *Address to the Faculty of Medicine, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, 26 June 1984*.

29 GC34, D.17, nn.6,7.

30 "For the poor [the universities] serve as major channels for social advancement" (GC34, D.17, n.2).

31 Ellacuría, op.cit.

32 Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., Address to the Congregation of Provincials (20/09/90), AR 20 (1990), p. 452.

33 John Paul II, Ex Corde Ecclesiae, August 1990, n. 32.

34 Galatians 5:6.

35 GC32, D.2, n.8.

**The Pursuit of Justice in Public Life**  
**Santa Clara University**  
October 6, 2000

Leon E. Panetta  
Former U.S. Congressman from California  
White House Chief of Staff for President Clinton

I am honored to have the opportunity to reflect on the issue of justice in Jesuit higher education. I do not approach this issue today as an academic or as a teacher. I approach the issue of justice and try to define it by my own experience, with a prayer that it may help you in your quest to try to ultimately provide students with that commitment to justice that is so important.

Justice is a vital component of our faith and a vital component of our nation in the commitment to liberty and justice for all. Surely, it is an integral part of the tradition of Jesuit higher education -- educating good citizens who would contribute to the common good of civil societies. But justice, like the proverbial elephant that was examined by the blindfolded explorers, can be defined very differently based on which part you touch. It ranges from John Stewart Mill and the utilitarian definition that justice is the right thing to do, where the right thing to do is what produces the most good. Locke and Rousseau talked of justice as fairness in the social contract. The teachings of the Church relate justice to the dignity of the individual created in God's image. There is also the justice of the Wild West, defined by a smoking gun, in the hands of a Wyatt Earp or a Judge Roy Bean, as well as the case law definitions of justice by Oliver Wendell Holmes and Hugo Black and others. Again, consider the justice that the people of Serbia exercised in the streets of Belgrade against Milosevic. Justice is one of those paradoxes. It can be argued to support every person's issue, every candidate's platform, every cause, every country's policy, every act of war, every closing argument by a prosecutor or a defendant regardless of guilt.

The advantage of Jesuit education is that it can create a central focus for students on what justice is all about. It promotes service *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam* ("For the greater glory of God") and acknowledges the dimensions of justice -- dimensions of justice to that very cause in the work for peace and equity and human rights and a healthy environment, global economies. Nothing can be exempted from the call to justice. That focus is what Jesuit education is all about.

Justice is a matter of education, of learning, of values passed on from others -- by parents, by faith, by friends, by teachers, by experience. My Italian immigrant parents brought their old-country values to this nation -- the importance of family, of faith, of loyalty, of hard work, of caring for one another, of common sense. The nuns who taught me in grammar school taught me about faith built on hope and love and charity. My friends gave me the ability to understand each other and the special uniqueness of each human being that makes them all special. My teachers, particularly the Jesuits here at Santa Clara -- people like Father [??] Donovan and Father Austin Fagothey reinforced the fundamental concepts of fairness, of right and wrong, and the importance of achieving the common good. And my wife and children taught me what love and giving is all about. Like the mariners of old, experience in life gives us a compass, provides us

the stars, tells us about the wind and the currents of life, may even provide us with a sturdy sail. But justice can only be achieved if it is a destination for all of us.

I believe that at the core of Jesuit education lies the relationship of education to justice. Jesuits taught me that it isn't just enough to have a compass and to have the stars; it isn't enough to just know about the currents in life. To really achieve justice, you have to set sail, and you've got to move forward. Yes, you have the values of right and wrong, but you have a greater responsibility, and the greater responsibility is to be an advocate, to be an apostle, to be a force for good. I think the fulfillment of Jesuit education is not just learning about justice; it is doing justice.

For me, following law school and the two years in the army, my course was set in public life, where justice can sometimes be very subliminal. Oftentimes, justice is lost in the day-to-day confrontations that you face. But I had help from many.

My first job was as a legislative assistant to a U.S. senator from California, Thomas Kuechel. I went back to Washington, having gotten out of the army. When arrived, the senator brought all legislative assistants into the office, and he said to us, "Look, you're here in Washington. And let me tell you that you will be subject to a lot of temptations. There will be those that will try to take you out to lunch to give you gifts in order to try to get to me. But understand why you're here. You are here -- we are all here -- to serve the interests of the people of California and the people of this nation." And he said, "Remember one other thing. When you get up each morning, you have to look at yourself in the mirror." And I never forgot that because he was right.

The first test that I really faced was when I became director of the Office for Civil Rights. It was a challenging responsibility. It was a responsibility to try to complete the desegregation of the South and try to get rid of the last vestiges of the dual- school system that had, by law, established a division, a segregation, of the races black and white. And I had had the opportunity when I was on Capitol Hill to indeed work on civil rights legislation. I worked on labor legislation, so I understood what those laws and the meaning of those laws were all about. Unfortunately, at the time I became director of the Office for Civil Rights, the Nixon administration had made a compact with Southern party leaders, that in exchange for their support, civil rights laws would not be vigorously enforced. When officials at the White House urged me to back off of enforcement in some key districts, both in Georgia and Mississippi, then justice for me became more than just a word or a cliché. Justice became a very terrible dilemma. If I enforced the law, then the chances were pretty good that I would be fired. If I resigned, then clearly the law would not be enforced. If I backed off, I could protect a promising career and a job for myself and my family. I decided to sail into the storm, not because I was brave or courageous, but because I couldn't betray everything that others had given me and because I knew I would have to look at myself in the mirror the next morning. That experience braced me for what I would face, not only then, but throughout my public life. Facing the constant challenge of trying to set a strong course for what you believe is right and just for your constituents and for those you represent and yet confronting challenges of every kind -- from interests that would offer political contributions in the hope that they could get your help, to party leaders who would withhold the bill in order to force your vote on a pay raise, from

members trading their votes for what they want. In dealing with all of that I really understood that, in their minds, justice indeed does depend on what part of the elephant you touch.

Later in my career I was director of the Office of Management and Budget. One of the things that we were working on was the economic plan, the first economic plan of President Clinton, which as you know, passed by one vote in both the House and the Senate. But we were obviously lobbying members to try to get their vote. This was a close vote; it was a major vote. It was an important vote, not only for the administration, but more importantly, for the country as shown by the course subsequently taken by the economy. However you define justice, you can see how it impacts on particular decisions at particularly crucial times in our history.

Very frankly, in addition to moving forward only in moving forward and advocating, if you're really going to implement justice, you have to be willing to take risks. However you define justice, you can see how it impacts particular decisions at particularly crucial moments in our history. During the winter of 1995/1996 the government was being shut down because the Republicans, led by Speaker of the House Gingrich, had won control of the Congress. They were pushing the contract for America, and the centerpiece of the contract was their budget, which had proposed significant cuts in education and healthcare and in other areas.

President Clinton, of course, had refused to go along with those proposals. In response, they had decided that it would be better to shut the government down in order to try to force the president to support their position. Now, the president, as is his nature, never really felt that this was a dead end. He is an individual who thinks he can cut a deal with anybody, anytime, anywhere, anyhow. He certainly thought that he could resolve this issue with Speaker Gingrich. And he always kept feeling there's somehow we can find a compromise here. As chief of staff, having known Capitol Hill, I said, "The problem is the Speaker's in a box. He got a lot of people elected who deeply believed in this contract. They are not going to give him the room to compromise. You're going to have to hang tough, Mr. President." And he kept saying, "Yeah, but we ought to try to offer one more compromise, one more offer." We were sitting in the Oval Office, just the leadership of the Republican Party, Bob Dole, Newt Gingrich, myself, the president, vice president, and the president offered one more proposal, one more compromise. Bob Dole thought it was a great idea and was prepared to accept it in a second, but Newt Gingrich said, "I can't do it." And finally the president said, "Newt, I know what you want, and I understand what you're fighting for in your budget, but I think it's wrong for the country. I think it's going to hurt people. And it may cost me the election, but I cannot go along with what you want to do." Now, I think for the first time, Speaker Gingrich finally understood that the president was not going to move. It was a discussion, frankly, they should have had weeks before. But at that point in time, the president got it. He understood that at that point, you draw the line on what you can and can't do, even if it means that ultimately you may lose an election. I have to credit Georgetown for giving him strength at that moment: he could have used it, obviously, in other moments.

Edmund Burke said that a representative is elected by the people to exercise his conscience, and he violates that trust when he fails to do that. In public life -- and for that matter, in life itself -- it is not enough to have a conscience. You must have the compassion and leadership to exercise that conscience on behalf of what you believe is right. That is justice. That, I think, is the vital linkage that Jesuit education must be about, so that the students that go to these schools can be

not just good citizens, but good apostles, individuals who learn to believe in themselves, and individuals who contribute to the strength of our democracy. Democracy, as we know, is a beacon to the world, for how a free people can govern themselves to truly provide liberty and justice for all. It is a beacon to those in former Yugoslavia today. Yet, at the very moment when we are, without question, one of the strongest democracies in the world, we live in a time when there is a weakening in our own system. In the last election, sixty-four percent of the adults who were eligible to vote failed to vote in that election in this country, a beacon of democracy. Adam Clymer of the New York Times said that we have a broken body politic in which fewer people are participating and involved in our democracy. Of greater concern is how it's impacting a younger generation of Americans.

At the Panetta Institute, we did a recent poll of college students throughout the country to get their attitudes on public service and lives in public life. We got some disturbing news back from that poll. Seventy-three percent of the students who were interviewed said they would never choose a career in public life. Sixty-six percent who were eligible to vote did not vote in the last election. Eighty percent said they had never had a conversation with an adult about getting involved in public service or public life. There are a lot of reasons for that, reasons that impact on the adult population -- concern about attack politics, sound bytes, consultants, focus groups, too much money in politics. Ultimately, students felt that whatever's happening in Washington or, for that matter, in state capitols, is just not relevant to their lives. It's not relevant to what they care about. The good news in this poll is that seventy-five percent said they would volunteer for service at the community level, because they found that relevant. They could look into the eyes of those they were helping -- in education, in health care, conservation, and so on -- they could see the results of their work. It was much more relevant to them.

Therein lies the greatest hope: to inspire young people to advocate for justice. You have the challenge to make that happen. It begins with the language of faith, basic beliefs about the nature of humanity, the source of our good, and our role in the whole of reality. It begins with the discipline and a reinforcement of the conscience about what is right and what is wrong.

Secondly, you must establish a bridge between what happens in the classroom and what is happening out there in society so that they see the relevance of what is right and wrong and what it means to people. How can students, many of whom get student aid, not believe that it's relevant what kind of decisions are made in Washington? Or if they care about the safety of their food, the quality of their environment, that somehow that is not impacted by the decisions that are made elsewhere? They have to be a part of that. They have to see the linkage between what they learn in the classroom and what's happening out there, and their responsibility to be part of that.

I believe that you have to promote, as a result of that, service learning in the community. At California State University at Monterey Bay where the Panetta Institute is located, it is a requirement for students to engage in service learning in order to graduate. But you need that tie between what they are learning and how that interprets into the society that they are a part of.

I would take it even a step further. I believe that we probably should establish a national service system in this country, where every young person can spend one or two years in some kind of

service to this nation -- in education, in health care, in conservation, in the Peace Corps -- and to provide a GI Bill of Rights that provides for their education. Young people need to understand what it means to work with others. They need to learn that sense of discipline, that sense of teamwork that becomes a foundation for the rest of their life in our society.

We all live in a very crucial period in history. There are tremendous opportunities that are out there. We are, as a nation, the world's leader in this post-Cold War era. We can advance good throughout the country. The paradox is that at the same time that we are strong leaders in that area, we still cannot find peace in the Middle East and in other parts of the world, and there is still tremendous poverty and hunger and discrimination. We have the strongest economy in our history, and yet the gap between rich and poor grows even wider.

We have tremendous technological skills and innovation available to us. It's happening all around, particularly here in the Silicon Valley. Yet at the same time that there are these tremendous advances in technology, we still do a poor job of teaching third graders how to read and how to truly understand one another. You don't get that from a computer; you get it from one another.

So, the paradox is that for all of the great opportunities that we have, we truly cannot succeed unless there is a commitment to justice, to making it happen.

In his book, *Citizen Soldiers*, Steve Ambrose describes how citizens were pulled out of their communities and suddenly thrown into World War II. They fought in these horrible battles from Normandy to the Battle of the Bulge, all the way through that part of Europe, until they came to the Rhine River. At the Rhine River, he describes how there was almost a sense of exhaustion. Because there were no easy bridges across the Rhine the soldiers began to say, "Why do we need to continue to fight? The next bullet could be meant for us. We've seen our friends get killed. We're going to win this war. What's the reason for continuing to fight?" A young lieutenant found the Bridge at Remagen and dragged his platoon across, saying "Get going." They didn't want to go, but he forced them to go across. "Get going," became the battle cry of our forces till the end of the war.

To some extent, I think that's where our nation is today. We have won some tremendous victories. We've won the Cold War. We've come through recessions. We've improved the quality of life in many ways. Yet, at the same time, there's a sense of exhaustion about whether or not we have the capacity as a nation to move on and to fight the final battles of poverty and discrimination and hunger, environmental degradation, and the other challenges that confront the people of this nation and the world. Justice is about "get going," fighting on, as an apostle, as a citizen, for a nation of liberty and justice for all.

## **Academy Institute as Citizens for Justice**

Santa Clara University

October 7, 2000

Claire Gaudiani,

Former President of Connecticut College and President of the New London Development Corporation

As I listened to Reverend Father Kohlvenbach last night, I know we could all hear Christ's voice in Reverend Father's call to do something about the cries of the poor, beyond simply sympathizing. The growing economic wealth in our world is a joy, but also a danger. I was pleased to hear him to call for changes in the structures of society and new partnerships between education and social activity. The concerns he shared with us last night are part of the great tradition of our Catholic heritage, part of the papal encyclicals *De Rerum Novarum*, part of *Quadregesimo Anno*, part of *Populorum Progresio*. This is part of the experience and contribution of Catholicism in the United States.

Where do we go from here? You are drafting a plan and programs, and these must all make a resounding difference. In the time I have with you this morning, I will outline how I hope we, as academic institutions, will expand our relationship to our cities and to the poor in the coming century. I will tell you about what Connecticut College and the development corporation I head has been doing in this area, and I will share my thoughts on what we have learned about making progress.

Connecticut College is a coeducational, highly selective liberal arts college in New London, Connecticut. The college is about to celebrate its 90th anniversary. It is situated on the top of a hill on 800 beautiful acres totally untouched by the economic difficulties in the city of New London. I am a graduate of the college and have been president for almost 13 years. I am also the volunteer unpaid president of the New London Development Corporation, a non-profit that is leading the economic development of New London. New London is a city of 25,000 citizens. Sixty-five per cent of the children in the schools are on government assistance. Seventy-five per cent are children of color. New London has the fourth weakest economy in the state of Connecticut and the eleventh highest tax rate. This is one very poor city whose children score in the lowest category on the state's mastery tests and drop out of high school at the rate of 50%. You might ask how a French professor got into this position of being simultaneously head of a highly selective college and an economic development corporation. The answer is faith and family. My grandfather arrived in the U.S. from Italy in 1889 as a boy of nine was deeply committed to his Catholic faith and wanted most in the whole world to be a doctor. He did become a doctor and was in fact the first Italian-American to graduate first in his class from Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1907. With this achievement, he could have practiced medicine anywhere. But he surprised his professors by choosing to return to East Harlem, where he practiced medicine for 57 years among the poor and also worked with the

sisters in Mother Cabrini's then new order. He felt called to be a transforming agent in his society and he helped bring people in his community to opportunities in the priesthood, in medicine and in law. I am proud to be his granddaughter and the granddaughter of his wife Rosa who worked right along beside him all through that epoch and gave his daughter, my mother, and their five other children, 12 years of Catholic education.

Our Catholic faith has also motivated my sense of commitment to the poor. I have been privileged to be a Eucharistic minister for 25 years. And I am proud to be the wife of 32 years of a splendid man who is not a Catholic and the mother of two young people who are. I have lived a very fortunate life with everything to be grateful for and never enough ways to express that gratitude. I tell you all this as a way of explaining why I was not satisfied to be "only" the president of a highly respected and selective liberal arts college situated on a beautiful hilltop above a troubled city. As the granddaughter of Augusto Rossano, as a Catholic, a wife and a mother, I had to go down the hill.

Connecticut College has been involved in the city of New London for all of the college's 90 years. We know that one of the volunteer activities of our students in 1915 was in a settlement house called the B. P. Learned House. But over these 90 years New London's fortunes have been declining while the college's have been rising. All through the 19th century, the city depended on whaling and in the 20th century on defense spending-particularly building submarines. In recent years, fewer submarines have been built, which meant fewer well-paid blue-collar jobs. New London's people have experienced profound economic difficulties for the last 50 years and more particularly for the last 30 years. With its high unemployment, very low level of owner occupied housing, New London was only in better shape than the struggling cities of Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven.

The college's commitment to volunteer service is a great asset to New London and the surrounding communities. Our students do the kinds of things your students do-literacy training, visiting in the prisons, working in early childhood programs and in the schools. We have had a splendid donor, Carolyn Holleran and her husband, Jerry, who have given the college \$1.5 million to start the Holleran Center for Community Action and Public Policy, to bring together our service learning courses, a whole program in micro-lending and micro-finance, and a set of funded student internships downtown. In other words, the college is an active citizen in New London, just as many of your colleges are in your cities. But times are changing as the song goes. I believe that academic institutions need to change the way they engage their cities, and two changes in particular have occurred that are especially noteworthy.

First, our young people do more volunteer work and they see first hand the problems of poverty and how poorly most areas are dealing with addressing the needs of economic and social development. More of today's students, having seen more of the conditions of poverty, having studied service learning courses with us, actually expect us to do as much for others off campus as we do for them and for our own institution. They expect us to be change agents especially

where we can all see the problems first hand. But for the most part, Connecticut College, like most colleges, has been simply patting down the problems in our cities. We have not making systemic, systematic, and lasting change. We have not exerted ourselves to solve the underlying problems of our cities in the same way we exert ourselves on our campuses to make real success emerge. We have been performing palliation not transformation. And we have felt comfortable in that role of palliator. Ultimately, the truth is we do not only teach our students in classrooms and laboratories, in libraries with technology, but also by example, by how they see us deploy ourselves, how they see us put our personal time and effort at risk for people who cannot stand for themselves. Our students are observing us. They see that for the most part, we make partnerships with those who can benefit our institutions but we do not close the triangle by getting those philanthropies deeply involved with the poor in our own cities.

Second, over the past twenty years, the world has seen a rising global consensus for democracy as the political system of choice and market economies as the economic system of choice. Of course, in both cases these are very broad consensuses with different locally appropriate forms of democracy and market economies developing in different parts of the world. Nevertheless, this is a crucial trend stemming in part from the failure of Communism in so many countries, and in part from the yearning for freedom and opportunity released by the knowledge spread around the world by technology. Despite the rising global consensus for markets, rising global consensus for democracy, there is no similar clarity, no similar global consensus around the ideal social system. What kind of social system will best support democracy and appropriate forms of market economies and at the same time enable all human beings to experience peace and justice and prosperity, to know the benefits of competition and also of security? Academic institutions with all the knowledge available to us ought to be engaged in experimenting in partnerships with the corporate and government and non-profit sectors in developing some models of the kind of social system that supports democracy and markets, competition and security. Where does the system come from if not from people positioned like we are in American society?

These two changes put pressure on colleges to rethink the way we engage our cities. Can we content ourselves to continue to do some fine things in our cities when we have the capacity to do more and influence the possible shape of social system development? My students engaged me in this question and changed my life. This can happen if we really listen to our young people. They call us to be a transforming force, rather than simply a palliating force, in our communities. In the course I teach called "Literature, Service, and Social Reflection," I get a chance to listen deeply to my students. In this service-learning course students read civic and sacred texts on generosity and modern American novels by and about disadvantaged individuals. Each week students also do three hours of community service work with people very much like those they read about in the novels. They reflect and write on the texts-in the books and in the lives they are engaging each week. One day a student in my class asked me: "Why is the college still sending us to literacy programs to teach fifth and sixth graders to read?" I answered, as I think many of you would, that we were responding to a need. These children who still do not read well in fifth grade are primarily low-income children, many of whom have unemployed parents and related economic problems to contend with. The student said, "My older sister went to Connecticut College six years ago. She volunteered at the same school where I am volunteering. In fact, I am

working with the younger sibling of the child my sister worked with six years ago."  
My first reaction was: "How wonderful!"

But my student did not agree. "Six years ago, the college knew that there was something wrong," he said. "We knew that life and the educational system was letting kids get to the fifth grade without learning to read. Why did we not do anything to change the system? Why am I finding six years later this younger child with exactly the same problem as the older sibling had? In those same six years, we have tripled our endowment, built a brand new science building, started another interdisciplinary academic center. We know how to meet the challenges and opportunities we face on campus. Why do we not use those same strengths to address the challenges in the city?"

Why not indeed? That question gave me one of my last carefree days on campus in the last three years. That day was an Annunciation of sorts. All I could think was: How can this be? I know not economic development. But I think that I was called, and all of us are called, to hear these annunciations, not only from the cries of the poor, but from the voices of our own students. In the remainder of this article I will describe what happens when one person in an academic institution tries to hear the call of changing times and new and challenging and even dangerous roles for us in higher education.

First, I sought the agreement of the Trustees that I should see what help the city might use from the college. They agreed that if the city wanted more significant help and I felt I could lead the way, I could proceed. They saw that the college would benefit from a thriving New London rather than the continuing to contend with the negative influence of the city, even two miles away. My trustees understood the importance of deploying the president. If anyone else from the institution replaces the commitment of the president, the clear message to people downtown is that they are not important. They know, as we know, that the institution does not send someone else to meet with the trustees, parents, or major donors. For truly top priority activities, trustees send the president. If the commitment to the city is real, the president must be engaged.

Second, we determined that Connecticut College would not be able to give money to the city but we would bring other resources. Academic institutions in the United States are among the most privileged institutions in the country. We are connected through deep longstanding relationships both to power and wealth and to poverty and to disadvantage. We are trusted by both sides and by the population in the middle as well. We have the power to be conveners. We have the power to be listeners and planners and, for those us blessed by our parents with spiritual faith, we have the power to invest our actions with prayer. We have the resources to create and sustain partnerships. We have the power to connect to our city work some of the philanthropists who give to colleges and universities.

Third, we admitted that the college would grow in strength from this effort. Any improvements

in the city would be an advantage to the college. The respect of parents and prospective students would support our admissions. The admiration of alumni would improve their contributions and sense of commitment to the college. New and powerful opportunities for internships and volunteer work would create assets for our students. New candidates for faculty positions might be attracted to a college with such a sense of civic purpose. More faculty and staff might eventually be attracted to live in New London if it were in better shape, if its schools improved. All of these have occurred over the past three years except the last and it is simply too soon to expect that change. We still have hopes.

And so I began the work of trying to understand what a college and a college president could do. I spent a whole summer asking the citizens of New London who were in their 70's and 80's how they thought the college could help, and to a person they said "Gather leadership. Convene a force that could help us out of the political and economic dead spots we are in." Then I went around and asked successful leaders from entities of all sizes to join with me for one year in a partnership to build up the city. I asked people in big jobs and small jobs and no jobs, people of color, people whose ancestors came over on the Mayflower. The 18 of us had our first meeting on September 19, 1997. We said, "We will stay together for a year and if nothing happens we will disband." We said, "We will focus on the assets of this city. We will not do any more studies. People are sick of studies. We will focus on mobilizing our assets." We had city and state officials there and they said, "If you will revive this defunct entity, this non-profit New London Development Corporation (NLDC), we will fund a year of staff support time."

What happened next? One of the people I asked to be on the board, was George Milne, who was at that time president of Pfizer Central Research in Groton, Connecticut, across the river from New London. He is a board member at Connecticut College. His son was in my class. George Milne commanded a \$3 billion operation and I asked him to think about a particular New London asset, a 26-acre brownfield on the waterfront. It was a site with great potential and some major drawbacks like the fact that it backed up on a completely dysfunctional wastewater plan. Dysfunctional means that it smelled terrible. It was adjacent to a defunct Navy base and to New London's downtown which was full of empty buildings.

I asked George Milne if Pfizer would be interested in building something on this site. He said, "We are expanding but we have already narrowed the choice down to two sites. They are both greenfields and right on I-95 and we are planning to build a beautiful research park." I asked Dr. Milne if he would be willing to help prepare the land plans to market the 26 acres to another Fortune 500 company.

