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Foreword

Proponents of Fr. Ignacio Ellacuría’s vision of the Catholic Christian university as “a new university way” to embody “the service of faith and the promotion of justice” owe a debt of gratitude to Fr. Kevin Quinn for this issue of Studies.¹ Fr. Quinn responds convincingly to critics who worry that the Society’s commitment to “the faith that does justice” compromises the nature of the university. In addition, he addresses hard questions from Jesuits working in American universities about Fr. Ellacuría’s proposal for a university that serves, in Fr. Quinn’s words, “as the critical and creative consciousness and conscience of the nation as it promotes the transformation of an unjust society.”²

To provide some context for Fr. Quinn’s analysis, in what follows I will explain how the 1969 retreat of the Central American vice-province of the Jesuits framed the apostolic challenge to which Fr. Ellacuría’s model emerged as the university-style response.

From December 24 to 31 of 1969, one hundred thirty Jesuits, representing all stages of formation and “the majority of the Vice-Province” gathered at the San Salvador Seminary for a Christmas retreat.³

---

¹ GC 32, d. 4, no. 2; Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees and Accompanying Documents of the 31st–35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ (St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources [IJS], 2009), 298.

² Fr. Quinn’s formulation synthesizes the following elements. First, Fr. Ellacuría says the university should serve as “a critical and creative conscience of the national reality” while holding the country’s “oppressed majorities as a horizon for its university activity.” Then, he describes culture as “the field of university activity,” the efficacious word as its “method,” hostility toward irrationality as its “disposition,” and structural change as “the object of its university activity.” Ignacio Ellacuría, “Diez años después, ¿es posible una universidad distinta?”, in Ignacio Ellacuría, Escritos universitarios (San Salvador: UCA Editores, 1999), 59, 54, 56, 61, 63, 64.

³ “Presentacion,” 2, in “Reunión-Ejercicios de la viceprovincia Jesuitica de
The meeting was organized to respond to the “preferential option for the poor” discerned by the Latin American bishops at Medellín, Colombia fifteen months earlier. Vice-provincial Fr. Segundo Azcue, “entrusted the retreat preparation” to his assistant Fr. Javier Llasera and to thirty-eight-year-old Fr. Ignacio Ellacuría, who recruited his former novice master, Fr. Miguel Elizondo, to the team. Fr. Elizondo helped Fr. Ellacuría to implement a truly radical approach to the retreat, using the long-neglected tradition of group discernment described in the *Deliberatio primorum patrum*, the official account of the 1539 deliberation by Saint Ignatius Loyola and his companions in which they decided to found the Society of Jesus.

Fr. Ellacuría welcomed the retreatants on December 24 with a reminder from the 31st General Congregation (1965–1966) that “St. Ignatius founded the Society with the expectation that . . . it would be continually renewed by the internal power of the [Spiritual] Exercises, and the vital momentum of the Spirit.” He added an exhortation from Fr. Pedro Arrupe, however, “that we be more Ignatian than St. Ignatius himself” in carrying “the principles of St. Ignatius to their ultimate conclusions.”

Day Two began with a summary by Fr. Elizondo of the transformative impact on St. Ignatius of his mystical experience of the Trinity at Centroamérica, Diciembre 1969,” *Reflexión teologico-espirtual de la Compañía de Jésus en Centroamérica, II* (San Salvador: Archives of the Society of Jesus, Central American Province, Survey SJ de Centroamérica). The Society of Jesus in Central America was elevated from the status of a “mission” to that of a vice-province of the Spanish Province of Castile on February 7, 1937. It remained a vice-province until August 5, 1976, when Fr. Pedro Arrupe officially elevated its status and appointed Fr. César Jerez as its first provincial.


6 Ignacio Ellacuría, “Finalidad y Sentido de la Reunión,” 2, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
the Cardoner River. This talk, more than any other, captures the Ignatian spirit driving Fr. Ellacuría’s vision of a university in service to the society in which it lives. Fr. Elizondo explains:

The Ignatian vocational experience consists in a Trinitarian experience, of the Trinity present and operative in this world . . . realizing its plan for the salvation of the whole world. . . . Into this history of salvation comes the human “par excellence,” Christ, and with him all persons chosen to actively cooperate with the operation of the Trinity, to realize the salvific plan of God. . . . When St. Ignatius feels that this is the call, that the one calling him . . . is . . . the God of salvation, he emerges from his solitude and . . . engages the world. [Thus,] . . . the definitive God of Ignatius is going to be the God of this world . . . and action will be for St. Ignatius the response to this Trinitarian God, and the sign of the active presence of the Trinity in Ignatius and the life of his Society.7

Here we see the Ignatian logic behind Fr. Ellacuría’s much-debated claim that the raison d’etre of the university cannot be only the education of its students. In essence, the Ignatian university must always be, first and foremost, a way of collaborating with God’s saving work in the world in which the university serves. In other words, for Fr. Ellacuría, the center of the Jesuit university must be outside of itself.