I did not have anything to lose, so I kept pushing. I pointed out the beauty of the waterfront location. I talked about the offices that would have sea views and the ionized ocean air. The great asset this site would be to recruitment of new employees. I tried not to focus on the wastewater treatment plant. Along with Steve Percy, a business leader in town, I kept taking George Milne down to walk the land and we moved ahead preparing it for a corporate site and we began to

look at within the context of larger area, a peninsula of 90 acres that included a shuttered Navy base, a down-at-the-heels fort that nevertheless dated back to the Revolutionary War, and a down at the heels neighborhood and marina.

To make a long story short, on February 4, 1998 Pfizer announced that it would build a research facility on that 26 areas, creating one million square feet of biotech space. And the Governor announced an \$11 million overhaul of the waste water treatment plan and \$20 million to create the first new state part in 20 years focused on the old fort. NLDC was put in charge of recovering the Navy base from the Navy. And a municipal development plan was drawn up for redoing the rundown surrounding neighborhood.

Today, all these projects are moving forward. The new Pfizer building is nearly complete. It will create 2100 jobs in New London. Economic experts estimate that each of those jobs will in turn create two more service jobs in the area. An \$18 million park giving citizens access to the ocean all along New London's waterfront was dedicated on June 8, 2001. Work with developers is underway to restore downtown buildings for commercial and residential use. The Fort Trumbull State Park has been opened and universally acclaimed. In addition to Pfizer, \$25 million of new businesses have arrived in New London in the last 14 months. All of this economic development is going to add \$700 million to a tax base that just a few years ago was \$900 million.

At the same time, we are making progress on the social justice side. These initiatives include projects to improve early childhood education, K-12 education, health and wellness, economic opportunity, jobs, housing, and social integration through the arts. We are working on programs to reduce the health problems associated with poverty, to increase home ownership, to provide job training for the jobs we know are coming to the area, and also to create arts events that will attract people from all walks of lives and their children and provide opportunities for them to build reciprocally generous relationships. Together with the economic changes, this is transformation-not palliation.

How do we work in all these important areas at once? The first answer is partnerships, profound and complicated partnerships, that neither the college nor the development corporation necessarily always leads but often takes the initiative to convene. We bring to these partnerships the assets that we are used to employing for the college's interests. These assets include access to expertise, relationships with foundations, connections to people of influence and power, experience in planning and building things. We work closely with City Councilors and commissions, and with state officials. We brought in first class architects, urban planners, and financial advisers. Student internships and a whole set of partnerships involve all three of the colleges in town-Connecticut College, the Coast Guard Academy, and Mitchell College. Faculty research projects, classes and supervision of summer internships make important contributions. The cities' staff, its social service agencies, and its businesses are involved in various ways as are the town's diverse religious and spiritual communities. With all of the focus on the economic development, the social justice side is just as strong. We work on both and have brought in

partners like Fannie Mae and Fleet and Citizens banks and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Second, we work systemically, systematically and inclusively. The systems are struggling, and sometimes, even broken in our cities--the school systems, the housing systems, the health systems, the systems that sustain businesses and jobs. Each system needs carefully planned support and all systems need support at the same time. There is no use in sequential help-one system after another. People experience the brokenness as destructive in their lives.

Consequently, their problems accumulate in such quantity and density that the systems break. We knew we would need to address all the systems systematically, and inclusively (which meant working with the leadership of each one, with the recipients, clients and patients of each one, and with outside support of all kinds--from foundations, experts, the state, the federal government. We knew we would be accused of being over ambitious--we decided to accept the criticism. Third, we committed ourselves to hard goals--measurable objectives within clear quality indices and timeframes. It would be better to know where we were falling behind rather than kidding ourselves and others. It was my observation that it is easy to be well-meaning and complacent with other peoples' poverty, disappointments, and difficulties. We should pressure ourselves to meet hard goals in this city building just as we would in our work at the college, the businesses or other enterprises represented by volunteers. My inspiration for hard goals was President Kennedy. I think back to the time when he wanted in the face of the Sputnik challenge to spur enormous advances in our space program. But he did not say, "I want to see a really, really improved space program sometime soon." He said, "Man on the moon by the end of this decade." That is what I call a hard goal. That means man, not monkey. It means on the moon, not near it. It means ten years, not "whenever." When you really want to make a difference, you need hard goals.

In the campus setting, we all know how to do this. We can say, as we did at Connecticut College, we are launching a \$125 million fundraising campaign. So when we got to \$138 million, we felt terrific. How do you translate this to the social justice setting? In early childhood, we work with all the partners--not just Connecticut College or just Pfizer or just United Way or just specific neighborhood groups--and together we work to create hard goals that are our goals not goals we assign to others. A hard goal is: in three years all New London children needing beyond school opportunities (meaning after school, Saturday, and summer learning) will have access to quality beyond school programming. Another hard goal would be: over the next five to eight years all New London children will have access to excellent preschool and perhaps even another: that the children in the new London's government funded daycare centers will achieve the same school readiness scores as the children in the Pfizer daycare center. These are hard goals. We know we will not succeed at all of them, but we believe they will help us focus our energies and resources and succeed better than if we did not have them in place.

In conclusion, I would come back to the initial challenge--the challenge of working with the younger generation and beginning to draft models of successful social systems that would work well with democracy and markets. Mort Zuckerman, Editor in Chief of U.S. News & World Report wrote in Foreign Affairs that the 21st century would be the second American century. He built his argument on the assumption that the 20th century is called the first American century

because the United States was the dominant world power in those hundred years, just as France, Germany and England dominated in earlier centuries. Zuckerman predicted this second American century based on the lack of a strong military opponent and on the extraordinary economic strength of the US.

But I would say to you that is only part of the story. I would say that the 21st century will be known as the second American century because during the next hundred years, the US will create a social system that will truly support the emerging democracies and market economies around the world and that will enable people in all societies to experience prosperity, opportunity and justice. This work is crucial to sustaining the growing global consensus for democracy and market economies and it is crucial for sustaining that consensus here in our own country. If this work is not done, then the \$46 trillion intergenerational private wealth transfer that is expected to occur between now and 2050 in the United States is likely to devastate our country, to rend apart the poor and the rich and to convince large numbers of lower income people that their children will not live better than they are living.

We are in a very important moment now where our dedication needs to match the dedication of the World War II generation, which for me-and for many of you, too-is our parents' generation. My father was a West Pointer in 1943 and his generation fought the war that Tom Brokaw brought so vividly to life in his book *The Greatest Generation*. That generation fought to preserve the values in our Constitution and Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. Their sacrifices gave us the privilege of building in the last half of this century the nation that we currently enjoy. Now we must find the same level of energy and courage to meet a new challenge, the challenge of transforming our society on behalf of its best self, the self I believe the founding fathers had in mind when they said "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Our colleges and universities have always served as "think tanks", as important generators of ideas and concepts. Now they must become at the same level "do tanks", not just talking about transformation but playing an active role in it. Without this connection of "think-tank" and "do-tank," our organizations, which have such enormous intellectual and economic resources at their disposal, will instead prepare the way for a weaker future and generations to come will look back on us as squanderers of opportunity. I believe that leaders of colleges and universities must make this work of the 21st century our work. We have an obligation to lead because of who we are and where we are and how we got there. We have to deploy ourselves now as conveners of the partnerships that make all the difference in America's cities and among her poor. The resources to succeed are available. They need to be deployed courageously.

As people of faith and leaders in higher education, we have a special additional responsibility. We must live as Good Samaritans keeping in mind that Christ did not tell a parable about a person who gave a great lecture on loving one's neighbor. We must strive to live at the highest level that Maimonides called the Chosen People to live. The great Jewish teacher and philosopher laid out eight stages of Tzedakah or generosity. The lowest level of Tzedakah is to give little, infrequently, ostentatiously, and with little regard for the recipient. The seventh level

is to give generously, frequently, anonymously, and respectfully. But the eighth level is something different. The eighth and highest level of generosity occurs when the donor enters into a partnership with the recipient. As academic institutions, we have an obligation to create true partnerships for and with the disadvantaged. We must remember that call of the prophet in Deuteronomy: "Justice only justice that you may thrive." Prosperity is linked to making justice really happen. We have the capacity to draw our corporate and non-profits partners to different levels of engagement with this kind of systemic, systematic, comprehensive, inclusive, economic and social change.

In these new dedications, we will be inspiring the work of this new generation and drafting in our lives versions of a social system that is sustainable-supportive of democracy and markets, but also of a just and fulfilling life for all. We are blessed in this country. We have blessings that we owe back. We find ourselves in a unique position to hear the words of Jeremiah. Jeremiah said "build cities and live in them. Plant gardens and eat their fruit. Make the well being of the city your concern and the city will create your well being."

**Section II. Three Keynote addresses  
Regional Justice Conferences, 1999**

**Of Kingfishers and Dragonflies:  
Faith and Justice at the Core of Jesuit Education**

Santa Clara University

October 1999 Joseph Daoust, S.J.

The Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins wrote of how all creatures shine forth most beautifully when they act out of their deepest selves.

As kingfishers catch fire, dragonflies draw flame;  
As tumbled over rim in roundy wells  
Stones ring; like each tucked string tells, each hung bell's  
Bow swung finds tongue to fling out broad its name;  
Each mortal thing does one thing and the same:  
Deals out that being indoors each one dwells;  
Selves-goes itself; myself it speaks and spells  
Crying What I do is me: for that I came.

Í say more: the just man justices;  
Keeps gráce: that keeps all his goings graces;  
Acts in God's eye what in God's eye he is-  
Christ. For Christ plays in ten thousand places,  
Lovely in limbs, and lovely in eyes not his  
To the Father through the features of men's faces.<sup>1</sup>

Like kingfishers and dragonflies, to serve itself, Jesuit higher education<sup>2</sup> must act out its faith and justice commitment as something at the very core of its mission as a university. Commitment to faith and justice cannot be something peripheral or added on, but has to be intrinsic to its central activities, part of its very essence, at the heart of its educational character. If not, then no matter how many service programs or politically correct speakers series are provided, or fair employment policies or prayer services, the Jesuit university is not being true to its inmost self, its identity. It risks being gilded with the cynicism with which our culture rightly views cigarette companies sponsoring health fairs or petroleum firms running environmental ads. The marginal good that is promoted is not consonant with the central mission of the enterprise.

It is usually said that the central mission of any university is to seek truth. This is certainly a necessary part of its mission, but not sufficient. As children of the Enlightenment, or perhaps its grandchildren-postmodern deconstructionists, it is hard for us to remember that universities were not the creation of the Enlightenment. They came into being well before then in a number of cultures, based in religious conviction that the fullness of being, or reality, could become ever more known.<sup>3</sup> And when it was known, it would be known with all the transcendentals together; it would be true and good and beautiful integrally. When Alexander IV wrote to the Universitas magistrorum et scholarium in Paris 750 years ago, he described them as a community which had come together "in a common love of knowledge for the good of humanity."<sup>4</sup> Truth and goodness were united as the core of what the Universitas was about. (It was also arguably about the beautiful.)

Universities that are faith based and focused on serving the good of society, then, are not some aberrant trend; they are in the mainstream of what universities have historically been about. This has been especially true about the character and mission of Jesuit universities since the first of them was begun by Ignatius Loyola four hundred fifty years ago.<sup>5</sup>

### Ignatian Inspiration

Jesuit universities were born as part of the humanist movement, which was reacting against the desiccated state of education then prevalent in universities. The humanists were especially vociferous about the failure to relate learning to a life of virtue and public service.<sup>6</sup> They shared the general Renaissance belief in the power of education to form and reform the moral character of individuals and of entire societies. And they were convinced there was an especially strong relationship between exposure to good literature and virtue. Prime among the virtues they hoped to inculcate were faith and upright character (*pietas*), the latter being the dedicated commitment to the good of one's society, (as represented in pious Aeneas of Virgil's *Aeneid*, rather than the meeker English transliteration "piety").

While there were many goals that the early Jesuits hoped to achieve through schools, chief among them were that students would develop good habits and virtue, and that they would direct their studies to the service of others, for "those who are now only students will grow up to be pastors, civic officials, administrators of justice, and will fill other important posts to everybody's profit and advantage."<sup>7</sup> Reasons given for opening particular schools were: "for the benefit of the city" (Tivoli, 1550); "colleges are a powerful instrument for the reform of cities" (Valencia, 1552); "colleges are of great benefit to the republic by producing good priests, good civic officials, and good citizens of every status" (Murcia, 1555). In 1556, Ribadeneira wrote to Phillip II of Spain that "all the well being of Christianity and of the whole world depends on the proper education of youth."

Among the characteristics of 16th-century Jesuit education were two that are no longer followed today: they were tuition free, and the Jesuits were never allowed to use physical punishment on the students. (When fighting broke out in the school corridors, the Jesuits got around the latter requirement by hiring lay proctors to come in to beat the students;<sup>8</sup> such was the inauspicious beginning of lay collaboration in Jesuit education!) Other characteristics true of Jesuit education then are still important today. They had special concern for educating the poor, but they aimed at a mix of social classes, rich and poor together. They stressed character formation and the inner appropriation of ethical and religious values. They were an international network, but involved in outreach to local situations of poverty. The teaching was not just to be verbal or conceptual, but suffused with love for the students, treating them with *familiaritas*, using example as the "teaching under the teaching."<sup>9</sup>

John O'Malley, S.J., the prominent commentator on early Jesuit ministries, summed up their approach to education this way:

"The Jesuits looked more to formation of mind and character, to *Bildung*, than to the acquisition of ever more information or the advancement of the disciplines.... [A Jesuit Ratio of the time] rose above details of curriculum and pedagogical technique without claiming education to be the panacea for all the ills of church and society. It ended with a section on 'topics' or

'commonplaces' for speaking and writing, which climaxed with typically humanist considerations about 'human dignity.' That theme accorded with the benign relationship between nature and grace that the Jesuits espoused, and hence fitted in a generic way with the positive view of human nature that undergirded Jesuit enthusiasm for education in the humanistic mode."<sup>10</sup>

For over four hundred years before Pedro Arrupe spoke of the aim of Jesuit education as being to form "men and women for others"<sup>11</sup>, such holistic education and formation for serving society have been at the heart of its mission. And it could not be otherwise, since the inspiration of Jesuit education, like every Jesuit or Ignatian enterprise, is rooted in the dynamic of The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola.<sup>12</sup>

In the Spiritual Exercises, once one is healed and set free from sinful attachments in the First Week, the dynamic builds on the call to service at the side of Christ the King. That call is found seminally in the particular Ignatian contemplation on the Incarnation. There, rather than the typical scene of a peasant Jewish girl and an angel, Ignatius has the contemplation begin with imagining the Trinity gazing on the whole circuit of the world, full of diverse peoples, at peace or war, healthy or sick, being born or dying. The Trinity, seeing all the peoples of the earth in such great blindness, doing evil, dying and going to hell, is moved with great compassion, and out of love, decides to send the Son to become incarnate as a human, leading the effort to renew the face of the earth. That is the mission for which the King calls us to his side; and much of the rest of the Exercises is focused on our understanding all that such a call entails, both in suffering and in resurrection. Finally, at the end of the Exercises, we are ready to go forth on mission, and to find God already at work in our world, in all things.

Such a dynamic underlies what has been called the Ignatian Educational Paradigm. In Ignatian spirituality, experience needs to be reflected on to find God at work in it. Then through analysis and discernment, decisions about how to join with what God's spirit is doing leads one to decision and action, which then creates further experience to be reflected on, find God, and follow, etc. Recent Jesuit General Congregations call for all Jesuit institutions to use "the apostolic pedagogy of St. Ignatius, a constant interplay of experience, reflection and action. Experience is to be reflected on in the light of faith, including a well informed use of social and cultural analysis, and an inculturation which opens us to the newness of Jesus the Savior in the evolution of every people."<sup>13</sup>

Experience, both personal and of one's society and culture, is to be taken seriously as the starting point of education. Analyzing that, one can discern how God's spirit is moving us to build up the reign of God, a reign of justice and peace on earth. Hearing the call of Christ to join in that mission, we have a sense of the meaning of our lives-to be about that mission, and can "find God in all things" as we continually learn through experience, reflection, and action all our lives. That is the Ignatian pedagogy that leads to forming "men and women for others."

### Catholic Identity

Jesuit colleges and universities are, of course, fully Catholic in their inspiration and identity. In 1990, Pope John Paul II outlined the essential characteristics of Catholic universities in the Apostolic constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*:

"Since the objective of a Catholic university is to assure in an institutional manner a Christian

presence in the university world confronting the great problems of society and culture, every Catholic university, as Catholic, must have the following essential characteristics:

- (1) Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university community as such;
- (2) continuing reflection in the light of faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge...
- (3) fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church; and
- (4) an institutional commitment to service of others...in their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal which gives meaning to life."<sup>14</sup>

Christian inspiration...reflection in faith...fidelity...commitment to service. Such is the vision that underlies the entire academic enterprise in a Catholic university. It gives the motive forces, the dynamic underlying the love for truth which is the *raison d'être* of the university. The final goal of a Catholic university, beyond career preparation or advancement of disciplines, is to give meaning to life, to find "the meaning of truth, that fundamental value without which freedom, justice and human dignity are extinguished.... For what is at stake is the very meaning of scientific and technological research, of social life and culture; but on an even more profound level, what is at stake is the very meaning of the human person."<sup>15</sup>

Central to that quest for meaning in the mission of the Catholic university is serving the larger society. It carries out this mission through critical engagement with issues facing society, such as the value of human life, equal justice for all, proper care of the environment, and the pursuit of peace and of an economic and political order that will be more equitable and serve the human community better. It educates so that its graduates will be concerned about these issues, enabling them to evaluate prevailing cultural values in the light of the Gospel, and challenging them to lives of service to others for the promotion of social justice. Thus every Catholic university has a responsibility to contribute concretely, as a university, to the progress of society toward the justice of the Kingdom.<sup>16</sup> That is at the core of the integrating vision which animates its identity as a Catholic university.

### Jesuit Mission

Rooted in Ignatian spirituality and Catholic in their identity, Jesuit colleges and universities share in the core mission of all Jesuit institutions as this has been delineated by the 34th General Congregation, the most recent (1995) of the worldwide legislative assemblies of the Jesuit Order.<sup>17</sup> In that congregation, the work of all Jesuit institutions was placed solidly within the framework of the Church's overall mission, which is evangelization. But evangelization is not limited to the sometimes oversimplified notions of proclamation, conversion, and creation of local churches; equally important in the Church's own understanding of evangelization are life witness, inculturation, dialogue, and the promotion of justice.<sup>18</sup> It is these latter aspects of Church mission which are the most appropriate focus of educational institutions.

The General Congregation reaffirmed what had been articulated by previous congregations since the Second Vatican Council: that the service of faith and the promotion of justice are the heart of the mission of all Jesuit institutions. But it called special attention to the need to root these dimensions of mission in the culture, building on social forces that nourish such a mission, and working counterculturally against whatever undercuts it. Dialogue was stressed as a preferred way of fostering the growth of such a mission, especially in the midst of the pluralism and often cynicism of these postmodern times. The General Congregation proposed a sketch of how these interrelate would be:

"The aim of our mission (the service of faith) and its integrating principle (faith directed towards justice) are dynamically related to the inculturated proclamation of the Gospel and dialogue as integral dimensions of evangelization. The integrating principle extends its influence into these dimensions which, like branches growing from the one tree, form a matrix of integral features within our one mission of the service of faith and the promotion of justice."19

In the experience of Jesuit institutions in recent decades, justice has been most able to flourish where it grew out of the taproot of faith, and was firmly rooted in an understanding of the cultural forces that supported it or militated against it. Dialogue with those of different perspectives had often nourished it more effectively than confrontation. Where these different dimensions of mission had not been integrated, little has been accomplished.

The faith that must underlie working for justice is not an exclusive or sectarian one. In some parts of the world where the majority of students and faculty are not Christian, all have been able to work very effectively together, sharing faith in the active presence of God, working in the world, calling us to work alongside the Spirit to renew the face of the earth. This is faith in God as portrayed in the Spiritual Exercises, which have often been made quite successfully by Christians of all denominations, as well as by Hindus, Muslims, and Buddhists. It is the faith necessary to sustain us in the journey, in spite of all setbacks, toward the more just world to which God calls us to devote our lives.

#### Our Mission and Justice

The justice at the core of our mission is not some philosophical or analytical concept. While certain philosophical concepts of justice may be useful in working out particular problems, most theorists, from Nozick to Rawls, are ultimately based in Western individualism rather than an organic vision of social realities such as underlies the covenantal dynamic of the Hebrew Scriptures, or the overriding Spirit-inspired commitment to the common good that underlies Catholic social teaching. "The vision of justice which guides us is intimately linked with our faith. It is deeply rooted in the Scriptures, Church tradition, and our Ignatian heritage. It transcends notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements, which can never be an adequate expression of the justice of the Kingdom for which we are called to struggle at the side of our Companion and King."19a

The Scriptural vision of justice is one of fidelity to the demands of relationship: God with us, and as part of that covenant, we with one another.<sup>20</sup> Justice is relational rather than rooted in self-interest, no matter how enlightened; it is radically social in nature. Nor is it merely procedural, based solely upon such as notions of fairness; it is substantive, concerned with providing the full measure of participation in the life and goods of the community to all. It is less concerned with recognizing rights than with making society "right." Allied in Scripture with love, compassion, and the fullness of peace, it forms with them a complex nexus characterizing a society where the reign of God is coming into being. It has a prophetic, active, challenging quality, always calling society and individuals beyond where we are to the vision of what God's spirit calls us to become. Moreover God is not seen as impartial; God takes the side of the oppressed, and is deeply concerned with those who are most marginalized. God's preferential love for the outcast of our social structures-"the widow, the orphan, the stranger in the land"-is the Scriptural basis for what has come to be called the preferential option for the poor.

Such a vision of justice is often more fully conveyed in stories with synthetic resonance, rather than in analytic concepts. The image in Micah 4 of the mountain of God's reign, where swords will be hammered into ploughshares, spears into sickles, and each will sit under his own vine and her own fig tree "with no one to trouble them," has echoed down the ages as an inspiring vision of what society is meant to be. More challenging to the existing order is the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55) where God pulls down princes from their thrones and exalts the lowly, fills the hungry with good things and sends the rich away empty. The Beatitudes (Luke 6:20-23) and parables like Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16:20-25) parallel this subversive quality of God's call to justice. The scene of the Last Judgement in Matthew 25 has been paradigmatic for two millennia: "When I was hungry, thirsty, naked, a stranger, sick or in prison, did you care for me?"

The vision of Revelation epitomizes what humankind longs for as the outcome of the struggle for justice: "Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth...the holy city coming down from God...beautiful as a bride... where God lives among humankind...God will wipe away all tears from their eyes, there will be no more death or sadness. The world of the past has gone." (Revelation 21:1-7)

This vision of justice is echoed in the traditions of the Church, both in practice by the people of God, and in social teaching especially of the last century. In their pastoral letter on economic justice,<sup>21</sup> the U.S. bishops delineate the model of a just community in Catholic social teaching. There they attempt to supplant the usual U.S. religious preoccupation centered exclusively upon the individual's relation with a transcendent God. Rather, they point out that Catholic social teaching is based on the human dignity of all, each one of us having been created with that inalienable dignity by God. Created in the image of the triune God, we are inherently called into relationship.

Out of gratitude for what we have been given, God asks us in covenant to commit ourselves to the community, to solidarity with others, to the common good. The touchstone of whether we are living up to that covenant is found in how we treat those who cannot do good to us in return, the poor and marginalized, the modern equivalent of the widow, orphan, stranger in the land of ancient Israel. Toward them, we are called not just to "works of mercy," the charitable sharing of what we have been given by God. Beyond such distributive justice, we are called to "participative justice," to give them a meaningful place at the table where they can participate in the creation of the community as equals. Then the community can all the better renew itself, and create a fuller community life, which in turn will build up the human dignity of all, again called into this covenantal cycle of building up the reign of God on earth. The transcendent God is to be found immanently at the center of such community activity, working in our midst, calling us to join in renewing the face of the earth.

Thus justice is based in our faith, evocative of our traditions, at the center of the synthesis of human experience and religious values. It is also a complex, evolving reality as society itself is constantly developing new possibilities of progress as well as forms of injustice. It involves more than just economic or political structural change. The 34th General Congregation noted new dimensions where the call to justice must be played out: human rights, life, the environment, interdependence in a globalizing world, and special concern for those most excluded in these times: refugees, indigenous peoples, the unemployed.<sup>22</sup> Justice is allied with reconciliation, the

preferential option for the poor, and solidarity; "the firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good."<sup>23</sup>

### Implementation

There are, of course, those who do not agree that justice should be so integrated with faith at the center of mission. Some opt for a faith that may be connected with God's justification of us in the Pauline sense, but with no incarnational connection with the justice we are called to in response to God's covenant. Attempts to make religion innocuous, blessing the status quo rather than challenging it, have a long history. But even among those of good will, there can be resistance to this call to justice, particularly in education, since they interpret social justice solely as working directly with the poor, or advocating structural change in an activist sense, neither of which is at the heart of the educational enterprise in their view.

But there are at least three levels or ways of working for social justice, all of which are equally necessary if justice is to be achieved in our complex world. The 34th General Congregation called upon every Jesuit institution to promote justice in one or more of these ways: (1) direct service and accompaniment of the poor; (2) developing awareness of the demands of justice and the social responsibility to achieve it; (3) participating in social mobilization for the creation of a more just social order.<sup>24</sup> Arguably neither the first (direct service) or third (advocacy) level is at the heart of what the educational enterprise is about; soup kitchens and political mobilization campaigns are organized around these ways of "doing" justice. But the second level, developing social consciousness and conscience, or conscientization as the Latin Americans call it, is of the essence of Jesuit education. A university which does not, in its main educational activities, concern itself with this mission is not, in the Jesuit or Catholic tradition.

This is not to say that universities have no role at the advocacy or social service level. Complex institutions can and often should be active at all three levels, but always keeping focused on their core mission. For example, if a soup kitchen, becomes increasingly active in advocacy, it had better continue to serve well those coming to it for sustenance. Without doing that it loses its credibility as an advocate. But if it fulfills its core mission well, it can become a better institution through caring about the social consciousness of those involved with it, and by becoming involved in advocacy on hunger issues. Likewise, a university, no matter how much community service it offers, or if it joins in on campaigns for this or that issue, fails at its mission if it is not effectively engaged in educating for consciousness and conscience. Given that it is carrying out such a mission, it can best engage in service programs that will advance the consciousness and conscience of its students and faculty—e.g., service learning rather than just community service. It can credibly speak to social issues in the larger community insofar as its critiques are based on solid research and scholarship.

A final word about where Jesuit universities carry out their mission: It is no accident that most of them are located in urban centers. The 34th General Congregation spoke movingly about this deliberate urban focus of Jesuit institutions: "Ignatius loved the great cities" because they were the places where this transformation of the human community was taking place. The "city" can stand for us as the symbol of this modern effort to bring about a fulfilled human culture. That the project, in its present form, is seriously flawed, no one doubts. That we look at it now with more skepticism than we did even thirty years ago is right. That it exhibits massive dislocations and

inequalities is clear to all. That in the totalitarian experiments of this century it shows itself brutal and almost demonic in its intensity, none will dispute. That it is not far from the Babel and Babylon of the Bible is also true. But it is also our muddled, but inescapable, attempt to attain a community which, according to Revelation, God will bring about-and God will bring it about-in the form of the holy city, the radiant New Jerusalem.... Until that day, our vocation is to work generously with the Risen Christ in the all-too-human city where there is poverty of body and spirit, domination and control, manipulation of mind and heart, and to serve the Lord there until he returns to bestow perfection on the world where he died.<sup>25</sup>

In conclusion, then, we have seen how Jesuit colleges and universities have at the core of their mission a commitment to faith and justice. They carry out that mission by educating so that students have an organic vision of social reality, and are challenged to lives of serving society after they graduate. They provide a context for intelligent commitment, giving students intellectual resources and forming character so that their graduates can truly go forth as "men and women for others."

How to teach, model, inculcate this vision? That is the question we will be grappling with for the remainder of the weekend at this conference, and hopefully well into the 21st century. Let us do so with confidence that God is at work in our midst, inspired with all the fervor that shines forth from Hopkins' vision: "As kingfishers catch fire, dragonflies draw flame."

[[Alternate Ending:

To paraphrase Hopkins:

As kingfishers let us catch fire, as dragonflies draw flame;

As Jesuit universities we do one thing and the same:

Deal out that being indoors each one dwells;

Selves-become ourselves;

Crying What We do is faith and justice: for that We came.

I say more: the just university justices;

Keeps faith: that keeps all our goings graces;

Acts in God's eye what in God's eye we are-

Christ. For Christ plays in ten thousand places

Lovely in limbs, and lovely in eyes not his

To our God through the features of our students' faces.]]

## Endnotes

1. Untitled and undated poem (probably 1881-2) by Gerard Manley Hopkins, S.J. The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins, edited by W.H. Gardner and N.H. MacKenzie, 4th edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 90.

2. Here and throughout, whenever Jesuit education is referred to, what is meant is education in the Jesuit tradition, very much including all those involved in the enterprise, whether they are Jesuits or not. To be fully inclusive of the many lay women and men who make such education possible, the more appropriate term might be Ignatian education, but the former term seems fixed in the popular understanding.

3. Centuries before the Enlightenment, the Buddhist universities of north India (e.g. Nalanda), the Muslim ones in the Middle East, and those of Christian Europe all grew up as religious centers where faith was a compelling motivation to seek to know reality as fully as possible, as a reflection of the divine. It was only two centuries ago, during the French Revolution, that the goddess Reason was enthroned in Notre Dame Cathedral, symbolizing the attempt to separate reason from faith—a cultural phenomenon we have not completely recovered from yet. Cf. John Paul II's encyclical letter *Fides et Ratio* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1998).

4. Letter to University of Paris, Pope Alexander IV, April 14, 1255. *Bullarium Diplomatum* cited in *Origins*, vol. 20, p. 275.

5. The first Jesuit university founded primarily for lay students was at Messina in Sicily (1548). Early Jesuit schools typically encompassed what would today be called primary and secondary as well as college level studies. By Ignatius' death in 1556, more than 50 such institutions had been begun on three continents. Cf. pp. 26-45, William Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972).

6. One of the best descriptions of the moving forces behind early Jesuit educational ventures is found in Chapter 6: *The Schools of John O'Malley's* excellent book, *The First Jesuits* (Boston: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993), to which I am deeply indebted for much of this historical material.

7. In 1551 Polanco listed 15 reasons for the Jesuits to open schools, ending with this overall benefit to the local community. For this and following quotations, cf. John O'Malley, *op. cit.*, 209-215.

8. "For those who fail in their duties, if they are little boys for whom words are not enough, an extern (i.e., someone not a Jesuit) is to be hired as a corrector to chastise them and keep them in fear. Thus none of our men will have to lay his hand on anyone." Ignatius' Letter to Araoz, Dec. 1, 1555. *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, Epistolae et Instructiones IV*, p.6. Cf. also Ignatius in *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, no. 488.

9. John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 226-7.

10. John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 214.

11. The phrase "men and women for others" became emblematic for Jesuit education following the Superior General's Address to the International Congress of Jesuit Alumni in Valencia, Spain, July 31, 1973. But as his address made clear, the concern to educate agents of change who would promote social justice had always underlain Jesuit education. This address can be found,

among other locations, in the collection of Arrupe's addresses, *Justice with Faith Today*, (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1980), 123-138.

12. Cf. George Ganss, S.J., *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: A Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992).

13. Documents of the 33rd General Congregation (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1984), Decree 1, nos. 43-44. This constant interplay is not, of course, solely Ignatian. H. Richard Niebuhr noted that it is wrong to begin with the question "What should I do?" Rather, the prior question should be asked: "What is God doing in the world?" That is the context for answering the other question. Something analogous to the process of experience-reflection-action has been called the hermeneutic circle (Juan Luis Segundo), the circle of praxis (Paolo Freire) or the pastoral cycle (John Coleman). It is fundamental to political or liberation theological method. But for Jesuit universities, it is rooted in their Ignatian heritage, transcending any particular discipline's methods.

14. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae: the Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities*, no. 13. The full text is in *Origins*, Oct. 4, 1990, vol. 20 no. 17. This fundamental charter for Catholic education worldwide has been universally well received, and is not to be confused with the more controversial U.S. Norms for Implementation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, a set of juridical regulations under discussion in the U.S. Bishops' Conference (cf. *Origins*, Sept. 30, 1999, vol. 29 no. 16).

15. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, nos. 4 and 7, citing John Paul II to the International Congress of Catholic Universities (1989).

16. Cf. especially *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, nos. 32-34.

17. Cf. Documents of the 34th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995). The core mission decree is Decree 2: *Servants of Christ's Mission*, which is amplified in the following three decrees on mission, dealing respectively with justice, culture, and dialog

18. John Paul II, Encyclical letter *Redemptoris Missio* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1990), n. 41.

19. General Congregation 34, Decree 2: *Servants of Christ's Mission*, no. 15.

19a. G.C. 34, Decree 3: *Our Mission and Justice*, no. 3.

20. For the scriptural discussion of justice, I am greatly indebted to John Donahue's excellent work *What does the Lord Require? A Bibliographical Essay on the Bible and Social Justice* (St. Louis, *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, vol. 25 no. 2, March 1993).

21. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1986) ; also in *Origins*, vol. 16, no. 24 (Nov. 27, 1986).

22. Cf. General Congregation 34, Decree 3: Our Mission and Justice, nos. 5-16.

23. John Paul II, Encyclical Letter *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1987), no. 38.

24. General Congregation 34, Decree 3: Our Mission and Justice, no. 19.

25. General Congregation 34, Decree 4: Our Mission and Culture, no. 26.

**Justice in Jesuit Education Today:  
Integrating the Hunger for Truth and the Hunger for Bread  
Conference at University of Detroit Mercy**

June 4, 1999

Paul Locatelli, S.J.  
President, Santa Clara University  
Introduction

We see that the promotion of justice is inextricably linked with the service of faith: integrating the hunger for bread with the hunger for the word and love of God. Both hungers place the individual suffering physical poverty at the center of the human community, not on the edge as our economic systems tend to do. [we need the reference for this]

This ideal of “integrating the hunger for truth with the hunger for bread and for the word of God” gives Jesuit education a new mission. Our interconnected world demands that we expand our intellectual inquiry to include the full range of human experience today: from technological progress and global economy to the hunger and frustration that plague over a billion and half people on this planet — an increase of over 200 million since 1993 according to one report.

Traditional Jesuit education insisted on the basic question of humanistic education: “How ought I to live?” [1] Learning in every discipline had a humanizing aim: it meant to free us to live a richer and more profoundly human life. Education was not simply a means to put bread on the table but the way to satisfy the human hunger for truth. Now that we live in a world where over a billion people survive on a dollar a day or less, that hunger for truth must also include the hunger for bread. Justice has become an integral part of a humanistic education. [2] The personal question, “How should I live?” has exploded into the global question: “How should all of us live?” Our faith commitment demands this integration.

As early as 1975, Jesuits at the 32<sup>nd</sup> General Congregation declared the comprehensive mission for all the works of the Society of Jesus to be “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement.” This historic document, Decree Four, went on to say that “reconciliation with God demands the reconciliation of people with one another.” [3] This mission was to become the integrating principle for every Jesuit work.

A generation later we realize that this imperative of integration comes not because we are Jesuit but simply because we are universities. No institution of higher education can be faithful to its commitment to truth unless it is also committed to justice. Justice here is not a partisan or ideological issue but the working out of the truth about our human condition. Education for justice tries to understand the complex causes of human misery and asks what can be done to put bread on the empty tables of the world. No university can pretend to be preparing its students for life in the twenty-first century unless it educates them for compassion and conscience as well as

for professional competence. The hunger for truth moves us to gain knowledge that gives meaning to life, for a truth that we can live by.

This pursuit of truth with justice gains an added urgency in Jesuit-Catholic universities where the pursuit takes on a transcendent, ultimate dimension. Faith tells us that these hungers are rooted in God's desire that all should live fully and that God labors in the world to bring this about.

This vision leads to a radical twist on how we learn: in today's world a humane education should not only teach about the forsaken of the earth, it should lead us especially to learn from them. They bring an understanding not found inside the university community.

The central question for us, therefore, is to ask whether our schools are bringing together the hunger for truth and the hunger for bread. Have we pushed this question to its deepest roots in the diverse faiths of our colleagues and of our world? What have we done over the past quarter century to bring the promotion of justice into the intellectual life of our campuses, into teaching and research especially?

### 1: Inspiration for Faith and Justice

Where did our contemporary emphasis on the faith that does justice come from and how did it evolve? We often hear that the inspiration for the commitment to justice comes, in large measure, from the Second Vatican Council. Specifically, in *Gaudium et Spes*, the Church calls us to show "solidarity with the entire human family" by addressing the global problems of "hunger, poverty, illiteracy, oppression, war, international rivalries, and the whole purpose and meaning of human existence." [4]The Church was moving from the periphery of the modern world to the center by accepting some responsibility for social and political systems. Vatican II realized that, since humans created these systems, humans have the capacity and moral responsibility to improve, even transform, them.

Decades earlier, beginning with Pope Leo XIII's 1891 *Rerum Novarum*, [5] *On the Condition of Workers*, a series of papal social encyclicals had focused on socioeconomic themes like the plight of the industrial poor and farmers, the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and the increase in the numbers of the industrial poor and unemployed. These encyclicals addressed also the causes of misery and the violation of basic human rights.

Catholic social teaching made a major advance with John XXIII and Paul VI. It became more biblical in its language and more global in scope. In writings like *Populorum Progressio* (1967) and *Justitia in Mundo* (1971), Paul VI forged new visions captured in the phrases: "the preferential option of the poor" and "action for justice." Genuine peace would come only through a just international economic order assuring all people of their human rights and authentic human development.

These influences converged with an experience of the poor. For the first time, Jesuits at the 32nd General Congregation represented the voices of the poor who were beginning to awaken and find their own voice in Latin America, Asia and Africa. Jesuit Jon Sobrino calls this moment "the irruption of the poor into history." [6] Pastors and theologians who identified with the poor began

to insist that there could be no announcing the Good News without first denouncing the unjust conditions and causes that oppressed the poor. Jesuit delegates who spoke this prophetic word were the catalysts in linking justice with faith.[7]

Since 1975, Jesuit universities have, to various degrees, incorporated the promotion of faith and justice and have tried, at least ideally, to accept the responsibility of graduating leaders who have both a special concern for the poor and the “power to bring about social change.” [GC 32, D 4]

Early on, concerns arose about linking justice and faith. They ranged from a strong reluctance to accept such a mission for universities to questions about its meaning to criticisms about the seeming indifference of universities to this issue. These concerns led Father Pedro Arrupe in 1976 to craft an “intellectual” rationale for this mission of the Society. He insisted that it applies to “education, research and the intellectual life” as much as it does to pastoral and social work. [8]

His successor, Father Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, challenged Jesuit educators in the United States to make this mission a systemic part of our academic culture:

[I]nstead 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 is to be seen as a pressing commitment to reevaluate our colleges and universities, our teaching priorities, our programs, our research efforts to make them even more effective.[9]

Then, in 1995, twenty years after the historic Decree Four, Jesuits at the most recent General Congregation affirmed and expanded the understanding of “the promotion of justice.”[10] The 34th General Congregation cautioned that the vision linking faith with justice “transcends notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements.” [GC 34, D 2, n 4] Arguing that this vision is deeply rooted in the Scriptures, Church tradition, and our Ignatian heritage, the Congregation endorsed all that Decree Four had said about socioeconomic and political structures[11] and went on to include both new dimensions of justice [12] and new ways of implementing justice into our ministries.

The new dimensions included ecological concerns, global interdependence, human rights of the marginalized with a special concern for women [GC 34, D 14). They also asserted that faith has an international human rights dimension, because “respect for the dignity of the human person created in the image of God underlies the growing international consciousness of the full range of human rights.”[GC34,D2,n6] The new ways of implementing justice include “direct service to the poor, developing (educating) awareness and sense of responsibility to achieve it, and participating in creating a more just social order.” [GC34, D 2, n 19]

A commitment to understanding justice in this way is not to be interpreted as an imposition from outside the life of the academy but an invitation to discover the responsibilities of the Jesuit university within the academy and within our world. Justice is in large part a way to live out one’s faith; justice is one window to understanding the relationship of faith and reason, faith and culture. Integral to a humanistic education, justice starts from recognizing the world-wide hunger

for bread, the very means of survival, and quickly becomes the hunger for truth, reminding us that our question is both “How should I live?” and “How should all of us live?”

Although American secular universities too often ignore that basic question, the spirituality and history of Jesuit education, with its roots in a social and Christian humanism,[13] places it at center stage. How this plays itself out in Jesuit universities leads to my second question.

II: Can Universities legitimately integrate justice into teaching and research?

We must address the hunger for bread as universities, not as bakeries, social agencies, community service organizations, retreat houses, or parishes. The recent General Congregation also challenged us to work, “with imagination and faith, to strengthen our charter both as Jesuit and as a university. Both the noun ‘university’ and the adjective ‘Jesuit’ must always remain fully honored.” The search for truth, therefore, must remain sacred; here truth emerges from disciplined inquiry and respectful dialogue where all voices are welcome. [GC 34, D 171]

Dialogue about Justice and Faith: A genuine university should represent the whole spectrum of ideas about justice in the pluralistic American and global culture. Justice is not the property of the left or of the right. Justice will appropriately mean different things to different people. It is imperative, however, that a Jesuit and Catholic university bring those different voices into conversation. We should not let our diverse views of justice obscure what should be our driving common concern: How can we educate our students to engage their world with the compassion and competence to address the basic struggle for human dignity?

Unfortunately, genuine dialog has become increasingly difficult in our universities where disciplines speak different languages and departmental boundaries have become increasingly rigid. Faculty research agendas are often set more by the interests of the guild and grantsmanship than by the needs of students or society. Socrates might be concerned about character development, but regrettably, Socrates would not publish enough to get tenure.

Let us be quite frank. Academic specialization is not the sole obstacle to dialogue. Speaking about faith and justice raises the specter of indoctrination and ideology among many faculty of good will at Jesuit universities. Any talk about integrating “faith” and “justice” raises the awkward questions, “Whose faith?” and “Whose justice?” What looks like justice to Milton Friedman looks like injustice to Amartya Sen. The world according to sociobiologist Edward Osborne Wilson is a different world from that of Maya Angelou.

Many faculty fear that behind the humane rhetoric of Jesuit General Congregations and administrators there is really only one acceptable meaning of faith and only one acceptable notion of justice. They suspect that any non-Christian or nonreligious framework of meaning will not be taken seriously. Some suspect that justice has been narrowed down to a progressive, even socialist, program of radical reform. No wonder they are reluctant to enter this discussion. Why sit down at the table if you think that the deck is stacked against you?

The usual way that Jesuit universities respond to this reluctance about discussing faith and justice is to bracket the question of faith and try for consensus on justice. I do not believe that genuine

dialogue about justice can occur by bracketing the question of faith. Our views of justice are inevitably shaped by our fundamental convictions about reality, that is, by the various “faiths” that we have. For secular persons, these convictions about reality serve the same intellectual function as religious faith does for theists. Whether we call them faith or not, these convictions set the framework within which we operate in our lives and academic disciplines. Everyone of us makes basic assumptions about the nature of the world and human beings, about how we can find coherence, about what is worth living for. These assumptions usually stay in the background, but they influence everything we do.

Dialogue works when the participating parties are assured that their basic assumptions are known and respected — not necessarily agreed with, but respected. The parties to genuine dialogue need to admit the limitations of their own positions. The recent General Congregation urged candor about the limits of religious perspectives and the need to cooperate with those who have no connection with organized religion and with all who share a concern for the future of humanity.[14]

Finally, we must realize that even those who profess the same religious creed may have very different assumptions about reality. Many, including Jesuit faculty and administrators, found “faith and justice” an unwelcome intrusion into the academy. They fear that it would compromise the disinterested pursuit of truth or threaten the independence of research and teaching. To some it sounds like a call to politicize the university by advocating left-wing ideology, while others are frankly embarrassed that not enough is being done. Ten years ago, some even charged that Jesuit universities had out-lived their purpose. A very few even claim that the last General Congregation proposes a more transcendent notion of justice, less social than the Decree Four of GC 32 or even Decree Three (Our Mission and Culture) of GC 34.[15] Even those who share a common faith need to dialogue openly and respectfully.

A Jesuit university is one place where the analysis about justice should be a dialogue that produces action, because the issues that plague our world cannot be solved by conversation alone. Jesuit education seeks congruence between what we know and believe, between what we know and say, between what we believe and do. Educating the whole person means that “faith and justice” be understood not as a curricular tack- on, an obligatory rhetorical flourish, a mode of volunteerism, or a confirmation of one’s own heritage, but as a fundamental reality to be probed and understood and lived out.

Ignacio Ellacuria, S. J., the martyred President of the Jesuit University of Central America spoke eloquently in 1982 about how a university connects the hungers for truth and bread.

We, as an intellectual community, must analyze causes; use imagination and creativity together to discover remedies; communicate to our public a consciousness that inspires the freedom of self-determination; educate professionals with a conscience who will be the immediate instruments of transformation; and continually hone an educational institution that is academically excellent and ethically oriented.[16]

This type of commitment will not confine the dialogue about justice and faith to the philosophy and religious studies departments. Every discipline will make its unique contribution to the

overriding question of how all of us should live. The university administration will support this commitment by repeatedly raising the question and by allocating the university's resources to address these concerns. Student life and alumni programs must be part of this educational effort. Only then will the promotion of justice become the integrating principle for the whole higher education endeavor.

Three Areas for dialogue: It seems to me there are three areas where the two hungers — truth and bread — converge and also reflect on the relationship between reason and faith, faith and culture:

§ when the university speaks and acts prophetically

§ when its members become involved through community service in the culture of poverty

§ when the university examines questions of justice in research and teaching

1. Speaking and acting justly with a prophetic voice: Jesuit colleges and universities over the past two decades have taken some prophetic stances when they examined how socially responsible their investments were, when they rejected grants for nuclear weapons research, when they assisted members of the campus community with particular needs, and when they have sponsored immersion experiences for faculty, students and staff in troubled spots like Chiapas and Guatemala.

I experienced this role in November of 1996 when I joined those calling for the closure of the School of Americas at Fort Benning. I stated that “a Christian University should never abdicate its mission of academic excellence — excellence is needed in order to solve complex social problems. [This means) that the University should be present intellectually where it is needed; to be a voice for those who have no voice; to give intellectual support for those who do not possess the academic qualifications to promote their legitimate rights.”[17]

Such a position must be located in the search for truth-Although job descriptions for university presidents and mission statements do not mention a prophetic role, perhaps they should.

[Article Continued on Next Page](#)

---

[1] See Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, (Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1997).

[2] See Michael J. Buckley, S.J., *The Catholic University as Promise and Project: Reflections in a Jesuit Idiom*. (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 1999) especially Part III.

[3] *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus*, (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995). [GC32, D2, n2]

[4] The Documents of Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et Spes. #1-5). The Council said: “The joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the [people] of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted” are those called by Christ; it went on to say that it offered “no more eloquent proof of its solidarity with the entire human family...than by engaging with it in conversation about these various problems.” While much progress for good has been made, global problems still “torment” us: hunger, poverty, illiteracy, oppression, lack of solidarity, war, international/ideological rivalries, and the spiritual purpose and meaning of human existence.” P. 199f.

[5] Rev. John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Ph.D., Justice in the Marketplace Collected Statements of the Vatican and the U.S. Catholic Bishops on Economic Policy, 1891-1984. ed. David M. Byers, (Washington D.C.: Unites States Catholic Conference, Inc., 1985).

[6] See Jon Sobrino,S.J., “Spirituality and the Following of Jesus” in *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, ed. By Ignacio Ellacuria, S.J., and Jon Sobrino,S.J. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1993), pp. 677-701.

[7] In “reading the signs of the time,” the members of GC34 wrote: “There are millions of men and women in our world, specific people with names and faces, who are suffering from poverty and hunger, from the unjust distribution of wealth and resources and from the consequences of racial, social, and political discrimination. Not only the quality of life but human life itself is under constant threat. It is becoming more and ore clear that despite the opportunities offered by an ever more serviceable technology, we are simply not willing to pay the price of a more just and more humane society,” (GC32, D4, n69).

[8] Very Rev. Pedro Arrupe, S.J. “The Intellectual Apostolate in Society’s Mission today: A Letter to the whole Society” (Rome 25 December1976).