Furthermore, from the perspective of the Spiritual Exercises, the university is a created thing that exists to give greater glory to God, and it does so precisely by serving not only those students privileged to study there but also the society in which the university lives. And so, if the goal of Jesuit education is to form “men and women for others,” then should not the university that forms them likewise be “for others,” especially the poor and disadvantaged?

---

Fr. Ellacuría followed Fr. Elizondo’s summary with two important talks pushing the retreat toward its critical moment, “the election and the reform of our works.” In the first, he asserts that “the Vice-Province must be the efficacious sign of [the] Christ experienced in the *Exercises* . . . in the historical situation in which we are living.” In the second, he points out that, for the bishops at Medellín and for the Central American Jesuits, “Christ is in the poor.” He says this “means that we are not the ones who have to save the poor, but rather it is the poor who will save us.” Moreover, he concludes, shockingly, that the *Spiritual Exercises* are leading the Jesuits of Central America to serve, and therefore to share, the fate of the crucified Christ of the poor.

Turning to Jesus, he explains, “It is not true . . . that Christ loved the cross, and that he went looking for pain, poverty, and the rest.” Rather, “Christ was only seeking to fulfill his mission,” and decided, “I will fulfill my mission even though I know I am going to end up there [i.e., at the cross].” Fr. Ellacuría then prophetically warns, “We are in the same situation [as Jesus].” And, following the principles of the *Exercises* “to their ultimate conclusions,” per Fr. Arrupe, he asserts,

What the Christ of the *Exercises* and the urgent needs of the Third World are asking of us are strictly parallel. Putting ourselves efficaciously with the force of the Gospel and our human preparation at the service of this Third World will . . . give the power they deserve to those who must be the protagonists of their own human and Christian advancement.

---

8 “Documento final de la Reunión de San Salvador,” 2, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
9 Ellacuría, “El problema del traslado del Espíritu de los Ejercicios a la vice,” 6, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
10 Ellacuría, “El tercer mundo como lugar óptimo de la vivencia Cristiana de los Ejercicios,” 4, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
11 Ellacuría, “El tercer mundo,” 8, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
12 Ellacuría, “El tercer mundo,” 8, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
... This is how the creative Logos who was incarnated, died, and has risen, will be seen in the people of the Third World.\textsuperscript{13} Note, however, that Fr. Ellacuría cautions, “We do not aspire . . . to a pure testimony of identification with the marginalized,” which is not “the charism of the Society as a whole.”\textsuperscript{14} Instead, the Society’s goal must be “putting ourselves efficaciously at the service of the Third World . . . as a modern incarnation of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh,” guided by “the spirit of the \textit{Exercises}.”\textsuperscript{15} Echoing the Beatitudes, he then concludes that the Society must simply “dedicate itself to its mission . . . and everything else will be given besides.” His key point is that, if Christ is calling the Central American Jesuits to collaborate with the work of the Trinity in the world by speaking up for those who are persecuted or marginalized, then the Jesuits should expect to share their fate.

The retreat ended two days later with an appropriation of Medellín’s preferential option for the poor, which Fr. Juan Hernández-Pico, secretary of the retreat, said would be used “to sketch a new navigational map for the Central American Jesuits.”\textsuperscript{16} The final document asserts, “The fundamental criterion for the election and the mode of the apostolic work of the Society in Central America must be to achieve efficacious action, which is simultaneously testimony, for the redemption and liberation of the Third World.”\textsuperscript{17}

Fr. Ellacuría, who would serve as president of the University of Central America (UCA) from 1979 until his death in 1989, and Román Mayorga, who would precede him as president from

\textsuperscript{13} “Documento final,” 3, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
\textsuperscript{14} Ellacuría, “El tercer mundo,” 8, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
\textsuperscript{15} “Documento final,” 3, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
\textsuperscript{16} Hernández-Pico, SJ, \textit{Historia Reciente}, 36.
\textsuperscript{17} “Documento final,” 4, in “Reunión-Ejercicios.”
1975 to 1979, were soon hard at work formulating that institution’s university-style response to the apostolic priority that the retreat endorsed. This is where Fr. Quinn’s essay begins: with the UCA’s first public declaration, made ten months later, of the university’s “principal mission as being the critical and creative conscience [and consciousness] of the Salvadoran reality in the context of Central America.”