[9] Very Rev. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach,S.J. Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education, (Washington D.C.: The Jesuit Conference, June 7, 1989), p.2.

[10] Documents of the 34th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995). [D2,n48]

[11] There is a new challenge to our apostolic mission in a world increasingly interdependent but, for all that, divided by injustice: injustice not only personal but institutionalized: built into economic, social, and political structures that dominate the life of nations and the international. [GC32, D4, n521]

[12] Documents of the 34th General Congregation, D3 & 14. Complementary Norms, Part VII, 247, p 271/2.

\* human rights and the safeguarding of human life itself from the “culture of death,”

\* new consequences of the interdependence of people in the global market economy,

- \* the quality of life and culture of poor people as well as a reaffirmation of the preferential option for the poor,
- \* the influence of the media in the service of justice,
- \* the ecological preservation of the environment and creation itself,
- \* the tragic marginalization of nations and the need for freedom, peace, and security as well as the concern for refugees.

Concerned for the present and future generation, they saw the importance of “preserving the integrity of creation.... Ecological equilibrium and a sustainable, equitable use of the world’s resources are important elements of justice towards all the communities in our present “global village.” [GC34, D3, n58] And, solidarity with the poor was again confirmed for “full human liberation, for the poor and for us all.... [Such liberation] lies in the development of communities of solidarity at the grass-roots and non-governmental as well as the political level, where we can all work together towards total human development.” [GC34, D3, n59]

[13] Very Rev. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J. Ignatian Pedagogy Today. (Villa Cavalleti, April 29, 1993). An Address to Participants at an International Workshop.

[14] On the importance of inter-religious dialogue and justice, the members of the 34th GC said: “Our involvement in the promotion of justice takes place in a world in which the problems of injustice, exploitation, and destruction of the environment have taken on global dimensions. Religions have also been responsible for these sinful elements. Hence our commitment to justice and peace, human rights, and the protection of the environment has to be made in collaboration with believers of other religions. We believe that religions contain a liberating potential which, through inter-religious collaboration, could create a more human world.” [GD34, D5, n81]

[15] Martin Tripole, S.J., *Promise Renewed: Jesuit Higher Education for a New Millennium* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1999), P. 10.

[16] Ignacio Ellacuria, S.J. Commencement Address at Santa Clara University (1982).

[17] The full text was printed in *America Magazine*(January 4, 1997), p.6.

## **The Identity Debate, the Ministry of Justice, And Justice in Jesuit Higher Education**

Boston College

October 29, 1999

Rev. Bryan Hehir

Director, Catholic Charities of the United States

Former Chairperson of the Executive Committee Harvard Divinity School

and Professor in the Practice of Religion and Society

and Professor, Harvard University Weatherhead Center for International Affairs

I have chosen as my topic the identity debate, the ministry of justice, and Jesuit higher education. I did that for a couple of reasons. First of all, one of the texts I've used as background for these reflections was Father Kolvenbach's address to Jesuit higher education at Georgetown in 1989. At that time Father Kolvenbach was speaking about higher education and the theme of justice, and he addressed the question in terms of the identity of Jesuit higher education. So the identity debate was already implicit in his presentation.

Second, I will argue that the discussion involved in what we today call the identity debate has a kind of dialectical relationship to the ministry of justice. It is the ministry of justice, I think, that creates, in a sense, a need for the identity debate: Who are we as we seek to shape the world? On the other hand, the identity debate calls for Catholic institutions to place the pursuit of justice at the center of their life.

Finally, in circles of higher education the identity debate sometimes generates more skepticism than creativity. There is sometimes a suspicion that maybe this whole discussion about identity is simply a cover for something else, for a kind of retrenchment, or a kind of tightening of the links between institutional sources of authority and universities, which by definition must have freedom to breathe and live. In my view, however, the discussions that today are called "the identity debate" in the Catholic church in the United States represent a moment of positive opportunity and ought not be let go. That positive opportunity invites us to creatively explore the connections among identity, the ministry of justice, and Jesuit higher education. In this essay I propose to contribute to that exploration in the following ways. First, I will offer what I will call a synthetic statement of the identity debate as I see it, its roots and character. Second, I will discuss the ministry of justice as the emergence of an idea that has become a movement in Catholicism. Third, I will consider Jesuit higher education on the grounds of moving from identity to even deeper engagement in the pursuit of justice.

### **The Identity Debate**

What do I mean by the identity debate? It is this sense of institutions across the life of the church asking self-reflective questions such as what it means to be a "Catholic institution." What does that imply? How do you maintain that identity and keep the institution open pluralistically as a welcoming place for people who don't define themselves as Catholic, but do define, for example, commitments of their lives to the question of the pursuit of justice? While the identity debate in higher education is often tied to the *Ex corde Ecclesiae* debate, what is really interesting is how

of the identity debate cuts across all the major Catholic institutions: education, healthcare, social service. Every major part of the Catholic institutional structure is now involved in this discussion. It takes a different shape in each sector of the life of the church, and it is difficult to create what I would call a transverse dialogue across the different sectors, because the problems are so different. But the common source of the discussion in these different sectors has something to do with what I would call the "social location" of Catholicism in this country. The identity debate emerges out of our social location. Where we fit in the society I think is an asset in terms of advancing the potential of the ministry of justice in the life of the church.

In broad synthetic terms, I think the identity debate arises out of a two-stage process of historical development that leads to our present social location. It is a story that runs from the middle of the nineteenth century up through today. The first phase of that story, of course, runs from the middle of the nineteenth century up through the 1950s. It is the story of immigrant Catholicism. During that time period both Catholicism and of individual Catholics stood on the edge of American life. Precisely because they did stand on the edge of American life, there were created within the community of the church a series of institutions to serve the community of faith: educational institutions from kindergarten through college, healthcare institutions of various sorts, and social service as represented, for example, by Catholic Charities. That process of building institutions to serve the internal community of faith resulted, by the 1950s, in a "social presence" within the Catholic church that was parallel to every major social sector in American society: schools, healthcare, social service, relief and development agencies (e.g., Catholic Relief Services). These institutions both held the community together and sent people forth into the wider society. But they were sent out from a given culture and from a given set of institutions.

That process began to change right after the Second World War. The story of that change - the second part of the story, beyond the immigrant church - has a historical component, a policy component, and a theological component that gets us to where we are in the identity debate today. The historical component involves secular sources of change. You might call it the mobility of the Catholic population. The Catholic population moved into different sectors of American life where they were not present before, particularly as a result of Catholic higher education: entrance into the professions, entrance into the business world, while still maintaining a presence in the union world, but also the kind of mobility that moved Catholics out of Catholic neighborhoods until they became almost indistinguishable from the rest of the country.

The policy component was that both the state and society in the United States began to change its policy, particularly with the coming of the New Deal. Then, up through the 1950s, government began to fund private agencies, non-profit agencies - including religious agencies - in every area except education K-12. These institutions that were once wholly "owned" by the church now become institutions that are rooted in the church but that draw vast amounts of their resources from public sources. For example, Catholic Charities in the United States today receives 62% of its budget from government funding. As another example, through much of its history vast amounts of the budget of Catholic Relief Services came from US foreign aid money (although it now receives less governmental funding because the overall federal foreign aid budget is lower). Likewise the Hill-Burton Act, which produced hospitals throughout the United States, also produced Catholic hospitals. So along with the movement of the Catholic population, there was this second factor of an inflow of public funds into agencies that were once wholly and

exclusively Catholic in their funding. But with funds come contracts, criteria, and demands on how you cultivate your service. Yet those two things alone, the history of mobility and policy of public funding, wouldn't have been enough to get us to where we are today. The third and crucial thing was theological. It was a movement in the realm of ideas. That theological source of change is most vividly symbolized by the Second Vatican Council. Both the style of the council and its substantive theological vision called Catholic agencies as part of the community of the church outward and beyond the boundaries of the church. This was not simply a matter of being drawn out by contract money. This was not simply the byproduct of people moving and changing and taking different positions in society.

If we think of the Second Vatican Council in broad terms we can recognize a shift of both style and substance. The shift of style involved a significant change in the definition of Catholicism, a definition that departed from that of the period from the seventeenth century through the middle of the twentieth centuries. That was a period in which Catholicism defined itself over against the major religious movement, the major intellectual movement, and the major political movement of those three centuries: the Reformation religiously, the Enlightenment intellectually, and democracy politically. In each instance the church, for a variety of reasons, felt its only response could be negative. It defined itself over against broad forces that shaped the whole society around it.

If we consider the documents of Vatican II - *Gaudium et spes* (the document on ecumenism for the religious sense), [The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World] [??] (the document on the church in the world, for the intellectual sense), and [??] (the document on religious liberty for the political sense) - we see in one sweep a call to change the basic posture of the Catholicism. The posture became a posture of engaged dialogue. It was not simply saying, "We accept everything that we've opposed for three centuries." Rather, took up a posture of both yes and no. It became what I would call a church of confident modesty - confident enough to think it has something to teach, and yet modest enough to believe it has a lot to learn. The result was a dialectical and dialogical relationship with the world. The spirit of the council, therefore, took a church that had thought about serving its own members and pushed it out beyond itself.

In addition to the shift in style of the council, there was also a shift in the substantive language of the council. The language of paragraph 76 in *Gaudium et spes*, which best exemplifies what I mean, says that it is the task of the church to stand as the sign and safeguard of the transcendent dignity of the human person. This is not a purely secular task; not even a purely moral task; this is a religious task. This council set forth religious content to be used in shaping one's life and to dedicate oneself to protecting the dignity of the person, especially in the face of the forces of the twentieth century that can erode or crush that dignity.

When this theological push from inside the church came together with the historical pull and the policy pull, it took Catholic agencies out onto new ground. When they headed out onto new ground, this led to both intended and unintended consequences. Some results were the sort of changes that we desired. But other things happened we never thought of. These developments posed new kinds of questions: How do you maintain your identity in a changing dialogical context? How do you maintain your identity when you welcome pluralism within it: pluralism of professionals, pluralism of the constituency you serve, pluralism in terms of contractual

obligations that you are held to by sources of secular public authority? Moving away from a parallel institutional presence opened up the question of what kind of presence this kind of church seeks, and for lack of a better term, I'll call it a penetrating presence. It has always been interesting to me that the Council's document was never named "The Church and the World." It was always "The Church in the World." Penetrating presence means it is the social system that is the object of pastoral religious concern. You enter into its fabric and you seek to shape it, for not everything there is just right. But once again, there was a posture of confident modesty; something to teach and something to learn.

So we arrive today, in various institutions, at a kind of moment of reflection. What has been the consequence of such a dramatic shift of agencies, and indeed of the church itself? The questions vary within each sector. As we try to think out the identity question for Catholic Charities, it's different than thinking it out for Catholic higher education, and it's different again when we turn to the Catholic Healthcare Association. There are different forces driving the questions. For example, there is this enormous economic change roiling healthcare. In addition, Catholic healthcare confronts the challenge of how to maintain a commitment to service of the poor and to maintain some viable sense of a bioethic when both come under enormous pressure today. On the other hand, in charities we serve a radically pluralistic population, and do so with a very pluralistic professional staff, many of whom have never heard the animating principles that drive the agency in the first place. At the same time 62% of its budget is from outside sources. How do you create welcoming context and some substantive vision that is shared to keep the agency on its own terms? Then again in Catholic higher education the identity debate leads to questions of freedom and authority and research and American academic life, questions that never occur in the healthcare debate.

The identity debate therefore presents us with a moment of reflection that has emerged out of deep, profound changes in our social location. Therefore I think in that sense it is a good thing, because that social location is an enormous asset. That asset consists in the fact that we now have a church that is both located at the center of American life, and a church that, precisely because it is no post-immigrant but newly immigrant, is back out on the edge of American life. If you're interested in the fault lines of justice, take a church that is urban and newly immigrant, put it in American society and think about the questions of the orphans, the widows, and the resident aliens, and ask if there isn't enough of an agenda for the ministry of justice. Reflecting upon how we got to this social location, and now how we want to stand in a situation that has been partly created by forces beyond us and partly purposely created by choices within the church - that, to my mind, is where the identity debate lies. In crucial ways it affects the vision of the leadership, the professional constituency in each of these sectors. Obviously that means faculty in higher education. But it also affects the expectations and the experience of those who are ministered to, served by these agencies.

#### The Ministry of Justice

My second point is that as we try to think out the identity question, there has been another movement in the church, namely the ministry of justice. I want to argue that the ministry of justice has to be woven through exactly the kind of church I've been describing and its institutions.

My thesis that has two parts. The first part is that we will not be ready for the twenty-first century unless we have a clear sense of what has happened in the last half of the twentieth century on this question, the emergence of the ministry of justice. I want to argue that during that period there has been a quite unexpected deep, profound, significant shift in Roman Catholicism. The second part of the thesis is that the forces that drove the last fifty years are not enough to drive us into the new century. In other words, it just isn't a matter of riding the wave, even if the wave has been very impressive and very effective. So let me try and make a case that both gives us a sense of what the past has been that brings us to this minute, and why it isn't enough for the next fifty years.

If we try to grasp the last fifty years, we really have to go back to the end of nineteenth century, the pope of that time Leo XIII, who was pope from 1878 to 1903. Leo XIII had three major objectives when he became pope: an intellectual objective, a political objective, and a social objective. He inherited a church that epitomized the kind of defensiveness I talked about earlier: rejection of almost all the major trends that were shaping Western life. To undertake these three objectives, Leo XIII instituted a series of movements. The first, intellectually, was what is often called Neo-Thomism or Neo-Scholasticism. It was the intellectual direction he sought to give the church, to root it in the teaching of Aquinas. There was a kind of lock-step interpretation and application of what that meant, not least in Catholic higher education. Politically, he inherited a church where virtually no country sent ambassadors to his inauguration as pope. They didn't think it was worth the effort. The church was so isolated that it was not a player. He set himself the task to reinvigorate the diplomatic presence of the church. Finally, he grasped "the social question." He grasped it late, but he did grasp it, and in doing so he went beyond his predecessors who had not grasped it. By grasping "the social question," I mean recognizing the challenge posed by the social consequences of the industrial revolution - recognizing that that was perhaps the most important pastoral question facing the church; that there was the risk of enormous loss of authority, influence, and membership if somebody didn't address the social changes which were the moral consequences of the industrial revolution.

In Catholicism of the first half of the twentieth century, Neo-Thomism was the intellectual follow through, while the so-called social encyclicals of the first half of the century were the follow-through from his social objective. Both of those carried the church into the 1950s. Neo-Thomism was still very much the dominant frame of reference by the 1950s for Catholic intellectual life. The two social encyclicals, Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* and Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*, drove the social vision up through the 1950s, that's what drove the Catholic model.

What has happened since the 1950s is of a different order than what has happened in the previous fifty years. Someone who attended a Jesuit college in the 1930s or 40s or 50s would have read the two social encyclicals in one of the required theology courses. But I think they read them as one dimension of what it meant to be Catholic, sort of an arrow in the quiver of what it meant to be Catholic. It was there, but it did not assume what you might call a commanding presence in the definition of what was Catholic.

Jump ahead from the 1950s to Father Kolvenbach's talk to Jesuit higher education in 1989. Referring to the consequences of the 32nd General Congregation on Faith and Justice, Father Kolvenbach said to Jesuit higher educators that the pursuit of justice should be what he called the

forum omnium [?? tape difficult to decipher here; check with Bill Spohn], the sort of inner spirit of everything, the inner form. Now how do you get from an understanding of the social component as one arrow in the quiver, one among many, to an argument that it ought to be the forum omnium of Catholic higher education, the driving spirit I take it loosely translated, the inner form?

In fact a number of things have happened to bring about that transformation. First, with the successors of Leo XIII - the popes of the second half of this century - the papal social teaching expands dramatically from the first half. There's much more of it. The range of topics is much wider. The scope of analytical interest is much broader. It is no longer limited to two documents. There is now a slew of ideas.

Second, a teaching that had been rigidly unilateral began to become a bit pluralist, for in the pursuit of justice there were different voices about how to pursue justice. The most visible example was the rise of the theology of liberation. But what was even more interesting was the pluralism of episcopal conferences throughout the world - the various Catholic bishops' conferences - who tended to look at things differently from one another, and at times differently in emphasis from the official teaching.

Third, the role of the laity: dramatically different in the last fifty years. For the first fifty years the laity fitted into what was called Catholic Action, where Catholic Action tended to mean that the laity was there to do what the bishop told them to do. The initiative all rested at the top, the argument was vertical, and at least in the United States, Catholic Action in that sense never caught on. Today, by way of contrast, I think the ministry of justice in many ways is driven by the laity. Its future is certainly in lay hands (though not exclusively, of course). But if you get the change in the kind of papal teaching, the theological discussion that surrounds it, and the shift about the moral agency of the laity (which is so evident in higher education, as well as in every other one of those agencies I talked about), then I think you begin to get a configuration of a different way of the church approaching this question of the ministry of justice.

How did it happen, this shift from one dimension to the form of everything? I think the fundamental catalyst was again the Second Vatican Council, although curiously enough, the council's contribution to the church's pursuit of the ministry of justice was not in the area where one usually thinks of the ministry of justice. We usually think of the ministry of justice in the area of moral judgment on politics, economics, law, culture, international relations. Yet Vatican II was sparse on new contributions in those areas. The fundamental thing that the Council did for this second half of the century, this qualitative shift in the ministry of justice, was ecclesiological. It gave a new way of interpreting the church, a way of interpreting what made the church faithful in a very fundamental sense.

That ecclesiological shift was a kind of fault line. The effects of playing out that fault line has been what the last fifty years has been about. That process has been three-dimensional. It has involved conceptual change, organizational change, and now the call for integration. The conceptual change is precisely the kind of theological development in the definition of what constitutes being Catholic that flowed from the Council. Not only the theology of liberation, but other forms of theology picked up *Gaudium et spes*, the document on the church in the world,

and began to play out its implications - about how it related to the preaching of the scriptures, the celebration of the sacraments, and to the formation and definition of what it meant to be Catholic. The effect of the Council was to take the "social" ministry of justice and move it into the center of the church's life. That was the fundamental shift, to move it from the edge of the church to the center, to say that this is not just some option. This is essential. It's not an option in the way you judge a diocese, it's not an option in the way you judge a parish, it's not an option in determining who ought to fill positions of leadership in the church, and it's not an option in the way you try to shape the Catholic conscience. Of course we do not live up to that ideal all the time, but that shift is now a permanent part of the conciliar documents. I think it is crystal clear, and I think it's a different approach than saying this is one dimension among several others that make us Catholic. That discussion continues to this day, really a quite different kind of discussion than surrounded the social teaching of the early part of this century, although a discussion very indebted to the ecclesiology of the 1930s through the Council.

The second shift was organization or institutional, and this is really what marks the last fifty years most visibly. As an organization, the Roman Catholic church is sort of hyper-institutional. It functions by permeating institutions, and to effect change through them. That kind of organization effected major institutional change over this question of the ministry of justice. The Jesuits themselves are a prime example of this. Both the initiative of the 32nd General Congregation, the very debate it sparked, and the consequences that flowed from it all over the world are one sign. But it is also evident in the role of women in religious orders in the United States, and the way in which if you watched the extraordinarily systematic attempt to integrate this vision into their life under the most difficult conditions of declining numbers - it's really quite extraordinary. Again, the ways that missionary orders changed their definition of how they thought about themselves, not simply to go from here someplace else and serve, but this new idea that you went someplace else to serve and then you translated your experience back into the United States. Such translations were picked up in the United States and played important roles in a major foreign policy debates about Central America, or human rights, or war and peace. This was a new dynamic: a community that depends on its institutions while the institutions themselves are in flux.

One could say that this is an elite movement. But we know enough about how elites work in complex organizations to know if you influence them, then the likelihood of wider results is high. A example is the episcopal conferences of the Catholic bishops themselves. In the 1980s we had lots of debates about those two large letters on the economy and nuclear war. But no one at the episcopal conferences ever stood up on the floor and said, "Why are we involved in this?" Nobody ever stood up and said, something must have gone wrong to get us into this discussion. Yet I think that neither of the letters on nuclear arms or the economy would have survived without *Gaudium et spes*. It was the foundation on which those movements were built.

Now the problem is that this is still a very unfinished product. There is a tendency today to say that the social teaching was taught better in the past, in the period from 1920 through 1950. I think what people mean by that is that everybody had to take theology then, and therefore everybody sooner or later had to read those documents. But today there is needed something at a deeper and wider level, something more complicated to implement, but richer. Thus we are faced with a third shift. It isn't simply conceptual development or organizational development of elites.

This is really this question about integration, which of course is part of the identity debate: How do you define who you are? How do you define who you are as a faith community, as a specific institution within the faith community, and as a person within a faith community? How do you define what your vision is about? Tell me where your treasure is, I'll tell you where your heart is located. How do you get at that question if you say the ministry of justice is integral, central, to what it means to be Catholic?

This clearly is an unfinished arena. After fifty rather remarkable years we still only have an elite movement. The most recent document from the Catholic Bishop's Conference on the question of the social teaching says the most serious problem we face is that individuals can regard themselves as Catholic and still be miles away from all concern about the ministry of justice - not necessarily through bad will; rather, just untouched by it. Yet even those who are touched by it do not necessarily integrate it. Integration is the great challenge of the present moment. There now is a solid foundation, an organizational structure, and the opportunity for integration. It is hard to think there are many places of greater significance for the task of integration than institutions of higher education, especially in a country which defines itself in terms of success, and higher education as the first step to it. Insofar as integration becomes the primary challenge, higher education becomes the critical site for meeting that challenge.

There are unique opportunities and unique challenges for justice and Catholic higher education. It is easier to change Catholic Charities than it is to change a major educational institution because, to put it bluntly, nobody in Catholic Charities has tenure. Nobody in Catholic Charities looks at you and says, "I am not interested in this recent movement, and you can't do anything about it." So, there are unique opportunities and there are unique challenges to try and do this in higher education. I've spent much of my life with people who are in what's called social ministry. They are both very interested in discussions of justice in Catholic higher education, but also skeptical, because it has been hard to do this in higher education up until now. They don't understand why the president can't just call everybody together and say, "we will organize this by breakfast this way, and anybody that doesn't like it can leave." This can be done in many other organizations, including some of the ones I talked about earlier, but not in higher education.

#### The Momentum of the Past Will Not Last

Let me shift ground a little bit. That was the first part of the thesis. The first part of the thesis was that there has been a remarkable development over fifty years. Present discussions of justice in Jesuit higher education are poised at the crest of a wave that we have been riding for many years. However, that wave won't carry us for the next fifty years. The wave is on the way down, not in the sense of decline, but rather because it has fulfilled its purpose. I do not think that an invigorated ministry of justice can simply proceed in linear fashion from momentum of the last fifty years. We've inherited a dynamic movement, but I do not believe that it's enough to get us through. It is not adequate to help us take advantage of the moment of opportunity that is here.

Consider for example both the documents of Vatican II and Father Kolvenbach's talk. Vatican II talked about the dramatic, powerful changes that were sweeping the world, and the reason why the church needed a council was to respond to those changes. That's exactly what John XXIII said, exactly what *Gaudium et spes* said. But consider how they defined the changes. There was

virtually no discussion of women, or feminism, or what we've come to know as the women's movement. Again, Vatican II concluded just as the Civil Rights struggle in this country was gaining momentum. And when Vatican II talked about technology it wasn't even close to what we today call biotechnology, not even close to the kind of questions that are thrown up daily. Even Father Kolvenbach's talk in 1989, begins by saying that the culture and the society and the world in which we live has changed irrevocably, and so we must change. He's very strong about that. But the date of the talk is fascinating: 1989. Six months after he gave that talk the wall came down in Berlin. He hadn't even thought about the end of the Cold War (understandably; neither had the rest of us), much less a global market, fully integrated, with the ability to move billions of dollars at the touch of a button. So if the thirty years leading up to 1989 made irrevocable changes, what about the last ten, as one thinks about what it will take to ride the next wave?

I think the social teaching today - the conceptual, intellectual foundation - is actually in place a very similar to where it was at the end of the nineteenth century. It's just that the challenge is different. At the end of the nineteenth century the challenge for the church was to try to understand the industrial revolution in its sources, its scope, its power, and its consequences. At the end of the twentieth century, there's an equally powerful imperative to understand globalization, which is qualitatively different from the industrial revolution.