In closing, I would simply recommend that Jesuit historians, retreat directors, and experts on the Spiritual Exercises study the 1969 Jesuit retreat and its echoes in the Society of Jesus worldwide. As a humble contribution to future studies in the spirituality of the Jesuits and to my friends in the Society, I have scanned the key talks and posted them online in a private file accessible through the link in the note below. I encourage those interested in Ignatian spirituality and in Fr. Quinn’s endorsement of Fr. Ellacuría’s model of the Catholic Christian university to explore them.

Robert Lassalle-Klein, PhD
Professor of Religious Studies and Philosophy
Faculty Director of the California Catholic Conference Partnership
Holy Names University
Co-Founder, Oakland Catholic Worker

---


For the 1969 Retreat notes, go to https://drive.google.com/file/d/1V1No9dl-pVC6oA1E-alHbirp-jVHGmW1/view?usp=sharing. All cursive comments in the margins and page numbers are mine. This link will expire on July 31, 2021.
CONTENTS

I. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision for a Different Kind of University ................................................................. 3

II. Three Problems with Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision for a Different Kind of University .......................... 9

   A. Problem One: Are Students Not Important? ........ 10

   B. Problem Two: Is the Role of Faith Lost? .......... 11

   C. Problem Three: Is It Too Propagandistic? .... 17

III. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision Translated for Use on Jesuit Campuses Today ....................................... 21

IV. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision and the Future of Jesuit Higher Education in North America ............... 26

V. Conclusion ................................................................................................................................. 31
Kevin P. Quinn (UDA) entered the Society of Jesus in 1973 in Syracuse, New York. After finishing his studies, he clerked for Judge Joseph M. McLaughlin of the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in New York. Fr. Quinn has served as president of the University of Scranton, executive director of the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education at Santa Clara University, and professor of law at Georgetown University, and currently serves as special assistant for legal affairs for the USA East Province of the Jesuits. He wrote the first draft of this essay while serving as the 2018–2019 Jesuit fellow at the Center for Ignatian Spirituality at Boston College. A graduate of Fordham University, he holds an MDiv and STL from JSTB (now the Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University) and a JD and PhD from the University of California, Berkeley.
There are two aspects to every university. The first and most evident is that it deals with culture, with knowledge, the use of the intellect. The second, and not so evident, is that it must be concerned with the social reality—precisely because a university is inescapably a social force: it must transform and enlighten the society in which it lives. . . . What then does a university do, immersed in this reality? Transform it? Yes. Do everything possible so that liberty is victorious over oppression, justice over injustice, love over hate? Yes. Without this overall commitment, we would not be a university, and even less so would we be a Catholic university.

Ignacio Ellacuría, SJ (1930–1989)1

In April 2010, in Mexico City, Superior General Adolfo Nicolás (1936–2020) addressed the first ever worldwide meeting of Jesuit university presidents. In his remarks, Fr. Nicolás examined how the “new context of globalization” challenges Jesuit higher education “to re-define, or at least, re-direct its mission.”2 And he left those gathered with

---


2 Adolfo Nicolás, SJ, “Depth, Universality, and Learned Ministry; Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education Today,” Remarks for “Networking Jesuit Higher Education:
an open-ended question; or, as he put it so well, an “unfinished” ending: “What kind of universities, with what emphases and what directions, would we run . . . in today’s world?”

In seeking to distinguish the *raison d’être* of Jesuit higher education in the twenty-first century, this essay attempts to answer Nicolás’s question—to volunteer a suitable ending—by examining Ignacio Ellacuría’s (1930–1989) vision of “a different kind of university” and its possible relevance for Jesuit universities in North America today. The pages that follow address how Fr. Ellacuría’s vision promises to provide a new university way to do faith-justice—namely, that the university can serve as the critical and creative consciousness and conscience of the nation as it promotes the transformation of an unjust society.