I would argue that if you're interested in the ministry of justice and justice and peace today, you need to stand back and see a world that is driven simultaneously by two totally different forces. One force is fragmentation, and the other force is integration. Now the two things sound like bad and good, like fragmentation must be bad and integration must be good. But the fact of the matter is, both of those forces can do enormous human harm. How do we manage a world in which the political order fragments? (You can put the names on that: Bosnia, Somalia, Rwanda, Kosovo, Sierra Leone.) At the same time, while the fragmentation goes on, how do you also manage a constant, almost irrevocable drive to integration - global markets, capital markets, financial flows, integration through knowledge and computer? Both of these forces have to be managed. Both of those forces, fragmentation and integration, have a logic but no ethic. They have a drive but no normative direction. They raise very large questions for the church.

If you look at the church's social teaching, it is a teaching that knows how to deal with states and it knows how to deal with international institutions. It has been dealing with states from their origin. It has a sense of how to think about the state, the nation-state, the human family. It latched on early to international institutions: support the UN, support the building of financial institutions. But neither states nor international institutions today are the driving forces in globalization. What drives globalization is a series of transnational forces, under the control of neither states nor international institutions, with a kind of independent logic. Meanwhile Catholics have a teaching that is aimed at states and international institutions, but is very soft on the way these other forces work. It's not at all clear that we have the conceptual tools to grasp globalization. So once again, the last fifty years don't guarantee anything about the next fifty.

#### The Challenge for Jesuit Higher Education

If Catholic higher education is crucial to the integration question, what are the implications of saying, for instance, that Catholic social teaching does not have the conceptual firepower to deal with the world that's before it? It means that we face a double task here, both pastoral and intellectual. We can look back and recognize that we have many resources. We can look ahead

see powerful challenges. We are someplace in between. We are not bereft of resources, but we ought not to be too sure we've got enough of them. That brings us finally to the question, then, of Catholic higher education, Jesuit higher education, the question of identity and engagement.

As I think about how higher education should respond to the picture I've painted, I would propose three steps regarding ideas, institutions, and citizens. With regard to ideas, I think there is very good raw material, not simply in the social teaching, but more broadly in the Catholic social tradition to deal with some of the very problems I've talked about. We have a basic structure that has an elemental clarity, and we can start to build around it. That basic structure consists of the dignity of the person, and the human family as the fundamental moral community. It will not be easy to sustain a commitment either to the dignity of the person or to the idea that the human family is the fundamental moral community. Those can no longer simply be taken as a granted set of propositions. But I think that's where we begin. We begin with the fundamental convictions that every social system exists for the benefit of the person, that the dignity of the person is a truth we hold onto because we constantly cultivate the themes that undergird our commitment to it, whether they be philosophical or theological or reinforced by art and literature and poetry and liturgy and sacraments. That's why the discussion about identity is not just about theology. It is about a way of looking at all the disciplines in light of certain fundamental convictions. But the emphasis on personal dignity does not yield a kind of isolated individualism, for the human community is the fundamental moral unit. We've got to be concerned about everyone if we're going to have moral rectitude in this position. We may not be able to do something for everyone. That's a different question. But the conceptual design of how you think about the world can neither undercut human dignity nor eliminate the moral community.

Consider for a moment how those basic commitments engage certain contemporary issues. My friend Robert Cohain [?? check spelling] at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government contends that "Sovereignty is up for grabs." That sounds like a mere matter of theoretical debate. But it is not very theoretical when it means that nobody is to go into Kosovo because it's within the boundaries of a sovereign state; or that nobody should have done anything preventative in Rwanda because it was a sovereign state. We need to think about sovereignty today in a Catholic setting. We don't have at present an answer to Cohain's challenge, but we've got some fundamental ideas. Our ideas that are different, for example, from those of standard realism and different from those of more recent communitarianism. On the basis of those fundamental ideas we would argue that the community must be universal community. I think that most recent communitarians would have difficulty with that. On the other hand, we would want to argue, against the realists position that the nation-state has a kind of absolute character about it, and that its interests trump everything else. As Charles Krauthammer said about Kosovo, this is the kind of war Sweden should fight - meaning that it wasn't worth the United States's effort. That is a problematic statement from the viewpoint of the basic structure of Catholic social commitments. Neither the realist nor the communitarian, I think, captures the picture in its complexity. I think that we should give some weight to the sovereign state. But we shouldn't give it everything, and we may have to give it less than we gave it before, but I'm not quite sure how to draw the line.

Consider as a second area of engagement that of human rights and globalization. When you want to press human rights in a world of sovereign states, you want to erode the power of the state so that other people can do something about human rights violations within the state. When you're

in a world of increasingly irrevocable integration through globalization, you may want to build up the capacity of vulnerable states so they are not simply at the mercy of forces that don't have an ethic, but have a logic. How should we strike the balance?

As a third example consider globalization itself. In John Paul II's letter, *Centesimus Annus* he articulates a principle called the common destination of the goods of the earth: that the goods of the earth are for everyone, and that therefore there is, to use the pope's language, a social mortgage on property. This is not something you're going to get in Economics 101 in most places, the common destination of the goods of the earth. It's a great idea. Not that you can't own property, but that you can't own it without responsibility. Now in a world in which global market forces are much more important than the boundaries of states, or the meaning of culture, or the distributional effect within a country of a process that is judged in the aggregate, the common destination of the goods of the earth is an interesting way to stand the debate up straight. But does it give you an adequate ethic for globalization? It doesn't even approach it. I am not convinced that if we put forth the best we have of the social teaching in a forum on globalization, that we would could regard ourselves as having an adequate ethic. I do not think that the wave of the last fifty years has prepared us for that. But the common destination of the goods of the earth and the option for the poor and a theory of distributive justice with roots in Aristotle, reshaped by Aquinas, and brought up to date by the twentieth century papal teaching - those give us something to enter the game with. Still, they do not constitute the finished product that we dearly need. At the conceptual level of ideas, as we start thinking about the problems of the day we must proceed with confident modesty. We don't approach these problems with nothing, but we don't go in with enough. This means that there really is a creative task for higher education. It is not a matter of just passing things on.

At the institutional level, I think again that there is a unique problem with higher education. Institutions are the way we lay hands on life. Institutions allow us to develop a vision of life and then they give us the capacity to lay hands on hunger, homelessness, killing, dying, making peace. Institutions carry values, and institutional posture and institutional activity exhibit values. But to be honest, there's a tension within institutions of higher education, a tension that in the 1980s Derek Bok struggled with when the debate was about embargo in South Africa. Bok was not against the embargo, but he wasn't convinced that an institution qua institution ought to take a position. He made a pretty vigorous argument that the best way an institution of higher education could serve was to create the space in which people could make very good arguments for what they expected was necessary to do.

Now, this is a question about academic freedom and a pluralistic community. Catholic institutions carry values. For example, we say today Catholic hospitals can't do certain things because that's going to project a value. Well they ought to do other things then. If they're not going to serve the poor they ought to close down. These are some of the identity issues that Catholic hospitals face. In a Catholic context the institution has to be able to project its own values. But how do you do that and do it appropriately within the context of freedom of research, etc.? A Catholic institution of higher education is going to have to deal with the value question a little bit differently than the way the president of Harvard did at one time.

Finally there is the question of citizens. This returns us to the integration question. I think that over the last ten to fifteen years students were not well treated by the public press, because you kept hearing students were so career oriented and so self-centered. This wasn't at all my experience at Georgetown or at Harvard. My experience of students was that were interested in religion, in their own way, and were very generous if you gave them some direction and something to grab hold of and something to do. There's no question that a great many students going through college have good what you might call social justice experiences - soup kitchens, Appalachia, whatever it might be. I think those things are good, and when they're combined with the courses, are even better. But we do not want to create a sense among students that social justice is like being on the crew team. That is to say, it's the thing you do in college, but then you leave college and you get into the real business of the world, just as you don't have any more time for crew, you don't have any more time for social justice. So in addition to religious commitment and authentic generosity - soup kitchens, etc. - there's a third piece. It is what you might call the intellectual structure by which someone integrates his or her life. So the question is what kind of intellectual structure is someone who sits in your economics class or your policy class, whom you're sure is going to be a CEO, going to take with her into that kind of tough arena? What kind of intellectual structure will they take with them into politics, business, the professions? How does one develop an intellectual structure about justice, human dignity, the moral community of humanity. How does one develop an intellectual structure that provides a way of judging sovereignty, and the markets, and technology in a way that they're intellectually tough enough to really deal with the forces that have a drive, a logic, but no ethic? How are young people to develop an intellectual structure that enables them to carry bring with them a vision of an ethic that tries to shape life and not simply be carried forward by it? What kind of an education produces that kind of person, ready for the long haul on these questions?

t's hard to assess fully the stakes that are always on the table when we talk about the ministry of justice. There are different ways of trying to summarize it. The one that I've remembered best is the story at the end of World War II, when the French Dominicans in Paris invited Albert Camus to come to talk to them about the future of Europe and by what vision the future of Europe would be shaped. He gave a talk on how he as an agnostic dealt with the problem of evil in life. At the end of the talk Camus said, it may not be possible for us to create a world in which no innocent children suffer, but it is possible to create a world in which fewer innocent children suffer. And if we look to the Christians and don't find help, where else will we go? I think that's the best way to summarize what is at stake in this intersection of the identity debate, the ministry of justice, and the future of Jesuit higher education.

**SECTION III. THREE PAPERS FROM THE REGIONAL JUSTICE CONFERENCES**

## **Broadening the Vision of Justice in Jesuit Higher Education**

Patrick H. Byrne  
Department of Philosophy  
Boston College

Over the past quarter of a century, many have come to think of the commitment to social justice as the distinctive feature of Jesuit higher education. This commitment can be traced to the work of the 32nd General Congregation of 1975 (GC 32), which proclaimed: “The mission of the Society of Jesus today is the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement.”[1]

This was a bold statement. It set in motion a major new direction in the Jesuit sense of mission. Its potential implications were sweeping, especially for Jesuit institutions of higher education. While this new point of departure has enjoyed a fairly positive reception among many affiliated with Jesuit institutions of higher education—Jesuits as well as lay people, both Catholic and non-Catholic—that reception has been neither unqualified nor universal. More recently, the proceedings of the 1995 General Congregation 34 (GC 34) took up several of the issues which emerged in the wake of this proclamation of an “absolute requirement” to the promotion of justice.

In this article I hope to do three things: first, briefly survey some of the pronouncements of the two General Congregations, and problems that have arisen regarding the meaning of the phrase, “promotion of justice.” I will argue that the notion of justice implicit in Decree 4 is both too ambiguous and too narrow, and that this is especially problematic for the mission of higher education. Second, I will present the theory of justice articulated by Aristotle and indicate how it might provide a stepping stone toward a vision of justice that is broader and more refined, while still including the commitments of the General Congregations. Third, I will suggest ways in which the work of Bernard Lonergan might be used to broaden still further this Aristotelian vision of justice in ways that are both more adequate to the demands of our contemporary world, and more inclusive of the work proper to a modern university.

### **I. The Vision of Justice in General Congregations 32 and 34.**

Arguably the most influential document of GC 32 (known as “Decree 4: Our Mission Today: The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice”) emphatically exhorts the promotion of justice over a dozen times in its twenty-seven pages. This decree came in response to the then growing concern about the plight of the poorest of the poor, especially in the Latin American nations. Yet its proclamation that “the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement” raises several serious questions. Does the absolute requirement apply to every Jesuit institution or only to the Society as a whole? To every individual in a Jesuit institution, or only to the institution as a whole? To every activity of the individual or only to the individual as a whole? Must the work of Jesuits that does not directly effect the promotion of justice be abandoned? The answer to some of these seems to be skewed in a decisive direction by §47 of Decree 4: “the promotion of justice is not one apostolic area among others ... it should be the concern of our whole life and a

dimension of all our apostolic endeavors.” But what exactly is meant by the “justice” which is an absolute requirement? What standard of justice is to be used in assessing whether the society or its institutions or affiliated individuals are complying with the requirement?

Confusion and division within the Society ensued, in part because of the ambiguities regarding the meaning of justice in this document.[2] In fact Decree 4 never does set forth a clear, explicit definition of the justice to be promoted. However, the contexts within which the phrase appears convey a general, albeit vague and conflicted, impression of the intended meaning of justice.[3] We find, for example, that the justice to be promoted is said to be “not only personal but institutional” (§6) or “structural” (§§32, 40), especially concerning “economic, social, and political structures” and development (§§6, 53). This sense of justice concerns “poverty and hunger ... racial, social, and political discrimination” (§20) and the affirmation of the “dignity of the human person” (§29), the “rights of all, especially the poor,” underprivileged, powerless, and oppressed (§§18, 27, 41, 48, 60, 79). There is an exhortation to “work to form public opinion” of the affluent (§81), and there is special attention to the “distribution of wealth and resources” (§20) and to “distribute resources ... more equitably” (§27).

The phrase “social justice” has been used to characterize these general features.[4] However, this does not really help clarify matters, for all justice has a social dimension. Rather, what the citations above reveal is that the “social justice” of greatest concern in Decree 4 is distributive justice: the equitable distribution of wealth, food, respect, and political power. GC 32 took its stand on the ground that intolerable inequities in the distribution of these goods had become “structurally” routinized and entrenched, and that it was imperative that the Society of Jesus take steps to redress these inequities.

Now if we were to survey what we currently do in Jesuit colleges and universities, we would have to admit that relatively little of what we do directly contributes to the promotion of distributive justice in Decree 4’s sense. We could, of course, include all of the direct services to the poor and the marginalized—conducting various drives for direct donations of money, food, clothing etc. to shelters, refugee and disaster relief organizations, as well as volunteer or underwritten direct services at legal aid offices, health clinics, or in counseling, pastoral care, tutoring, mentoring or companionship programs, etc. But these are certainly tangential to the primary functions of colleges and universities. Again, our colleges and universities may be said to directly address distributive injustices when they provide special college scholarship programs supplemented by preparatory and supportive services, to young people from poor families and from groups historically victims of discrimination. Perhaps we may also count those educational programs that prepare people who will make careers in institutions that provide these sorts of direct services. Likewise, we could count courses which incorporate components presenting data and analysis of poverty, hunger and discrimination in the world and which emphasize the special obligation to seek out and assist the poor and marginalized. At a somewhat further remove, colleges and universities might be considered to meet the “absolute requirement to promote justice” insofar as faculty engaged in research projects contribute to the knowledge base related to such issues. All of these are functions which Jesuit colleges and universities already engage in, to a greater or lesser degree. All, it seems to me, are worthwhile efforts that ought to be continued, supported, and encouraged to grow to the extent feasible given the resources of a given institution.

However, if we take into consideration the entire range of the properly academic functions of teaching and research that we presently engage in at the Jesuit institutions of higher learning in the United States, the vast majority of these simply do not conform to the conception of justice implicit in Decree 4. The vast majority of our course offerings and research projects occur in fields such as literature and languages, history, philosophy, theology and religious studies, mathematics, engineering, nursing, education, medicine, law, the natural and the social sciences. Even if in certain of these courses issues of distributive justice are treated explicitly, even if ever more courses explicitly incorporate such issues in the future, it remains that the main trajectory of these present-day successors to the core of the Jesuit liberal education cannot be realistically viewed as having any direct bearing on problems of distributive justice. Moreover, probably less than 10% of our graduates will go on to careers that directly impact the lives of those suffering from the failures of distributive justice. Realistically, even if we thought it proper to restructure our institutions to conform to Decree 4's standards, we would all be bankrupt within a few years. All this suggests that we need a broader way of thinking about the commitment to promoting justice in relationship to modern Jesuit colleges and universities.

Behind Decree 4, I think it is fair to say, was the quite legitimate worry that the Jesuit mission, especially in education, had failed to "turn the hearts and minds of their often well-heeled students to a concern for the poor and oppressed." [5] Legitimate as this concern was, the limitations of Decree 4 were certain to give rise to difficulties. Among other things, its insistence that distributive justice "should be the concern of our whole life and a dimension of all our apostolic endeavors" (§47) seems to require the abandonment of the vast majority of academic functions of the colleges and universities. This follows not only from the narrowness of the focus upon distributive justice, but also from the sense implicit in Decree 4 that priority should be given to efforts that directly bear upon the plight of the poor. [6] For these and related reasons, "it was becoming apparent to [then General of the Society of Jesus Rev. Pedro] Arrupe ... that Decree 4's understanding of justice had led to 'exaggerations and one-sidedness' on the part of some, and 'fear' on the part of others." [7]

This worry of was finally addressed by the Society in a systematic way in the 34th General Congregation of 1995. Martin Tripole remarks that there was

an explicit attempt to enlarge the understanding of the mission of the Society beyond that understanding set in place by GC 32 in Decree 4. GC 34 reaffirms Decree 4, but does so by going beyond it to formulate a theological and apostolic framework that notably deepens and broadens its perspective ... and thereby [is] more supportive of the Society's apostolate of higher education. [8]

Where mission and justice were fused into one document by GC 32, mission, justice and culture are treated in three separate decrees by GC 34. Significantly, GC 34's decree on mission (Decree 2) drops the phrase "absolute requirement" in its statement of the connection between Jesuit mission and justice. [9] Moreover, in place of Decree 4's insistence that the promotion of justice should be "a dimension of all our apostolic endeavors," GC 34's decree on mission states instead that

in the conduct of our personal and community lives and in whatever ministries we undertake—whether works of pastoral service, academic scholarship, spiritual ministry, or education—we will live in ways which look to the fullness of the Kingdom in which justice, and not human sin, will hold sway.[10]

While GC 34 in no way abandons the importance of the promotion of distributive justice, this becomes an indispensable but by no means exclusive dimension of the Society's mission. In this broader context, justice is understood to be

dynamically related to the inculturated proclamation of the Gospel and dialogue with other religious traditions ... Justice can only truly flourish when it involves the transformation of culture, since the roots of injustice are embedded in cultural attitudes as well as in economic structures (§§15, 17)

This recontextualization of the promotion of justice does much to broaden the conception of the Jesuit mission in ways that are more compatible with the recognizable academic functions of institutions of higher learning. Tripole proposes a theological interpretation of this broadening. According to his analysis, the theological sense of "justice" has three dimensions: (1) most foundational is God's transcendent justice or "justification," that is, God's redemptive activity which makes humanity just (i.e., freeing humanity from sin and "setting humanity right"), and through personal conversion bringing people to share in God's divine life; (2) the consequent "liberation from the mental patterns and attitudes ... [which] permeates human culture" through the lives and works of God's followers; and (3) the portion of these works which are specifically directed the reforming of "social structures to overcome economic poverty and political oppression." [11] But, Tripole notes, "Unfortunately this larger perspective is not consistently followed" throughout all the documents from GC 34—and in particular, while the conception of the mission of the Society of Jesus now reflects this broader analysis, the conception of justice to be promoted in the documents of GC 34 are still troubled by serious tensions and ambiguities.[12]

The inconsistencies among the documents suggest that still further clarification is needed. In the remainder of this article, I will attempt to suggest a philosophical clarification, first by drawing some suggestions from Aristotle's theory of justice, and then by considering how the work of Bernard Lonergan might be used to broaden still further this Aristotelian vision of justice.

## II. General Justice and Distributive Justice in Aristotle

In their major writings, both Plato and Aristotle situate their the discussions of justice within a broader discussion of the good—the Good in itself for Plato; the ultimate good of the "realm of human action" for Aristotle. For Aristotle, as for his teacher Plato, the most important thing was to open up and keep open the horizon of the good. Both come at this broader question of the good not directly, but indirectly. In the Republic Plato only speaks about the Good by means of analogy and allegory. He uses the famous "divided line"—itself a geometrical proportion (or analogia)—to introduce the "Forms," of which the Form of the Good is the highest and most fundamental. This introduction is filled out more richly in the famous "Allegory of the Cave." The allegory conveys, as only symbolic expressions can, that: "The sunlit landscapes in which

you so delight are no more than shadows when compared to the Good.” The allegory does not tell us what the Good is; but it does evoke a desire for this “something more.” This Eros for the Good is indispensable for Plato’s account of justice. The Good is never described in itself. It is only described in its erotic, transcending relation to the realm of common beliefs regarding the real and good life.

Likewise, Aristotle takes as his point of departure the fact that every human being desires the human good, happiness. As he puts it, happiness is an “end in the realm of action [praxis] which we desire for its own sake” (1094a19). I ask my students why they came to class. Their answers vary—“this might be on the test,” “because I want to get a good grade,” “I want to learn,” etc. When I repeat the question, “Why do you want to do that?” their successive answers retreat to ever more comprehending motives— “I need this course to graduate,” “I want to get a good job,” “to earn a lot of money”—inevitably converging upon, “Because I want to be happy.” What their responses reveal, Aristotle would claim, is an all-pervasive, underlying desire for the highest human good, happiness. Though all pervasive, people seldom pay attention to their desire for happiness and only rarely articulate the object of their deepest longing with genuine care.

Aristotle sets himself the task of offering just such an articulation in his *Nicomachean Ethics*. When Aristotle does take up the issue of distributive justice—the issue of greatest concern for Decree 4—it is within the larger context of his articulation of the human desire for true happiness. Hence, for Aristotle serious discussion of distributive justice presupposes more general considerations. In fact his discussion of distributive justice is set in between his discussions of “general justice” on the one hand, and justice in exchange and rectification on the other. Moreover, his comprehensive treatment of justice (Book 5 of his *Nicomachean Ethics*) is itself set in between his earlier discussions of happiness and the moral virtues, and his subsequent discussion of the intellectual virtues and friendship. These structural features of composition are not without significance. For Aristotle, acts of just distribution presuppose and are linked to broader and deeper activities of human living, both individual and communal. Without this wider context his ideas about distributive justice would be drained of their meaning and could seem superficial, even naive.

According to Aristotle, distributive justice concerns the fair distribution of “common goods” (1131b27). He mentions material goods, security, and honor as examples of common goods (1130b3). More generally, we could say that “common goods” are things that it takes virtually the entire community to produce, goods which are then divided up for distribution to members of the community.[13] In our contemporary situation, we might add education, health care, transportation, recreation, and information as further examples of common goods.[14]

Because common goods are only of value when they are divided up and made available to individuals, the question of distributive justice for Aristotle becomes the question of the criterion for “fairness” in distributing goods that are produced by the wider community. In answer, he proposes that distribution of common goods is just when it is made “proportionately,” that is, “the ratio between the shares [of the common goods] will be the same as that between the persons” (1131a22). In other words, distribution is just when  $b : c :: B : C$ , where  $b$  is person B’s share of the common goods, and  $c$  is person C’s share. Aristotle does not intend this to be taken

as a strictly mathematical equation, but rather as a kind of paradigm for thinking about just distribution.

Even as a paradigm, however, Aristotle's proposal raises difficult questions. Although there is a concept of equality embedded within this ideal, it is not a simplistic notion of equality. Aristotle's proposal clearly envisions inequalities between individuals, and proclaims that distributive justice requires equal ("same") ratios among unequals. His proposal naturally leads to the significant further question as to which sorts of inequalities among individuals ought to be taken into consideration, and which not. By what standard are the individuals to be compared? Aristotle seems to dodge the question, replying, almost hesitantly,

Everyone agrees that in distributions the just share must be given on the basis of what one deserves, though not everyone would name the same criterion of deserving: democrats say it is free birth, oligarchs that it is wealth or noble birth, and aristocrats that it is excellence, that is, virtue (1131a25-27). [Note that Aristotle's understandings of the words denoting these three classes is rather different from our own.]

Yet Aristotle is not nearly as indecisive as this remark suggests. His own position among these options is made clear by the very way which he has situated the discussion of distributive justice within the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He deliberately prefaces his remarks on distributive justice with his account of "general justice" or "justice as a whole." General justice is "complete virtue or excellence ... in relationship to our fellow human beings" (1129b26). In our contemporary terms, Aristotle is speaking of justice as "right relationship." On the one hand, general justice is a quality of individual men and women who are truly just, those who are "morally good" and "live in conformity with every virtue" in their dealings with others (1130b1-23). (Aristotle has in mind that the totality of virtues such as courage, generosity, self-restraint, honesty, magnanimity, friendliness, wittiness, high-mindedness, etc.) On the other hand, general justice pertains to "the common good," to that which "produces and preserves the happiness for the social and political community" (1129b18). Indeed, what "produces virtue entire [general justice] are those lawful measures which are enacted for education in citizenship" (1130b24-25).[15] For Aristotle, the proper function of law is to form people in "every virtue"—to produce the true happiness that comes from a life complete in virtue and nothing less.