Part I of the essay summarizes Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a new kind of university, with special attention to two foundational documents. In brief, Fr. Ellacuría’s university would promote social change in a university manner with a Christian vision. Not surprisingly, more than a few commentators find this vision deeply troubling. So, in part II, I identify three significant criticisms and attempt to answer them. Part III then translates Fr. Ellacuría’s Salvadoran vision for use on North American Jesuit campuses today and submits that his social project for a Jesuit university could serve as a suitable premise for innovative strategic planning. Finally, in part IV, I argue that this new university way to do faith-justice ought to have a future in Jesuit higher education, and I champion the Ignatian phrase “to love and serve in all things” (*en todo amar y servir*) as capturing the essence of a transformational Jesuit education. Part V concludes the essay with the suggestion that Fr. Ellacuría’s version of a Jesuit university can have a role in implementing the Society’s worldwide preferences first promulgated in 2019.

---

I. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision for a Different Kind of University

In the pre-dawn hours of November 16, 1989, six Jesuit priests, the cook from a nearby Jesuit formation community, and her teenage daughter were murdered at the University of Central America, José Simeón Cañas (UCA) in San Salvador by members of a US-trained counter-insurgency battalion of the Salvadoran army. These killings have become emblematic of the civil war that ravaged El Salvador in the 1980s. An estimated 75,000 Salvadorans were killed in the twelve-year war between the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN), a leftist guerrilla coalition, and US-backed Salvadoran military forces.4

The UCA Jesuits were murdered “because of the role they played as intellectuals, researchers, writers, and teachers in expressing their solidarity with the poor” before, and especially during, the civil war.5 One of the Jesuits killed was Ignacio Ellacuría, UCA’s president and the country’s leading public intellectual. Although he was little known in the United States before his murder, Fr. Ellacuría is now celebrated as a principal contributor to both Latin American liberation theology and philosophy.6 It was from these theological and philosophical insights that he fashioned his vision for “a different kind of university.”

In a 1975 essay titled “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?”, Ignacio Ellacuría offered “an important programmatic statement about the mission and identity of the UCA” in which he impressively proposed “a new university way of practicing faith-justice in society.”7

---


7 Ignacio Ellacuría, “Diez años después, ¿es posible una universidad distinta?,”
For Fr. Ellacuría, a new kind of university is one that “by its very structure and proper role as a university is actually committed to opposing an unjust society and building a new one.” It has a clear political mission in serving the poor majority by studying the national reality (la realidad nacional) and promoting the structural transformation of society by means of “the efficacious word” (la palabra eficaz). The university is to serve as the “the critical and creative consciousness [and conscience of] the national reality” and so engage in a rational struggle against the irrationality of injustice. But Fr. Ellacuría insists that this political
mission must be exercised as a university (universitáriamente);\(^{11}\) it is political by doing what universities do—teaching, research, and “social projection” (proyección social).\(^{12}\)

At a time of crisis in the country (1978–1979), the UCA Jesuit community, including Fr. Ellacuría, and their lay colleagues reaffirmed their commitment to a new idea of a university—the university for social change\(^{13}\)—by drafting and approving a significant document titled, “Las funciones fundamentales del universidad y su operativización” (May 1979).\(^{14}\) As its country prepared for civil war, the UCA had a new charter,\(^{15}\) which represented a mature statement of its new self-understanding:

The UCA seeks to be an institutional university response to the historical reality of the country, considered from an ethical perspective as an unjust and irrational reality which should be transformed. This is rooted . . . in a purpose: that of contributing to social change in the country. It does this in a university manner and with a Christian inspiration.\(^{16}\)

---


\(^{12}\) Commentators translate proyección social as “social projection” or “social outreach.” Michael Lee’s analysis of the term neatly uncovers why this might be the case: “Social projection . . . indicates how the university must have a center ‘outside itself’ . . . [and] the various ways that the university ‘projects’ its knowledge to the wider society” (Lee, “Ignacio Ellacuría,” 43). For more on Fr. Ellacuría’s understanding of “social projection,” see below, notes 18–26 and accompanying text.

\(^{13}\) UCA, “Las funciones fundamentales,” in Ellacuría, Escritos universitarios, 106.

\(^{14}\) See above, note 11.

\(^{15}\) See Beirne, Jesuit Education, 144.

\(^{16}\) UCA, “Las funciones fundamentales,” 47, quoted in and translated by
It exists for the Salvadoran people . . . for the majority of our people who suffer inhuman conditions. . . . This means the work of the UCA is decidedly oriented by social outreach [proyección social].

What is most distinctive about Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a new university way of practicing faith-justice in society? Social projection is “the foundational disposition of [his] university . . . the heart of its mission and identity,” and is an original contribution in the history of higher education. For Fr. Ellacuría, “This social projection . . . is not something apart from the other two fundamental functions of the university. It presupposes teaching as its basis of support; likewise, it presupposes research as the fundamental illuminator of its task. But [social projection] becomes the regulator of these.”

Tragically, it was also the reason why the UCA Jesuits were murdered, for the goal of social projection was “[to prioritize] radical transformation of the established disorder and of structural injustice.”

Social projection should be understood in two senses: “the first is broader and involves the overall impact of the university on society, the

A new kind of university is one that “by its very structure and proper role as a university is actually committed to opposing an unjust society and building a new one.”

---


19 Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 163–64.


21 Ignacio Ellacuría, “Universidad y política” in Ellacuría, Escritos universitarios, 171–219 at 189, quoted in and translated by Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 164.

22 See Brackley, “The Challenge of the UCA,” 31: “The Jesuits at the UCA were killed for the university’s proyección social.”

22 Ellacuría, “Universidad y politica,” 186, quoted in and translated by Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 164.
cumulative effect of all university resources dedicated to social transformation. . . . The second sense is important but [narrower]: publications, public statements, broadcasts, editorials, and social service activities, and so on—the product of the UCA’s teaching and research.”23 As a critical and creative consciousness and conscience of society, the university with its social projection, in both senses, has a political mission, but “because of its fundamental need to be rational and ethical, the university cannot be reduced to taking the side of any given political or social system indiscriminately.”24 Rather it must take the side of the oppressed majority “using university methods and not those of other social forces in the country which . . . would not be appropriate for a university.”25 For Fr. Ellacuría,

The university should strive to be free and objective, but objectivity and freedom may demand taking sides. We are freely on the side of the popular majority because they are unjustly oppressed and because the truth of the situation lies within them. . . . Our university as a university has an acknowledged preferential option for the poor, and it learns from them in their reality and in their many expressions which . . . draw matters together and point the way ahead.26

This university way of contributing to social change also confesses its “Christian inspiration,” and Fr. Ellacuría is notably brash and eloquent in explaining the “business of the Christian meaning of a university.”27 First, he highlights the university’s autonomy:

Legally the UCA does not depend on anything or anybody. It stands by itself. It does not depend on any Church hierarchy, nor does it make obligatory any religious confession or even any kind of religiosity. It sets its own objectives in accordance

23 Beirne, Jesuit Education, 122.
24 Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 179. Here Fr. Ellacuría is exploiting both senses of conciencia, rational and ethical. For more on this important Spanish wordplay, see, above, note 10.
27 Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 204.
Kevin P. Quinn, SJ

with what it wants to do and not on any outside orders that might coerce it to follow any particular pattern. What does it mean then, to speak of Christian inspiration as our university does many times?28

Fr. Ellacuría then answers the question by using a “Latin American vision of Christianity:”29

Correctly understood, Christianity defends and promotes a series of fundamental values which are essential to our current process of history and therefore very useful to a university endeavor committed to that process in history. . . Christianity regards the rejection of human beings and of human kinship as the radical rejection of God and, in that sense, as the rejection of the source of all reality and all human actualization. Since all these values are not merely professions of ideals but fundamental demands that must be lived out and implemented, the university finds in its Christian inspiration an energizing principle that little needs to be spelled out in confessional terms.30

A university is a Christian university when its horizon is the people of the very poor who are demanding their liberation and struggling for it. [Thus, it is] a university whose fundamental commitment is to the change of both structures and persons with a view towards a growing solidarity; a university which is willing to engage in dangerous struggle on behalf of justice; a university whose inspiration for making ethical judgments of situations and solutions

28 Ellacuria, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 204. The UCA was founded in 1965 as a “corporation for the benefit of the public” (corporación de utilidad pública) (Beirne, Jesuit Education, 71). It was a special kind of public—and not an official Catholic—university. As such, neither was it owned by the state, nor did it answer to Vatican officials, local Church leaders, or even Jesuit superiors (Beirne, Jesuit Education, 233). A self-perpetuating board of directors controlled the university and appointed its administration. Five Jesuits were the university’s first directors (https://uca.edu.sv/historia/). Given these institutional adaptations dating from its foundation, the nature of the university—its autonomy and its “Catholic” or “Christian” character—remained a controversial issue for many years.