With these observations Aristotle subtly but no less definitely identifies a standard according to which formally enacted laws themselves (as well as the informal "laws" of social customs and practices, including structures and mechanisms of distribution) are to be evaluated as to their justice. Do the laws, norms and structures yield a "common good," a communal life of interaction and conversation characterized regularly by virtuous and noble deeds? To the extent that they do, the laws and structures of a society would be "just" in the general sense; to the extent that they produce the opposite, they are unjust. Moreover, while there is an undeniable function of law as commanding and punishing, the more fundamental role of law in Aristotle's view is that of "education in citizenship" and virtue, which operates both informally as well as formally. Law, which in Aristotle's day at least made "pronouncements on every sphere of life" (1129b14) is the expression of the community as to what it means to live justly. People are formed in general justice by just people; just formal laws and just informal structures are the means by which this is achieved. Of course people who fall short of the high standards of "virtue

entire” institute flawed laws and structures, and thereby form their successors in ways that fall ever further from the life of virtue and general justice. The natural desire of individuals for true happiness and virtue, grounds and offers a transcommunal standard by which laws are to be tested, criticized, modified. Indeed, Martin Luther King, Jr. appealed to this sort of transcommunal standard, both in his criticism of segregation laws as unjust, and in replying to the clergymen who criticized him for breaking those laws.[16]

Hence Aristotle’s account of general justice depends in a crucial way upon a theory of the virtues and their connection to the intrinsic human desire for true happiness. In the first four books of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (which immediately precede the book devoted to justice) Aristotle carefully develops a critical theory of happiness and its relationship to the moral excellences (or virtues) such as courage, generosity, self-restraint, honesty, magnanimity, friendliness, wittiness, high-mindedness, etc. Like Plato his teacher, Aristotle began his investigation of the meaning of virtue and happiness by reflecting upon his own community, both the local polis of Athens as well as the wider ancient world of diverse political regimes. He describes and comments upon diverse opinions about happiness, about the best way to live, about friendship and about the best form of political rule. But he does not rest content with describing and reporting the states of affairs as he finds them. He applies the tools of dialectical criticism in an effort to arrive at better and truer understandings of these guiding ideas. Nor is this work of criticism a merely a scientific end in itself, for knowledge of this good is “important to our lives” and can “better equip us, like archers who have a target to aim at, to hit the proper mark” (1094a24). In Aristotle’s overall effort, one can discern something that is intrinsically academic in its functions and practices.

From this brief outline of Aristotle’s treatment of distributive justice, general justice, virtue and happiness, let me draw some conclusions which I believe can be of value for our present concern about the relationship between the “promotion of justice” and higher education.

First, distributive justice has to do with goods that are communally produced but are divisible and utilized by individuals. Distributive justice consists in a kind of equality, but not a simple-minded egalitarianism. Distributive justice in Aristotle’s sense acknowledges both the reality and the value of difference. Hence, any mechanisms that fail to take critical account of such differences cannot fulfill the requirements of proportional fairness—distributive justice.

Second, distributive justice cannot exist in a vacuum. Distributive justice results from a myriad of individual choices that effect the distribution of common goods. While Aristotle acknowledges the pluralism of opinions regarding the standard to be utilized in attaining just distribution, he appeals to the innate human desire for happiness to criticize both those opinions and the laws that serve to “inculturate” and institutionalize them. His own view is that true distributive justice is realized only to the extent that distributive decisions promote general justice—“virtue entire”—and this happens only insofar as people who are just in the broadest sense (general justice) are making those choices. Aristotle would regard it as absurd to think that genuine distributive justice could be accomplished by “procedural” structures alone, without people who are by character truly generous, self-restrained, friendly, high-minded, honest, even-tempered, courageous, critically thinking and so on. All of these virtues are necessary in order that “no one takes more than his or her share.” Acts of just distribution occur only so far and so

often as there are people who are just in the broader and more profound sense to enact and model general justice.

Third, truly just people are the products of a communal process of formation in which formal laws, institutional structures, informal interpersonal encounters, friendships, and critical academic and scientific investigation all play their respective, complementary roles. Therefore, to the extent that the work of promotion of justice has to do with addressing problems of structural and institutionalized injustice in economic and political spheres, we may learn from Aristotle that the broader cultural structures which educate for general justice (or which fail to do so) require the greatest attention and care. The promotion of “justice as a whole” or “general justice” is a work spread throughout the entire community. Sustained criticism and evaluation of ideas, beliefs, practices and institutions is indispensable, lest intellectual trends entrap the community’s understanding of justice within narrow confines.

### III. Lonergan: Creating Justice, Healing Injustice

In the previous section, I have tried to show how there are sources in the thought of Aristotle for thinking about justice in a broader sense. Yet while there is a long standing tradition in Roman Catholic and Jesuit thought of drawing upon Aristotle’s writings to think out the implications of the Gospel, clearly Aristotle’s ideas alone are not sufficient to meet all the challenges we face today. For one thing, Aristotle had neither the Hebrew nor Christian scriptures as sources for his reflections. As a result, we do not find anything in Aristotle that explicitly treats the problematic of the need for liberation from sin, or of the “justification” and transformation (“conversion”) of individuals and of human history by the grace of God.[17] Moreover, Aristotle did not have to confront the challenges posed in the twenty-first century by the rapidity of economic, political, and cultural transformations. So while Aristotle provides us with a broader vision of justice than did Decree 4 of GC 32, something broader still is needed.

Recently John McDade, S.J. revealed how the work of Bernard Lonergan, S.J. had informed the composition of one major section of the documents from GC 34. There he noted that

The Congregation used Lonergan’s writings to reinterpret the connection between faith and justice, and to provide it with a stronger, less overtly political foundation, of particular significance to cultures which are experiencing cultural and moral disintegration, what Lonergan calls “decline”, a culture’s disruption by “conflicting ideologies”, “the vast pressures of social decay”. [18]

McDade’s ensuing comments make use of Lonergan’s notions of human culture and history as “man’s making of man,” and especially of the roles played by what Lonergan called “creativity from below” and “creativity from above.” However, McDade’s presentation misconstrues certain details of Lonergan’s ideas.[19] In what follows, I attempt to give a presentation closer to Lonergan’s own account, and to explore the ways other parts of Lonergan’s work might profitably help us think about justice as developed in GC 34. In particular, I hope to show how these ideas can help us think more adequately about the relationship between justice and the role of the Jesuit mission in higher education.

Lonergan is perhaps best known for his writings in cognitional theory. Yet he himself always understood his efforts in that realm as but a contribution to a larger project. During his earliest days in the Society of Jesus, the papal encyclicals had a great impact upon him.[20] Under the influence of the encyclicals, and the Catholic Action movements they inspired, Lonergan recognized that there was a need in Roman Catholicism for a theory of the human good that took seriously the challenge of “thinking on the level of history.”[21] Lonergan found the neo-scholastic metaphysical framework within which he was educated too static and lacking in resources to meet these challenges. By the age of 34, he had set himself the task of developing such a theory.

His path to that theory is a long, indirect one with many detours, but in a late essay, “Healing and Creating in History”[22] he gave a succinct formulation to his mature thinking on the subject. Human history, Lonergan argued, can be characterized as the interplay among three dynamics: creativity, bias, and healing. First, there is the “creative” dynamic that consists in the intelligence (“insights”), reflectiveness, and responsibility that arise out of the irrepressible spontaneity of human inquiry. This dynamic is creative, because it is the source of ideas, evaluations, and decisions which bring about both the construction of individual character and identity, as well as the development of interpersonal patterns of social cooperation and institutions (what Lonergan called “schemes of recurrence”). Moreover, because human inquiry is “unrestricted,” human creativity is at least potentially unlimited. Hence, the creative potential is also a potential for improvement upon past achievement and correction of past mistakes, since among the questions which arise from unrestricted inquiry are “Why isn’t this working out as expected?”, “How can we extend this achievement to a wider population?” and so on. As Lonergan put it,

The creative task is to find answers. It is a matter of insight, not of one insight but of many, not of isolated insights but of insights that coalesce, that complement and correct one another, that influence policies and programs, that reveal their short-comings in their concrete results, that give rise to further correcting insights.[23]

This is a most interesting aspect of Lonergan’s understanding of creativity. Far from some sort of Romantic notion of creativity that spurns critical intelligence and rationality, creativity in Lonergan’s sense includes and depends upon intelligent criticism.

Lonergan’s account of the human good insofar as it results solely from the dynamic of creativity bears important resemblances to Aristotle’s account of the common good characterized by general justice. At any given moment, society consists of complex, recurrent patterns of human activities that depend upon one another in complex, mutually intertwined ways. Economic patterns depend upon cultural patterns, and vice versa. Creative economic innovations raise questions for cultural creativity (e.g., how to conduct the education in virtues under changed economic circumstances), and cultural norms set challenges for economic adjustment. We might think in terms of the analogy of an ecology of interdependencies to characterize the evolving economic and cultural institutions and practices resulting from this dynamic of “self-correcting” creativity.[24]

However, while this creative dynamic is potentially unlimited, in actuality of course it is stunted and distorted by the second dynamic, human bias—or, in theological terms, sin. In Lonergan’s

view, bias can be defined as anything that blocks further questions, or that interferes with efforts to find solutions to those further questions, or that impedes efforts to implement intelligent, reasonable and responsible solutions to those further questions. Bias comes in many forms. Most often discussions of social justice are concerned with the varieties of what Lonergan termed “group bias.” That is to say, biases of economic class, political affiliation, ethnic and racial identification, gender and “religious” affiliations all divert the search for and the implementation of insights that would improve the situation of the “other,” preferring instead to serve only “one’s own.” But Lonergan also identified additional forms of biases—the “individual bias” we commonly identify with brute selfishness, the “dramatic bias” of psychological aberration (however mild or severe), and for Lonergan the most ominous of all, “general bias.” General bias, according to Lonergan, afflicts all groups and all cultures. General bias operates insofar as people succumb to “the peculiar danger [of extending] legitimate concern for the concrete and the immediately practical into disregard of larger issues and indifference to long-term results.”[25] As a result “social functions and enterprises begin to conflict; some atrophy and others grow like tumors; the objective [social] situation becomes penetrated with anomalies.”[26] People thrown into the arbitrariness and unintelligibility of situations distorted by general bias are prone to respond with frustration, anger, resentment, and hatred that only serve to reinforce the biases against one another as well as against “larger issues and long-term results.”[27] This sorry state of affairs is the human condition that in many ways characterizes our world-wide plight as we begin the twenty-first century.

Yet for Lonergan the world caught in the throes of bias is not the whole picture, for there is also a third dynamic of “healing.” According to Lonergan, healing is primarily the fruit of love.

There is the transformation of falling in love: the domestic love of the family; the human love of one’s tribe, one’s city, one’s country; the divine love that orients [men and women in the] cosmos and expresses itself in worship. Where hatred sees only evil, love reveals values... Where hatred reinforces bias, love dissolves it.[28]

Human love—familial love, love among friends, love of neighbor, patriotic love—all can serve to overcome some biases; but forms of human love can also be themselves perverted into sources of bias. On the other hand the love most profound and most indomitable is God’s redemptive, universal, and unconditional love. Lonergan held that grace is fundamentally God’s gift and communication of unconditional love “flooding our hearts through the Holy Spirit.”[29] Moreover, Lonergan held that there is a direct correlation between God’s unconditional love and the unrestrictedness of human inquiry. “Just as unrestricted questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so being in love in an unrestricted fashion is the proper fulfillment of that capacity.”[30] God’s gift of love becomes effective in human history only insofar as individuals decide to love God in return and act out the consequences of that decision[31]—those that GC 34 refers to as “Servants of Christ’s Mission.” The decision to accept unconditional love and to love in return is what Lonergan means by “religious conversion.” Its principal fruit is to begin a process of healing the hatreds and biases which have strangled and distorted human creativity in individual lives, in economic and political systems, and communities and cultures.

Yet the healing process is far from simple, complete or immediate. It has to overcome the tangled distortions inherited in personal biographies and cultural histories. Just what it means to

respond positively to God’s love—what GC 34 calls “the inculturated proclamation of the Gospel”[32]—requires the mediations of a myriad of acts of discernment, of intelligent insights responding to the many questions (and especially questions regarding “larger issues and long-term results”), of persistent critical evaluations. It also requires ongoing personal and communal transformation.

---

[1] Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, John W. Padberg, S.J. (ed.), (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1977), p. 411.

[2][2] See for example Martin R. Tripole, S.J., *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), pp. 9-21 (hereafter cited as *Faith Beyond Justice*). See also Martin R. Tripole, S.J., “An Assessment of the 34th General Congregation’s Understanding of Justice and its Role in Jesuit Higher Education,” (hereafter cited as “Tripole”) in Martin R. Tripole (ed.), *Renewing the Promise: Jesuit Higher Education for a New Millennium*, (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1999), pp. 3-4.

[3] Initially “promotion of justice” is linked with “the service of faith.” It would seem, therefore, that a clarification of the service of faith would be essential to understanding the sense of justice intended. While there are a few sections of Decree 4 that address the meaning of “the service of faith” as, for example, making God’s presence known to humankind (e.g., §§4-5, 10-26, 51-58), even these sections tend to speak overwhelmingly of the service of faith in terms of the promotion of justice and the overcoming of injustice. Hence this avenue does not yield a clarification of the intended meaning of justice.

[4] See for example Tripole, p. 4. In *Faith Beyond Justice* Tripole offers a detailed analysis of the concept of justice inherent in Decree 4, drawing upon and criticizing the effort to clarify the concept by Jean-Yves Calvez, S.J. (pp. 27-41).

[5] Tripole p. 4.

[6] See for example §§48-50. This criticism was also raised by Avery Dulles, S.J., as quoted by Tripole, p. 12. (See also *Faith Beyond Justice*, pp. 52-54, 91-93.) According to Tripole: “The major problem with GC 32 Decree 4 ... was its conflation of the promotion of justice to socioeconomic and political action, which was then inflated and made the measure of all apostolic life and activity in the Society,” p. 10.

[7] Tripole p. 6.

[8] Tripole, p. 10.

[9] It states, instead, that the “commitment of the Society to a radical life of faith that finds expression in the promotion of justice for all” Documents of the 34th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, John L. McCarthy, S.J. (ed.), (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995, hereafter cited as *Documents of GC 34*), Decree 2: “Our Mission and Culture,” §8, p. 31.

The phrase “absolute requirement” does appear in §7 which quotes GC 32 Decree 4. For the most part, however, when GC 34 Decree 2 speaks in its own voice, “absolute requirement” disappears.

[10] §10, emphasis added. There is also an explicit acknowledgement that the ways in which the promotion of justice is to be worked out for university settings must avoid “distortion” and “reduction” of “the nature of a university (Decree 17 §7). It is noteworthy that when GC 34 Decree 2 reiterates the commitment to service of faith and the promotion of justice (§14), it quotes the more open-ended formulation of GC 32’s Decree 2 §9, rather than the narrower formulation of Decree 4 §47.

[11] Tripole, p. 8.

[12] While the decrees on mission (GC 34 Decree 2) and culture (GC 34 Decree 4) incorporate this broader, integrating context, “Decree 3: ‘Our Mission and Justice’ does not follow through on these deepened insights regarding justice.” Tripole, p. 13.

[13] While some products can be fashioned entirely by a single individual, a good like wealth cannot be produced individually. Wealth or prosperity requires a vast range of coordinated human efforts of producing and exchanging. Likewise, no one person can provide himself or herself with the same level of security that the coordinated patterns of informal “social capital” and official police interventions can provide. Again, honor, at least in the classical sense of what is rightly bestowed upon someone through widespread recognition of achievement, cannot be self-produced.

[14] I should note that most of the text of Book 5 on justice is devoted to the discussion of a further subdivision, namely the problem of rectifying or restoring equity in cases of exchanges between two individuals. In effect, Aristotle’s standards for justice or fairness in exchange and recompense are valid to the extent that the distribution of common goods, and its underlying patterns of communal life (“the common good”) are themselves just.

[15] Such remarks point to the important relationships between justice and friendship which Aristotle develops later in Books 8 and 9.

[16] “Letter from a Birmingham Jail,” in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, James Melvin Washington ed.), (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), p. 293.

[17] Yet Aristotle was not totally unaware of the problem that Christians describe by the phrase, “need for redemption/liberation from sin.” Aristotle repeatedly noted that virtue entire is “a hard thing to achieve” (1130a8) and that “such people are few” (1165b25). Given this fact, the probability that a polypace would be formed in general justice by human means alone is nil.

[18] John McDade, S.J., “The Jesuit Mission and Dialogue with Culture,” p. 60 in Martin R, Tripole, S.J. (ed.), *Jesuit Education 21: Conference Proceedings on the Future of Jesuit Higher Education*, (Philadelphia: St. Joseph’s University Press, 2000).

[19] For example, McDade writes: “For Lonergan, the instinct of Faith is inseparable from the instinct for human progress ... these two impulses arise from the same root which God plants in our nature,” *ibid.* This is not quite correct. The “instinct for human progress”—what Lonergan variously refers to as “human self-transcendence,” the “unrestricted desire to know and love,” or “human creativity from below upward”—is indeed rooted in human nature. However, for Lonergan of *Method in Theology* faith is knowledge born of being in love in an unrestricted fashion (p. 115). As such faith is rooted in human participation in God’s unrestricted love and is, therefore, not from the “the same” natural root as human progress, but rather from a distinct supernatural root. For a more detailed discussion, see below.

[20] See for example pp. vii-viii of Frederick E. Crowe, “Editor’s Preface,” to Bernard Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 2, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). See also Michael Shute, *The Origins of Lonergan’s Notion of the Dialectic of History*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), pp. 63-71.

[21] Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, 4th edition, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 3, edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), p. 253; hereafter cited as *Insight*.

[22] Bernard Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History,” pp. 100-109 in Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. (ed.), *A Third Collection*, (NY: Paulist Press, 1985); hereafter cited as *HC*.

[23] *HC*, p. 103.

[24] Lonergan’s technical phrase was “emergent probability,” (*Insight*, pp. 139-151, 235-240, 252-253), although in at least one text he did use the term “ecology” in this connection; see Bernard Lonergan, *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 15, edited by Frederick G. Lawrence, Patrick H. Byrne, Charles C. Hefling, Jr., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999). pp. 89-93.

[25] *Insight*, p. 251.

[26] *Insight*, p. 254.

[27] See for example Patrick H. Byrne, “Ressentiment and the Preferential Option for the Poor,” *Theological Studies*, (1993) 54, pp. 213-41.

[28] *HC*, p. 106.

[29] Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), (hereafter cited as *MT*), p. 105. Lonergan is citing Paul’s Letter to the Romans, 5:5.

[30] *MT*, p. 106.

[31] *MT*, p. 116.

[32] Documents of GC 34, Decree 2: “Servants of Christ’s Mission,” §15, p. 36.

## **Conversations About Distributive Justice (with the “There isn’t enough” generation)**

Catharyn A. Baird[1]  
Professor of Business  
Regis University

Stop doing wrong, learn to do right! Seek  
justice, encourage the oppressed.  
Defend the cause of the fatherless,  
plead the case of the widow.  
Isaiah 2:21

### Introduction:

The Judeo-Christian prophetic tradition is rich with admonitions to those of privilege to be attentive to the plight of the less fortunate. The question of how, as faculty and as universities we can address issues of teaching justice has arisen in part because our students come to us hungry to explore their own faith tradition and often admonish us to be “more Catholic” in our teaching. In response to questions both asked and unasked, I am pleased to introduce my students to concepts of economic justice and Christian social teaching (both in the Catholic and Protestant traditions) which often confound members of my classes. As one economics major told me this semester, “My economic training teaches me that transferring resources for the common good is not efficient but my Catholic conscience is not happy with the result.”

The social justice tradition embodies the belief that, as Dag Hammarskjold wrote, “The road to holiness necessarily passes through the world of action.”[2] Richard J. Foster in *Streams of Living Waters* asserts that the Christian social justice tradition has three themes that have emerged from Hebrew concepts. The first is *mishpat* which concerns a morality over and above strict legal justice. The notion embodies wisdom which can bring equitable, harmonious relationships between people. The second is *hesed* which is a covenant love, a steadfast love which results in grace-filled, compassionate laws and practices which attend to the needs of the poor. The third is *shalom* which conveys the notion of harmonious unity with the natural order as well as with other humans.[3] Foster asserts that

Economically and socially, the vision of *shalom* means a caring and consideration for all peoples. The greed of the rich is tempered by the need of the poor. Justice, harmony, and equipoise prevail. Under the reign of God’s *shalom* the poor are no longer oppressed, because ravaging greed no longer prevails.[4]

Many members of our community quickly solve the problem of economic injustice by privatizing their altruism and compassion while remaining staunchly individualistic in their approach to the business world and the realm of public policy, that place where we decide how the resources of our community are going to be allocated. Classes in public policy and economic justice, whether taught as a segment of the business curriculum or in a seminar which draws students from a variety of majors, provide a rich opportunity to explore the implications of

fervently held (though badly articulated) economic philosophies which often give short shrift to notions of the common good.[5]

As I begin to broach the notion in my classes that our responsibility as citizens as well as people of faith is to work not only at the individual level but at the organizational and institutional level to provide justice for all, students look mystified. Many of my students believe that America is a purely capitalistic economy. They have little understanding of the myriads of ways that resources are distributed and redistributed in our community. They also tend to believe that an economy is either capitalistic or socialistic. Few recognize that in fact we have a mixed economy, a combination of capitalist, socialist and neo-mercantile philosophies and policies. Even fewer recognize that their role as citizens is to determine which particular mix of economic policies make the most sense for us as individuals and as a community. Thus a primary task of a class on economic justice is to help students see that solutions are not black and white but truly can be rich shades of the rainbow as public policy objectives are advanced.

Students are also quick to articulate that individual self-sufficiency is good and receiving government handouts is bad. The students' beliefs reflect the current public policy goal which strives to encourage self-reliance through romanticizing the Horatio Alger mythology and reducing as well as stigmatizing any reliance on certain shared community resources for moving up the ladder of success. Few have any understanding of the degree to which they have and currently are benefitting from shared resources. A benefit as direct as a guaranteed student loan is seen as a basic right rather than a privileged transfer of resources and is always contextualized as different from other kinds of "handouts" such as Aid to Dependent Children.

In the contemporary climate of reducing taxes and shrinking government, many believe that a return to the days of minimal transfer of resources is the answer to making sure the United States stays on top of the economic heap, however the 'top' is defined. Fears of foreign competition, market collapse and economic stagnation result in a 'circling the wagons' mentality where the irony of people working full time and not getting to threshold poverty levels is lost. Somehow students believe that they will be miraculously exempt from the economic pressures or be able to personally prevail against the uncertain future even as the employment contract is changing, job security is waning, and safety nets for workers are sporting bigger and bigger holes. In this climate of uncertainty and fear, Jesuit institutions are well positioned to address issues of the common good and to deeply influence the thought and actions of our graduates.

### Framing the Question

The first stage of the conversation is to frame the question. Most students have no idea what transfers of wealth entail. They have never noticed that a community distributes many resources unequally: education, health care, employment, even marriage (as the current conversations about homosexual marriage indicate). Michael Walzer's *Spheres of Justice* provides an excellent text for exploring the various venues in which goods are distributed. Walzer invites the reader to explore the three most common criteria for distribution: free exchange (where goods are convertible to other goods through the medium of money); desert (where goods are exchanged based on what one deserves); and need.[6] Then Walzer provides conversations about what kinds

of items are distributed. For example, students don't think of time and work as goods which are distributed even as the articulated norm in industry is a 50 hour work week which gives little time for family, leisure or community activities. Thus, students can be encouraged to expand their notions of distributed goods beyond the narrow world of food stamps.

The second phase of framing the question involves exploring the different mediums by which goods are distributed. The first cut is to acknowledge that distribution happens at the individual, organizational and governmental level. The second cut is to see that distribution can be direct through transfers of wealth as well as systemic through access to resources and power.

Distribution at the individual level, private charity, occurs when individuals determine what of their own resources they will give to others who are perceived as needy and/or worthy of the transfer. This particular method of transfer of resources is extolled by many of the Enlightenment philosophers and classical economists as the most efficient and ethical way to serve those in need. Individual giving was primarily conceived as direct transfers of wealth. However, our community has developed institutional ways of distribution through shelters, soup kitchens, and other non-profit organizations. These institutions gather individual donations and distribute them to those determined to be deserving and in need. As individual giving becomes institutionalized, the systems of information, determining who will get the resources, and strategies to prevent "fraud" add layers of complexity to something as seemingly simple as helping someone who is down and out.

A growing source of distribution of goods is through institutionalized charity, often framed as 'service.' As not only schools encourage their students to serve the community, many companies are giving employees reimbursed time to serve the community in various ways. At first blush, many students believe that such service is good for the company and the community. As we explore the principles of a market economy, that goods should reflect the cost of manufacture, the students are invited to question whether it is ethical or appropriate to spread the cost of altruism to the customers by building the expense of community service into the price of the goods and services or by tying the service to a marketing function and enhancing name recognition through brand name service to the community. Is buying the rights to name a stadium a 'service' through providing something the community needs or is it an inappropriate intrusion of the market economy into community life. Is buying the exclusive right to market Coke in schools in exchange for a handsome 'donation' to the school a way to help finance schools and reduce taxes or again an inappropriate marketing device. Such questions generally result in scowls across a classroom as the answers are not self-evident.

Finally, we explore distribution through community sharing, governmental transfers of wealth and resources. Gathering common resources to pay for that which is used by all is easily justified. Roads and parks seem 'no-brainers' for students. More interesting conversations come when community resources are used to pay for private enterprise. Colorado is not alone in passing tax increases for building stadiums for professional teams while voting against building roads and schools. And then we talk about transfers of wealth to individuals, from grazing rights, water rights, through AFDC and unemployment. Students are quick to criticize welfare moms without questioning whether ski resorts are paying their fair share for building ski runs through national forests.

Moving the conversation beyond Aid to Dependent Children and Medicare to subsidies for farming and tax incentives for environmental action invites students to realize that the discussion is not about 'us' and 'them' but rather about who is going to share in the wealth of the community and whether the distribution will favor those who already have or those who have systemically been shut out of opportunities to achieve the American Dream either because they were not deemed as worthy or because they were denied access to the distribution channels.

### Historical Perspective

Many students perceive correctly that their parents have what they have through hard work. Most of their grandparents who survived and thrived during WWII and their parents who worked through the ups and downs of the 70's and 80's have improved their standard of living as family wealth and opportunity is traced back to the roots of immigrants who survived the travails of the Depression. What most students do not realize is that government policies determined who had access to shared resources and thus determined who had an opportunity to build wealth.

We begin our historical journey by examining who got to possess the land. Native Americans believed that land was to be held in common, the wealth and resources of the land shared by the community. Settlers to America brought with them the notion of private property and then began appropriating community property for individual use. Without the notion of private property, America could never have developed its particular brand of a capitalistic economy. Thus from the first colonization through the Homestead Act, thousands of families who in Europe would never have had access to land were able to begin their fortunes through acquisition of real estate.[7] Then in the Depression, the Federal Housing Authority was established to assure low interest loans for families. However, with institutional red-lining in a segregated America, very few African-Americans were able to benefit from that government distribution of wealth.

Access to education provides another rich conversation. Public education is an idea born in America. The common school movement, fathered by Horace Mann, was grounded in the notion that both business and industry would benefit from educated workers.[8] But with segregation and lack of resources for schools who were to educate young Blacks and then denial of educational opportunity to women, government policies assisted white males in moving ahead while limiting access to others.[9] Even a policy which on its face is non-discriminatory, the GI Bill, in fact did not achieve its goals as many colleges and universities denied access to African-American vets who otherwise could have benefitted from the resource allocation.

Most students have never considered the wide security blanket which has been woven through direct allocation of monies and regulatory policies which limited the harshness of capitalism. Education, health care benefits, social security, unemployment benefits, tax incentives, and a myriad of other subtle transfers of resources in fact define an economy which many students prefer to consider pure capitalism. Most students have no idea how unequally these resources were and are appropriated, the primary beneficiaries being white males and their families.

Even today the preferences are masked. We have had thirty years of affirmative action and minority set-asides, policies which were devised to grant access to higher education and work for women and minorities who were historically denied access to the fundamental building blocks

for personal wealth and individual responsibility. As fears of ‘reverse discrimination’ were articulated, those policies were curtailed. However, many prestigious universities still find room for legacies, those who do not meet the stated admissions criteria and who Garrison Keillor characterizes as “academically challenged students” with “financially gifted parents.”[10] Proposition 209, California’s anti-affirmative action proposal which was passed by California citizens, got rid of every preference except preferences for veterans. Most people miss the fact that the majority of people who will be able to claim any preference in California is white males.

Manuel Velazquez articulates the cultural shift from a reliance on individual rights to claims against others for resources in his discussion about negative rights and positive rights.[11] Negative rights are those which one can enjoy without interference from others. If I choose to spend my money on landscaping while you choose to spend your money on a snowmobile, if we each have the resources, no-one can stop us. Thus, for example, I am entitled to as much health care as I choose to purchase.

Members of my family sometime inherit a lactose intolerance, which makes even mother’s milk difficult for infants to digest. One of my aunts died as an infant because no one knew the problem. When my next aunt was born, the problem had been discovered but my grandparents didn’t have the money to send her to the hospital for the month it would take to deal with the illness. It never occurred to my grandparents to take Lois to the hospital if they couldn’t pay for the care; one only purchased what one could afford. A neighbor was not willing for the child to die, so he paid the entire hospital bill. Most students are appalled at that particular approach to health care. The same students, however, are not willing to pay much in taxes or premiums for health care.

Positive rights are those which some other agent (and as Velasquez notes it is not always clear who) is to provide for us.[12] When students are asked to list what everyone should have, the inventory is long: health care, education (often a college education), housing, food, clothing, work, and on and on. When I ask who is to pay for these positive rights, the corner into which the students have backed themselves becomes clear. If they say that people should pay for these goods on their own, then the students must be willing to take the action of my grandparents and deny themselves and their children ‘basic’ rights. If they say that someone else should foot the bill, we are back to charity, business or the government as the source for those goods. Scowls abound.

Students have no problem with the Enlightenment notion of the integrity and value of each human person. They also are quick to note that self-sufficiency is a core value for our community. What they become forced to acknowledge during our romp through economic history is that the rhetoric of individual effort and merit masks policy decisions which determined who had access to what community resources. We didn’t have conversations about race and class bias in SAT scores in the late 40’s and early 50’s because the tests did not exist. Admission was based on race, gender and connections. Only when we as a nation were forced to guarantee access for all based on merit rather than privilege did evaluative tools such as the SAT become popular. The notion was that we would be able to measure individual ability without looking at the systemic advantages and disadvantages given to members of the community. However, the theory is much easier to speak than to live.

## Exploring the tension between individual rights and the common good

Once the class explores how individuals build wealth and begins to come to terms with the systemic support for the unequal distribution of goods, they are ready to engage in a conversation about the tension between relying on individual talents and resources in making one's way through life and supporting the common good. At this point two assumptions about economics can be challenged: first, that economics is value-free and second, that the market is always the best way to distribute goods.

Economists have made great strides in their field by developing descriptive economics, models which tend to predict what will happen if certain policies are adopted. What descriptive economics does not do is provide insight into the norms or values which should inform the decision making. Thus, policy makers must examine their own value systems to determine which policies should be adopted. If we uncritically hold the belief that economic policy is value free, we fail to explore and tell the truth about the ways that different policies can either support the common good or support the individual at the expense of the common good.[13]

To the degree that students doggedly hold onto the belief that the market economy must be preserved at all costs and is best way to accomplish all economic goals, developing economic policy that supports the common good becomes difficult. Often policies which support a market result are at cross purposes with solutions which support the common good. Public policy thus becomes a perverse Hobson's choice with the result that neither individual goals nor the common good are enhanced.

Health care in the United States is a prime example of cross-economic policies. The market demands that products be made efficiently, the lowest cost for the highest quality. What is required then is that the cost of the production of the goods be borne completely by the purchaser. When costs of providing social benefits are added to the price, expenses which have nothing to do with the quality of the product, the cost of the product no longer bears a direct relationship to the cost of manufacturing the goods or providing the services. Pricing then depends on externalities, which "occur when production or consumption by one firm or consumer directly affects the welfare of another firm or consumer, where 'directly' means that the effect is not mediated through any market and is consequently unpriced." [14]

Regulation has the effect of requiring that all firms meet the same externalities. So, if companies are required to meet safety standards or provide environmental safeguards, all companies bear the same cost and can adjust their price equally. However, the government of the United States has not required that all companies provide health care for employees. We have said that the preferred locus for the provision of health care is the firm, but firms can choose the amount of health care provided, including none at all. Further, stockholders and employees expect that firms will remain competitive both with other domestic companies which do not provide health care benefits as well as with international companies where the cost of health care is borne by the state and paid for by a more equitable taxing scheme. The situation is further complicated by the fact that citizens in the US have characterized health care as a right, because individuals are entitled to every option for preserving not only life but the quality of life. Yet, as rational

consumers of health care benefits, we don't want to pay more than 12 - 13% of the gross national product for health care.

If in fact health care is a basic right for all members of the community, then the economic policies need to reflect that value. We have two ways of providing care: (1) requiring all firms, regardless of size to provide health care for all who work, full and part time, or (2) providing care through a government vehicle. If as citizens, consumers of health care, and members of the economic system, we are unwilling to engage in either of these policies, then we cannot with integrity say that we believe that health care is a right. Rather, our actions articulate the belief that health care is a privilege for those who have the resources to pay for services.

Students are generally very uncomfortable with the above direction of the conversation. First, notions of self-sufficiency are challenged. We all are where we are because of the efforts of others as well as because of societal norms and policies which enable us (or our parents and grandparents) to pursue our dreams. Thus, if notions of the common good require that all have access to education, then policies and resources should be put into place to assist all members of the community in reaching that goal. Second, if we truly believe that all are created in the image of God and that all members of the community have equal value, then we need to implement policies which reflect and support that core belief. Third, notions of goods going to those who deserve them are shaken as students begin to understand the inequality of distribution of goods in our community. Again, when people are working full time to the very best of their capacity and still cannot earn enough to provide basic goods for themselves, then we cannot say that folks are poor because they are lazy.[15] Rather, we must look at organizational and governmental policies that institutionalize and support poverty.

### Call to Action

Jesuit schools are proud to graduate “Men and Women in Service to Others.” We embrace as part of our mission teaching students to give a “preferential option to the poor.” I believe that this call to action must address individual, organizational and governmental policies and attend to both individual transfers of wealth and systemic barriers which impede and bridges which enhance access to resources. We must embrace all of the institutions of our community as mediating institutions which can move us from privatization of our altruism into notions of the common good.

Acting at the individual level is a common solution to distribution of goods. We donate our time and our resources to help those who are less fortunate than we are. Inviting our students to experience the “other” through their service learning activities enhances their ability to act in the face of need. We also advocate and easily work with organizations which provide services to the poor. This form of participating in the common good is encouraged and rewarded.

What we don't do so well is talk about participating in the common good at the organizational level. Timothy Fort in “The First Man and the Company Man” suggests that the “organization provides a framework in which one has no choice but to negotiate with others in the organization so as to understand one's identity within the context of the demands and aspirations of the

members of the organization. One learns interdependence and moral values.”[16] Fort continues by suggesting that businesses are uniquely positioned to be mediating institutions because “individuals remain human beings to whom social relationships are important...Allowing relatively small groups within corporations to form a community would foster the atmosphere in which individuals must face the consequences of their actions and thereby form moral identity in a context transcending the categories of identity (race, class, gender) with which they may have otherwise been content.”[17]

Such an approach requires that students exercise the virtue of courage as articulated by Alasdair MacIntyre in *After Virtue*. MacIntyre suggests that courage is a core virtue “because the care and concerns for individuals, communities and causes which is so crucial to so much in practices requires the existence of such a virtue. If someone says that he cares for some individual, community or cause, but is unwilling to risk harm or danger on his, her or its own behalf, he puts in question the genuineness of his care and concern.”[18] Courage in an organizational context requires a willingness to jeopardize one’s own reputation and financial well being to speak for the common good and others.

At the July meeting of the Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education, a fledgling organization where faculty and administrators in Jesuit Universities can come together to discuss and support each other in living out the Jesuit mission in business schools, a Jesuit member of the group discussed the difficulty of acting with such courage. He sits on the board of a national health insurance company. The company was faced with cutting costs to remain competitive and thus had outsourced the janitorial services. The contract went to a company who was able to provide a low bid by not providing health care for its employees. Clearly, the Board could have made providing health care a requirement for awarding the contract. However, placing that provision on the table would have required that one speak up firmly for the common good and the working poor. Such conversations are not fashionable but we each must be responsible for asking the hard questions if our organizations are going to be mediating institutions for the common good.

Finally, we must talk carefully about distribution at the government level. Again, the conversation is complex. We must balance between individuals retaining enough of their earnings so that they remain productive and motivated to be responsible for themselves with enough resources being shared that people who are contributing to the community are appropriately sharing in its wealth and resources. If we do not want to burden companies with trying to remain competitive and provide health care, then we need to find some way of sharing community resources so all can have a basic level of health care. If we don’t want to raise the minimum wage so that American companies can remain globally competitive, we must find some way to assure that those who work full time are not positioned well below the poverty line and thus unable to provide for themselves or their families. If we truly value education for our children, then we must find ways of providing quality schools and day care for all.

The conversation is messy and complex. However, we must be willing to thoughtfully and persistently engage in the conversation. As James Smurl noted in *The Burdens of Justice*

One may have to measure the world not from perfection downward but from chaos upward. While not relinquishing ideals, one should not strive to refashion too quickly this less than perfect world and its less than perfect persons. Striving for improvements is akin to making the tempered steel of contingency somewhat more pliable. If we are to be even modestly effective, however, we must give pain and suffering greater weight; indeed, they must determine the just allocations of advantages and disadvantages of social goods.[19]

### Gratitude and Humility

While the conversation can be overwhelming, broadening the perspective of students to see that distribution of goods and the common good is not just about 'them' but rather penetrates through all of our individual and communal life is useful. First, students begin to note how privileged they are. Even those who compare themselves to the relative wealth of others at the university begin to see that in comparison to the community as a whole they have an ample share of the goodies. Through exploring the complex distribution of goods, students have the opportunity to understand that they have benefitted from transfers of community wealth grounded in pervasive notions of the common good. Thus, they can become generous with their resources now that they are in a position to individually give as well as influence organizational and governmental policies.

Next, students can begin to harmonize their learning across the various disciplines and realize that they are all citizens who are responsible for the shaping of public policy. Those who are not business majors don't like to dirty their hands with economic matters. However, liberal arts and science majors can appreciate that all of us are members of the community and have the opportunity, even the obligation, to participate in decisions that affect individual and community well being. Students can begin to articulate both the policies behind individual distributions of goods as well as see the systemic pressures which mask the transfer of wealth. They can begin to look behind the slick facade presented by politicians, business leaders and the media and determine whether the distributions of wealth are fair or unfair, whether they benefit primarily those who already have resources or help those who might need a hand up the ladder.

Finally, students can begin to grapple with complex issues and develop ways of thinking about the problem so that as they move into positions of leadership they can institute policies and systems which in fact strengthen the common good and more fairly distribute benefits. The opportunities present themselves in subtle, but powerful, moments of decision. I sit on a non-profit board that was authorizing the transfer of a pension plan from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan. The reserve monies in the plan could be distributed one way which would benefit the top earners of the company or another way which was slightly more complex, which would benefit the secretaries and other members on the lower end of the wage scale. A member of the board asked about the alternate method of distribution and positioned the conversation so the more equitable distribution was seen as the only viable solution. Asking those kinds of questions requires paying attention and exercising courage and leadership to forward the claims of those who don't have access to power.

As members of the Jesuit learning community engage in conversations about distributive justice, we must exercise ruthless self-discipline in not imposing our personal agenda. Rather, each of us must seize opportunities to respectfully explore the strongly held but generally unarticulated beliefs of the students about the allocation of wealth. As the strengths and weaknesses of all possibilities and policies are explored, students can begin to get a sense of the tradeoffs inherent in any policy option. Encouraging students to wrestle with the implications of getting only what one earns personally or enjoying both the benefits and burdens of working for the common good, opens the possibility that students leave our institutions with some sense of the power and potential of economics in service of others.

---

[1]. A word about my own standpoint in this conversation. Raised an Evangelical Protestant (General Conference Baptist) with a strong infusion of Quaker values from my grandmother, through college I focused on individual acts of justice. However, when in my naivete I expected the transition to a Ph.D. program in English to be seamless, I was confronted with systemic barriers to education. Thus, I am a lawyer almost by accident. When I applied to graduate school, I was informed that the university was not accepting women at that time. As I was very upset, my mother suggested law school, since a new school was opening in my town. I later learned that I was the beneficiary of a class action suit against law schools, where, in 1972, law schools agreed to accept 10% women into their student body. The personal denial of access to my dream began my life-long passion for forwarding systemic justice in the marketplace. Whether in school, in my practice of law, or now as a teacher of law and ethics in a Jesuit institution, the quest for substantive, as well as procedural, justice informs (often annoyingly, according to some students) all of my professional work.

[2]. Dag Hammarskjold, *Markings*, trans. Lief Sjoberg and W.H. Auden (New York: Ballantine, 1993), 103.

[3]. Richard J. Foster, *Streams of Living Water* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), 167-171.

[4]. Foster, 171.

[5]. Faculty in the Division of Business teach two kinds of classes which deal with economic justice. The first type is classes which are part of the College Core Seminars. The freshman seminar on Economics and the Common Good and the senior seminar on Economic Justice in America draw students from all disciplines. The second type is offered to business and economics majors and focus on issues of public policy (the regulatory environment) or other economic topics as they applies to the business community.

[6]. Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), 21-26.

[7]. Richard White, *It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own: A New History of the American West* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 143-145.

[8]. Myra Pollack Sadker and David Miller Sadker, *Teachers, Schools and Society*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1997), 274.

[9]. *Lessons of a Century: The Struggle for Integration* @ Education Week Volume XVIII, Number 28, 24 March 1999, 1.

[10]. Garrison Keillor, *Wobegon Boy* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1997), 7.

[11]. Manuel G. Velasquez, *Business Ethics, Concepts and Cases*, 4th ed. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998), 90-91.

[12]. Velasquez, 90.

[13]. Daniel M. Hausman and Michael S. McPherson, *Economic Analysis and Moral Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 57-61.

[14]. Herman E. Daly and John B. Cobb, Jr., *For the Common Good* (Boston, Mass: Beacon Press, 1989), 53.

[15]. Often the reality of poverty gets lost in statistics The Wall Street Journal recently reported that income is up and poverty is down. However, the article also noted that *The census study...also offers stark proof that life is still a struggle for millions of Americans...The poverty rate was still 1.6 percentage points higher than it was in 1973, the twilight of America's last prolonged golden age.* @ *Charting the Pain Behind the Gain,* @ The Wall Street Journal 1 October 1999:B1.

[16]. Timothy L. Fort, *The First Man and the Company Man: The Common Good, Transcendence, and Mediating Institutions,* @ *American Business Law Journal* 36 (1999): 430.

[17]. Fort, 434.

[18]. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 2nd ed. (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 192.

[19]. James F. Smurl, *The Burdens of Justice in Families, Education, Health Care, and Law* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1994), 37.

## **Justice and Natural Science Aren't Related ... Or Are They?**

Trileigh Tucker  
Director, Ecological Studies Program  
Seattle University

### Introduction

Not too long ago my university began a search for a new Dean of the School of Science and Engineering, and as part of the process, the search committee developed a set of questions to ask all candidates. Having gotten increasingly interested in justice issues over the past couple of years, I suggested in an e-mail message to all Science and Engineering faculty that one of the questions should ask about candidates' interest in justice issues. Two faculty members sent public e-mails in response, both disagreeing with my suggestion: one stating "I would suspect that science and justice would overlap only rarely, if ever" and one that "politics", as a matter of individual conscience, should be left out of the dean candidate selection process. No faculty member responded publicly in favor of explicitly discussing justice in the dean search, although several told me privately that they agreed with this suggestion.

Fortunately, our new dean turned out to be a person with a strong commitment to justice, whom we are very excited to welcome as part of our campus community. But the resistance from thoughtful, intelligent faculty both surprised me and motivated me to think more carefully about whether, why, and how justice and natural science should be interconnected, particularly at Jesuit universities.

### Context for Justice and Science

Defining "justice" is a notoriously difficult task. The most common characterization I've heard is "right relationship," a phrase with enough ambiguity and potential for bias (who gets to define "right"?) that most scientists would dismiss it immediately for not being a rigorous or even useful definition. Nevertheless, I do find "right relationship" useful, at least as a heuristic definition of justice, especially in light of Patrick McCormick's contribution to this volume.[1]

Right relationships may exist, or be missing, between individual humans or between groups of humans, including some of whom may not yet be born (future generations). In addition, because natural science deals with non-human beings, science itself confronts us with questions of right relationships between humans and non-humans.

### Interactions between Science and Justice

Interactions between science and justice can take several forms: (1) science's role in human society as a promoter or inhibitor of justice; (2) justice concerns within the scientific community itself; and (3) justice issues in scientific interactions with the natural world.

#### (1) Science's role in society

Perhaps the most straightforward role of science in promoting justice in human society is the generation of information that can be used to help remedy injustice. The most basic form of human dependence on nature revolves around our absolute physical dependence upon it: breathable air, drinkable water, fertile soil. What constitutes a healthy natural environment, and whether all humans have equal access to these essential natural supplies, are justice-related questions on which scientists can help to shed light.

It has become clear through of recent years that there are profound injustices generated by the ways humans interact with the natural environment. One set of injustices is created by intense, localized activities that present significant short-term health threats to less-powerful individuals and groups. Scientific and statistical work generated the 1987 landmark study by the United Church of Christ, which documented a clear correlation between siting of toxic waste facilities and locations of minority populations across the U.S., regardless of community socioeconomic status.[2] Scientific information about air pollutants from petrochemical plants concentrated in predominantly African-American communities along the Mississippi River in Louisiana was essential to understanding whether the health of these communities would be threatened by existing and proposed chemical-production plants.[3] The environmental justice movement has arisen in response to these and many other similar situations in an effort to publicize and help remedy them.

Another set of injustices arises from long-term, global changes that may present threats not only to individual human lives, but also to complex living systems that support humans; not only in the present but also to future generations of humans and other creatures who have no say in the damage being done to them. Climate change, almost certainly caused by tremendous fossil-fuel burning and chemical emissions by the industrialized countries, is already causing problems for people in less-developed countries. Skin cancers have significantly increased in southern Argentina, which lies below the ozone hole. South Sea Islanders are reporting coastal flooding and saltwater contamination of farmlands due to sea-level rise associated with global warming. Of course, sea-level rise is a global phenomenon; but the island nations contain a much greater proportion of coastline to inland areas, and have much less ability to move elsewhere when farmlands are ruined. These problems took a long time to create, and their solutions will also require a long time to take effect, even if implemented today. Future generations will pay much of the cost of consumption by today's developed countries.

Study after study has shown that the world's poor suffer the most from environmental degradation, and that it is the world's wealthy who contribute most to environmental damage, in large part through their highly disproportionate consumption of the world's resources:

“People living in the industrialized world comprise only about 21% of the global population.... But industrial countries consume about 86% of the globe's aluminum, 81% of its paper, 80% of its iron and steel, 75% of its energy, and 61% of its meat. Consequently, they are responsible for the vast majority of the hazardous wastes created by the mining and smelting of aluminum and iron ores, the clearcutting of forests for the sake of paper production, the air pollution and build-up of greenhouse gases caused by fossil-fuel burning, and the soil erosion on grazing lands.”[4]

Scientists' work is essential to understanding and remedying such injustices. Having the ability to generate such useful information, are not scientists morally bound to see that our research is used to help heal injustice, as we understand it?

A more complex relationship between science and society lies in the infrastructure of the scientific enterprise. Scientific research is a major U.S. industry, funded both by private enterprise and by tax dollars. Although scientific research itself is supposed to be morally "neutral", how this scientific research interacts with the rest of society raises profound justice questions.

For instance:

- In what geographic areas is scientific research conducted, and how does this research affect people living in these areas?
- Who ultimately benefits from the research, and who pays the various long-term costs of the research?

After I graduated from college with a geology degree, my first professional job involved water sampling for a large mineral-exploration company. My task was to go to homes in a rural part of Virginia and ask if I could take a water sample from an outside spigot. Most people agreed easily to this request. Several asked to find out what was in their water, and my boss said to tell them we would send them a report - but I knew that I was not supposed to tell them we were prospecting for gold. I realized later that had the company found gold tracers in the water, the company would probably have offered to buy their land, or at least the mining rights to it, with little compensation compared to what the company expected to profit from their land - and certainly without letting the owners know there might be gold under their land.

Other potentially justice-relevant questions about the societal context of scientific research include:

- Who funds the research, and why?
- How are decisions made about which of a set of competing proposals will receive funds?
- To what uses will resulting information be put?

A third form of justice-related interaction between science and society lies in the idea that scientific theories are not always neutral, but can reflect and promote cultural biases. Examples are rampant throughout the history of science; for instance, the "scientific finding" that "women's low brain weights and deficient brain structures were analogous to those of the lower races, and their inferior intellectuallities explained on this basis."<sup>[5]</sup> Yet science's reputation as a "fact-based," "neutral" enterprise can blind both nonscientists and scientists to its potential biases, which can then perpetuate injustices.

A concern of many thoughtful scientists about bringing justice into the realm of scientific inquiry is that allowing an emotional or philosophical attachment to outcomes may inhibit free investigation and diminish instead of expanding the truth of science. Scientists are aware that

many opposing conclusions can be promoted from a single data set, by emphasizing particular subsets of those data and by using loaded language in communicating about the data. An example used by theoretical physicist Brian Martin[6] compares two studies published in the prestigious journals *Science* and *Nature*, concerning how exhaust from supersonic jets affect stratospheric ozone. One scientist refers to the “shield” of ozone, the “burden” of NO<sub>2</sub>, and the “threat” to ozone. The other refers simply to the “ozone layer,” “amounts” of NO<sub>2</sub>, and how chemicals “interact with, and thus attenuate” ozone. Each scientist quoted by Martin “emphatically denied they had engaged in ‘pushing’” a viewpoint. Even if neutral language is used in contrasting studies, one scientist might emphasize (perhaps by allocating more text to) the statistical probabilities of a phenomenon, another the statistical uncertainties. The observations and statistics are the same for each scientist, but the implications of these numbers vary according to the conviction of the individual. If a scientist hopes that her or his investigations will help heal injustice, is it not possible or even likely, the argument goes, that the scientist will unconsciously bias her or his investigations in favor of a particular set of data that seem to support a justice-promoting conclusion?

Because of the long history of scientific conclusions reflecting societal prejudices (not only prejudices we abhor but those with which we are in alignment), we must admit the reality of this possibility. I believe that reconciliation of this concern lies in a deep conviction about the compatibility of truth and justice; that it is a scientist’s - and any human being’s - duty to rigorously seek truth, to be continually skeptical about and retest any of one’s conclusions, and to trust that justice need not fear truth, but actually depends fully on it. To seek this truth, we must work hard to understand our own biases so that we can release them in the cause of justice.

## (2) Justice Concerns Within the Scientific Community:

### Why Scientists as Scientists Should Care About Justice

A number of scientists would probably contend that it is fine for a scientist to care about justice and injustice, on her or his own time, but not in her or his professional life. As a professional, a scientist is supposed to be objectively interested in facts, processes, and theories about the natural world. Objectivity in this sense is communal in nature; facts and theories are agreed upon or argued over by the scientific community. But questions of fairness or moral rectitude are considered private, and therefore not appropriate for communal interactions in the workplace. They are regarded as irrelevant to the non-human realm of interest of the professional natural scientist.

These convictions ultimately derive from a healthy respect for the independence of science. One of the gifts modern science initially brought to the world in the seventeenth century was the honor it bestowed upon the individual as a source of true observations. Ideally, anyone who carefully observed or measured a phenomenon would find the same data, independent of who she or he was, and independent of external authorities such as the church or government. Because of this heritage, modern scientists tend to be strongly suspicious of “external” ethical or moral frameworks, which they see as potentially constraining their scientific research.

But human beings as whole persons - the focus of our concern in Jesuit universities - cannot with integrity restrict questions of fairness or moral rectitude to personal life only. A concern for justice, along with love, compassion, generosity, and other moral standards, is a fundamental aspect of human nature that cannot be split into professional and non-professional realms. The split between professional and personal contains the potential for tremendous evil, as history has repeatedly confirmed.

But why should scientists in particular care about justice? Because, first, justice is a good thing for science, and second, injustice is a bad thing for science. From at least two utilitarian perspectives, a professional concern for justice serves the purposes of scientific inquiry, understood here as a human enterprise whose goal is to understand the physical workings of the observable natural world. The first perspective involves the sense of “justice” as applied to human relationships within the scientific community. Attending to these justice issues means that the skills and intelligence of all people can better be brought to scientific work - including those of women, people of color, and people in non-industrialized countries. These additional observations and insights cannot help but benefit science, while strongly challenging it as well.

Science faculty at universities around the country are still disproportionately white and male, and hold higher ranks than women and nonwhites.[7] Some of this rank imbalance is due to age, since women and people of color in academic science tend to be younger than their white male colleagues; yet even when comparing within age groups, women and blacks are still found to hold lower academic ranks than men (although gender and other racial differences lose their statistical significance).[8] There is little question that racism and sexism are still creating situations of injustice within the scientific community. Women students and students of color have few role models. I was fortunate in that I was in college as a geology major in the few years after the theory of plate tectonics had revolutionized the field of geology. One of the major players in creating this new paradigm was a female graduate student named Tanya Atwater. I still remember her photo from one of my geology texts: in long braids, she stood proudly on a hill, holding her rock hammer - and I thought, I can do this! But many young students of color and women do not encounter people that they consider “like us” in prominent scientific roles.

Scientists sometimes unconsciously extend their conviction that science is morally neutral to mean that the scientific community is outside of justice-related evaluation: “those questions don’t apply to our work.” A professional whose career is based on her or his demonstrated ability to make objective, unbiased evaluations of scientific observations and theories does not necessarily apply this well-honed skill to applications of junior faculty toward tenure, or toward annual reviews of a supervisor’s performance.

The second utilitarian perspective expands its view of justice to include human relationships beyond the scientific community. If scientific work is motivated by a true concern for justice, then intellectual rigor - including carefulness of observation and thoughtfulness of hypothesis - is deepened to become a form of respect and caring for the Other: both humans and the natural world. We scientists can put even more energy toward truth when it is a direct path toward justice, benefitting others’ lives as well as the scientific community’s knowledge. Scientific truth is expanded in this approach.

### (3) Interactions between science and the natural world

Does the natural world have value in and of itself, or does its value depend only on whether it is useful to humans? If the natural world has value of itself, does it have “rights”? If so, do these rights pertain to individual beings within nature (for instance, individual chimpanzees), to ecosystems (for instance, a rainforest), or both? The environmental injustices described in an earlier section of this paper are based on damage to humans. In contrast, could it be unjust to eliminate an old-growth forest that has been thriving for 3,000 years, including all its billions of non-human inhabitants, in order to provide thick logs for wealthy homes? Could it be unjust to destroy an entire species that took millions of years to evolve, that can never be recreated, and that plays an integral role in a large bioregion? Certainly these questions evoke a basic human sense of fairness and respect toward living beings. “The virtuous man looks after the lives of his beasts, but the wicked man’s heart is ruthless.”[9]

Whether or not a scientist believes in non-human rights, it is right to ask whether the natural world is treated appropriately in scientific work. The question can be asked not only about laboratory animals, but also about the way science interacts with other creatures and places in the field. Seafloor oceanographic research has discovered an extensive, previously unimagined, sunless ecosystem at the mid-ocean ridges, with towering mineral “castles” and eerie creatures that live in eternal night. A new dimension of the Earth’s beauty has been revealed, and along with it insights about the origins of life on our planet. Yet other outcomes of this research include destruction of delicate rock formations as scientists extract samples for surface examination, and damage to organisms’ sensory organs from submarines’ floodlights. When does the value of the research justify these costs, and when is it morally right to cease and desist? Right answers are not easily arrived at, but the questions must be addressed if we are moral beings.

#### Inhibition of scientific research

Another authentic concern of scientists has to do with the relationship between scientific research and its potential technological uses. Many scientists fear that others’ concern for justice - by others’ definitions of justice - will require them to stop their research because of its potential technological applications: for instance, developing deadly missiles or cloning “perfect” human beings. Scientists point out that technological outcomes of their research are unknown, and that if research were halted from a fear of negative applications, many positive, life-giving outcomes might be lost as well. As physicist Freeman Dyson points out,

Science and technology, like all original creations of the human spirit, are unpredictable. If we had a reliable way to label our toys good and bad, it would be easy to regulate technology wisely. But we can rarely see far enough ahead to know which road leads to damnation.[10]

These points are quite legitimate. Nevertheless, a great deal of scientific research, even so-called “pure” research, is funded by organizations motivated primarily by the expectation that the research will lead to marketable technologies. Scientists depend on such organizations, not only so that they can generate the new knowledge they seek, but also for their livelihoods. Hence, it can become easy for even a highly ethical scientist to conclude that she or he is not morally responsible for the unpredictable outcomes of her or his work. How much responsibility a

scientist has for either immediate or potential long-term applications of her or his research is a matter for the individual scientist's conscience as well as for debate within the scientific community. However, in our current scientific culture, even asking the questions is discouraged.

The above objections, and others, are often raised out of a healthy respect for the importance of keeping science distant from the biases of society - but ironically, this distance also allows perpetuation of those biases as scientists stay uninvolved with the societal context of our profession. Sandra Harding carries this point even further: "Too many science teachers and researchers in universities evidently have thought that they could point to their own ignorance of the origins and (predictable) consequences of their work as evidence of the purity of their work and the enterprise to which they recruit students." [11] Even without complete knowledge or universal conclusions, we as scientists can begin to ask challenging ethical questions about our work. We can also hold ourselves open to and interested in nonscientists' questioning the values, assumptions, and ethical bases of our research. Engaging in such reflection and dialogue is squarely in the Jesuit tradition, as we try to help guide our profession toward a greater call for justice in all realms.

## Justice and Science in the Classroom

### Why Bring Justice Issues into Science Teaching at All?

As a long-time teacher of science courses for non-science majors, I can aver that most of these students initially come into a required science course with trepidation or even resentment. Teaching science through consideration of its relationship to justice issues can open science to these students in a way that they find meaningful and inviting. In addition, non-science majors typically constitute a much larger proportion of all graduates than science majors - and therefore the majority of college-educated citizens. Their required college science courses may be their first, or even only, acquaintance as adults with science as a human endeavor and a way of interacting with the natural world. Such a course may therefore be a particularly powerful communicator of values embedded in the practice of science. If most students graduate from college with the idea that science and the scientific community need not deal with questions of justice, their potential contribution as citizens will be diminished.

For science majors, there are additional considerations. Students should be educated not only about their profession's intellectual content and ways of proceeding, but also about its interactions with society, including its implications for justice work. This feature of professional education occasionally is explicitly handled in graduate school. However, rarely are these issues raised in undergraduate studies, even though many students will go directly into the scientific work force after receiving an undergraduate degree. Scientists who have not deeply considered their profession's societal responsibilities are unlikely to be open to non-scientists' judgments on this topic. Who, then, is to assess whether science is in appropriate relationship to justice?

### Ways to Raise Justice Questions in Science Courses

There are several ways to effectively raise justice questions, while at the same time teaching students the scientific principles and processes they need to know: using case studies to provide a

framework for scientific understanding; using as examples scientists who work for justice; modeling and discussing justice within the classroom community; and using classroom exercises and activities that help students experience using science to work for justice.

### Science through Case Studies

I have found that studying concrete situations in which scientific principles are critical to evaluating and resolving an unjust situation is a highly effective way to reach two goals: to get students immediately engaged in trying to understand the science behind the situation, and to help them see connections between science and justice. For example, in my introductory geology class (typically taken by non-majors to satisfy their science requirement), I have used the Green Belt Movement of Kenya, founded by Wangari Maathai in 1977, as a case study. This situation raises justice-related issues such as the role of local versus colonial jurisdiction, empowerment of the poor, the importance of sustainable development that takes into account the needs of future generations, and the value of biodiversity relative to the extinction of native species in favor of species cultivated by humans. To fully understand how and why the Green Belt movement arose, students must understand how soil develops, effects of deforestation on soil erosion, plate tectonics (to explain why Kenya has no fossil-fuel deposits of its own), and climatology (to understand what constitutes sustainable agriculture for this region).

One useful format for engaging with these questions is to have students perform a role-play in which teams are assigned contrasting identities and political positions, and must justify and debate them using scientific information relevant to their roles. Students are motivated to learn their science in order to convince their fellow students of their viewpoints. This format also promotes the valuable understanding that scientific information can be used to support either side of a debate. Of course, an important part of this exercise is afterwards discussing the debate process and how students experienced the role of science in it.

In choosing justice-related case studies, I think it is important to bring in local situations as well as distant ones. Studying stories from across the world helps students understand their roles as global citizens, but can also lead students to believe that injustice happens somewhere else, to “others.” Studying stories from across town - or in our own back yards - helps them realize that both science and the requirement to work for justice apply everywhere.

### Scientists as Examples

Using scientists’ biographical sketches to help students understand a particular branch of science is valuable because it reminds students of a fact that science courses often neglect: the existence of science requires scientists, human beings who inevitably bring not only their intellects but also their personalities, backgrounds, and biases to their work. Studying scientists’ lives is an important way of teaching students that science is a human endeavor with all the strengths and limitations of all human endeavors: strokes of genius and exquisite beauty, and unconscious slants and value assumptions.

Particularly valuable in setting a justice context for science are discussions of scientists whose work and thinking explicitly address the promotion of justice. Schweitzer, Carver, and Einstein

are obvious examples. But, as with case studies, it's important to include "local heroes" who work in our own places or beyond to promote justice. Many of my students who are science majors told me how deeply affected they were by my guest speakers. These included a Jesuit and Seattle University faculty member who regularly travels to Africa to teach local citizens techniques for building sustainable water and food supplies. His work requires expertise in physics, water resources, and engineering. Another effective speaker was a Seattle University alumna who founded the Community Coalition for Environmental Justice, a rare environmental organization led by people of color. She is not herself a scientist, but made it clear how much her organization relies on scientists' contributed expertise.

### Student Research Projects, Service Learning, and Internships

Another highly effective way to help students connect justice and college science is for them to conduct their own research and field work in this area, hands-on learning in which students interview people who have been involved with situations of injustice, or in which they perform scientific research themselves to make a real contribution to remedying injustice. Many of our Ecological Studies majors have worked in the South Park area of Seattle. South Park is a neighborhood at the southern edge of the Seattle city limits. It lies on the flood plain of the Duwamish River, between the glacial hills that underlie most of Seattle. The Duwamish originally emptied through tidal flats into the south end of Elliott Bay adjacent to Puget Sound. After long hunting and fishing use by the Duwamish, the area was converted to farmlands in the late nineteenth century by people from the eastern U.S., eastern Europe, and Japan. Industrial development followed in the early twentieth century, along with dredging and straightening of the river. Currently, most of the area is zoned for heavy industry. It is inhabited by a predominantly nonwhite population with a median household income below Seattle's average. The lower Duwamish River area, including South Park, is recognized as one of the most polluted areas not only in Seattle but in the U.S. Along with numerous sites hosting toxic chemicals, the area contains two Superfund sites.

Several Seattle University students have served as interns alongside people working to clean up toxics in the neighborhood. Others have collaborated with the Community Coalition for Environmental Justice analyzing land-use and population data for South Park. Still others have used phytoremediation techniques to clean up a creek feeding the Duwamish. In these projects, students come to understand toxicology, groundwater chemistry, salmon biology, and soil development. They also become passionate about their work and consider their project supervisors to be "eco-heroes" who are true role models for authentic living.

### Modeling Justice in the Classroom

One of the most dangerous ideas about college education, in my opinion, is that it is not "the real world." The idea that the ways we interact in college "don't really count" means that students can leave our universities without experiencing a mutually accountable community. We talk in the classroom about working for justice - but the classroom community itself is often an absolutely centralized power structure in which students must yield to the professor's every request in order to receive the reward of a good grade. In the classroom as well as every other venue of societal life, an authority's biases and prejudices can thwart the call to live in right

relationship. Because students who have been accepted to a college typically performed well in similar pre-college educational systems, they tend to accept and promote this power structure, along with many of an authority's biases.

Many of the authority relationships manifested in the classroom are appropriate and effective ways to promote true learning. For instance, I hold a Ph.D. in geology, and it is appropriate that I, and not my students, set guidelines for what my students should learn in our geology class. (Although I should also be prepared to explain plausibly to them how I chose these guidelines.) But I am continually astounded at how easy it is to fall into other authority patterns that are less healthy, in which I fail to respect or learn from my students' insights and wisdom. Moreover, even with attentiveness any one of us can unintentionally promote prejudices that inhibit the creation of a just community in our classes. For example, a few years ago I was preparing to give a talk at a national science conference, and I chose some slides of students doing geology class exercises. In one of my preliminary run-throughs, I noticed that in every slide, a male student was performing the action, and female students were looking on. Was this a matter of which slides I chose? Which classroom scenes I decided to capture on film? Or did this gender imbalance characterize my class as a whole, and I had simply captured an accurate picture of what happens on a regular basis? If so, was there something I was unknowingly doing to perpetuate or even increase that imbalance? If I had not noticed the pattern in my slides, I could have perpetuated through my presentation the idea that male students are (and thus "should be") most actively engaged in science, and that female students tend to be more passive, less interested. Of course, the same violation of justice is manifested in the often-reported tendency of teachers to call preferentially on male students or white students for active class participation.[12] We must be always vigilant for our own prejudiced thoughts and actions.

As teachers interested in justice, we can share our authority by explicitly inviting class discussions on topics such as power structures in the classroom; gender and science; race and science. We can share our power, without reneging on our professional responsibilities, by asking students to collaborate with us on developing grading schemes. And we can make it clear that we are willing to learn as much from our students - every student in the class - as we hope they will learn from us; that we respect them as full human beings.

We can also model a concern for justice by expanding our realm of care beyond the micro-community of our classroom. We can consider together with our students what information or education we as a class could offer to help remedy a specific situation in which justice has been violated. We can reflect together about who benefits from our learning, or on which geographic areas we want to focus our examples and studies. We can analyze our physical impact on the Earth and on other people through evaluating our resource use during the term. I have found this last approach to be a particularly powerful one for students, who, simply by paying attention and making simple calculations, realize quickly the extraordinary amount of energy, materials, and water a class of 25 students uses during the quarter. Once students begin to notice their consumption of the Earth's resources, they not only reduce it without needing further encouragement from me, but also urge their friends and families to do the same.

On an international level, the Association of University Leaders for a Sustainable Future (ULSF) brings together more than 200 universities from around the world to reflect on issues of natural

resources, justice, and how institutions of higher education can contribute to a more sustainable world.[13] Supported by ULSF, Seattle University faculty, students, and staff have collaborated over several years in “greening” of our college as we move toward more just use of the natural world.

#### Student response

Courses in which I emphasize justice have generated the most enthusiastic student responses of any I teach. Following are some examples:

- “I have never taken a science class before that talks about these issues. I like it. I feel more informed and it is interesting to learn about, too. My previous science courses were not very intriguing because it was just straight facts and figures that you pretty much just had to memorize. Studying issues makes you think more actively and aggressively.”
- “South Park and other environmental discussions have been some of the best of the class. I have enjoyed the chance to use my new knowledge in the pursuit of environmental justice. ... As a result of the depth with which we explore all of our topics, this class blows and high school course out of the water. ... All I want from my science classes is application to my life and this provides it.”
- “I think that there is a strong relationship between geology and justice. It is justice that must guide decisions having to do with the Earth, not just technology and science. .. I really enjoy relating geology to justice in this course. It gives science a completely different aspect that I relate to much better than formulas and scientific law.”
- “This is the most effective way of teaching in science I’ve ever had. It puts all of the things we’re learning right in front of us to see.”
- “I have anxiously awaited a course that inspired faith in God and justice for the health of this planet.”

#### Some proposals for college science

1. No student should graduate from college with a science degree without having taken at least one course that deals with issues of justice and science. This is not, of course, to say that all science courses must raise these issues. But we are not preparing our students to be contributing world citizens unless they reflect on the role of their profession in society and in promoting a more just world.
2. In a college’s offerings of science courses for non-majors, at least a few courses should raise questions about the relationships between science and justice.
3. Science faculty should take professional time to reflect on questions of how their work interfaces with justice. Such reflection could be part of an annual faculty retreat, or informal

lunches hosted by the Dean, or a lecture/discussion series, or other forms appropriate to the university.

### Science, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission

The Society of Jesus has become increasingly active in exploring interconnections between justice and environmental concerns. The first official Jesuit reference to ecology was at the 33rd General Congregation in 1983: “Lack of respect for a loving Creator leads to a denial of the dignity of the human person and the wanton destruction of the environment.”[14] Six Jesuits participated in the United Nations Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro in 1992. After several years of workshops and publications on the topic, the April 1999 issue of *Promotio Iustitiae* was published on the theme “We Live in a Broken World: Reflections on Ecology.” In this document, Peter Walpole, S.J., asserts that:

“Of primary importance is the reinvigoration of the scientific apostolate for socio-environmental concern. Such reinvigoration calls for:

- establishing the global focus
- linking science to justice
- ecological involvement for those deeply engaged in the sciences, thus needing more dynamic and unhampered access to grass-roots experiences
- then taking up concerns of more general interest
- maintaining an intense sense of the mission.”[15]

One of the charisms of Ignatian spirituality is that it is world-affirming, believing that “God can be discovered, through faith, in all natural and human events.” If our Jesuit education is to be world-affirming, we must be attentive to the discoveries of natural science. If our Jesuit education is to be communal and companionate, we must engage in a dialogue with scientific culture. And if our Jesuit education is to flow from the “faith that does justice,” we must reflect deeply with our hearts and minds on the multiple, complex interrelationships between science and justice - and then heed the resulting call to action, in our individual lives, on our campuses, and in our world community.

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the two Seattle University faculty members who disagreed with the suggestion to include justice concerns as a question for our Dean candidates; it is partly because of their challenge that I have been moved to reflect with more attention on questions of science and justice. Members of the Faith and Justice Committee at Seattle University have been instrumental in encouraging not only me, but all of the SU community to consider justice in our professional work. Frankie So, President of the Associated Students of Seattle University, was originally planning to co-author this paper; serious family health problems prevented him from doing so, but I appreciate very much our conversations on the topic. Loretta Jancoski, Dean of the School of Theology and Ministry at Seattle University, has been a continual inspiration on the topic of ecology and justice for the past five years; I owe her a great debt.

[1] Patrick McCormick, “Whose Justice?”, pp. ???

[2] Commission for Racial Justice, United Church of Christ (Charles Lee, Director, Special Project on Toxic Injustice). *Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States: A national report on the racial and socio-economic characteristics of communities with hazardous waste sites*. New York: United Church of Christ, 1987.

[3] Nixon, Ron. “Toxic Gumbo.” *Southern Exposure*, v. 26, no. 2 and 3, Institute for Southern Studies, 1998.

[4] Sachs, Aaron. “Eco-Justice: Linking Human Rights and the Environment.” *Worldwatch Paper 127*. Worldwatch Institute, 1995.

[5] Haller, John S. and Robin S. Haller, *The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974. [Quoted in Harding, Sandra (ed.). *The “Racial” Economy of Science*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.]

[6] Martin, Brian. *The Bias of Science*. Canberra, Australia: Society for Social Responsibility in Science, 1979. [Quoted by Linda Jean Shepherd in *Lifting the Veil: The Feminine Face of Science*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 1993, p. 111.]

[7] National Science Foundation. *Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 1998*. Arlington, VA 1999 (NSF 99-338).

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., “Our Mission Today and Tomorrow,” *Faith Doing Justice: Promoting Solidarity in Jesuit Ministries*, Detroit, 1991, pp. 48-49 [quoted in “We Live in a Broken World” - *Reflections on Ecology*, *Promotio Iustitiae* 70 (1999), Social Apostolate Secretariat, Rome].

[10] Dyson, Freeman. *Disturbing the Universe*. 1979.

[11] Harding, Sandra (ed.). *The “Racial” Economy of Science*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993, p. 15, emphasis added.

[12] Hess, David J. *Science and Technology in a Multicultural World: The cultural politics of facts and artifacts*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, p. 257.

[13] For more information, contact ULSF at 2100 “L” Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037 (email [ulsf@aol.com](mailto:ulsf@aol.com)), or at [www.ulsf.org](http://www.ulsf.org).

[14] GC 33, Decree 1, n. 35 [quoted in “We Live in a Broken World”, p. 7.]

[15] Walpole, Peter, S.J. [quoted in “We Live in a Broken World”, p. 68.]