29 Ellacuria, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 205.

30 Ellacuria, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 206.
and for the means to use in moving from such situations to solutions is the inspiration of the gospel.\textsuperscript{31}

In sum, Fr. Ellacuría and his UCA colleagues understood the Christian inspiration of their university to be rooted in its special commitment to the poor rather than through juridical control or religious practices.\textsuperscript{32} One colleague, Jon Sobrino (\textit{CAM}), put it this way: a Christian university “places itself at the service of the Kingdom of God with an option for the poor.”\textsuperscript{33}

\section*{II. Three Problems with Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision for a Different Kind of University}

To repeat: Ignacio Ellacuría aspired that his different kind of university promote social change in a university manner with a Christian inspiration. To many, this vision is problematic on three counts: (1) Fr. Ellacuría’s ambiguity over the proper role of students and faculty in university life; (2) his lack of any sustained analysis of a faith commitment; and (3) the fear that his university would become a “propaganda mill for a new political or social orthodoxy.”\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31} Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 207.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} In the early 1990s, the UCA began to offer pastoral services that had been lacking on campus, which included establishing a university parish. Writing in 1996, Charles Beirne opined that, despite these initiatives, “much remains to be done” (Beirne, \textit{Jesuit Education}, 242). Fast forward to 2020: a quick review of the UCA’s website suggests that the university has done much to introduce Ignatian spirituality and activities on campus. See, for example, https://uca.edu.sv/cie/programa-ellacuria/ and https://uca.edu.sv/vida-estudiantil/liderazgo-ausjal/.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34} Michael J. Buckley, SJ, \textit{The Catholic University as Promise and Project: Reflections in a Jesuit Idiom} (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1998), 111.
\end{flushright}
A. Problem One: What Is the Role of Students and Faculty?

In heralding that the UCA “exists for the Salvadoran people,” university leaders also made clear that “[t]he UCA does not exist for itself, or for its members. Its center is not within itself, nor in its students, nor its professors, nor in its authorities.” To read that the UCA does not live for its students is puzzling if not unreasonable, as least to North American Jesuit educators. Fr. Ellacuría did claim “it cannot be said that the UCA set out to teach anyone. It was opened to provide a service to the Salvadoran people from a Christian viewpoint.”

Moreover, he was clear that “the university’s activity is not aimed primarily at changing persons but at changing structures.” While some senior UCA administrators showed limited interest in students as potential agents of social change, most only identified them as “the principal source of funding for the global task of the university.” Without question, this funding philosophy with its limited interest in students as compared to the university’s role as a platform for social change would never see the light of day on any contemporary student-centered Jesuit campus in North America.

More fundamentally, Fr. Ellacuría’s ambiguity over the proper role of students and faculty in university life would have no place

---


37 Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 191.

38 Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 187–88.

39 See Román Mayorga, La Universidad para el Cambio Social, 3rd ed. (San Salvador: UCA Editores, 1976), 124, quoted in and translated by Beirne, Jesuit Education, 127: “[I]t would be unrealistic to pretend that one could launch a liberating process of social transformation, and construct in the present century a committed society, without people to lead it.”

40 Beirne, Jesuit Education, 173.

41 In his discussion of what type of student should be admitted to his new kind of university, Fr. Ellacuría suggests that good candidates would already possess the
in the vision for a different kind of Jesuit university that this essay is proposing. It is sensible to repudiate Fr. Ellacuría on this issue simply by pointing out that people are needed to launch and maintain a new university way of practicing faith-justice in society. And these people must include the university’s students and, of course, faculty, who, with proper knowledge and skills training, can serve as important contributors to the university’s social projection. Assuming that we can concede this point, this essay will argue that Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for achieving a new kind of university is still relevant and valuable for North American Jesuit universities today.

**B. Problem Two: What Is the Role of Faith?**

Because Fr. Ellacuría fashioned his vision for a new university way of practicing faith-justice in society from his academic work in both Latin American liberation theology and philosophy, it is important to acknowledge that by the late 1980s and early 1990s liberation theology had begun to lose its momentum. John Paul II (1920–2005) and other prominent religious leaders contributed to its ultimate decline by arguing that liberation theology secularized the Christian faith and effectively rid Catholicism of its connection to the afterlife and to its service of faith.\(^\text{42}\)

At first glance, Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a different kind of university is vulnerable to the same charge. One might ask how his university serves faith or how faith is the necessary foundation for any Christian commitment to justice. This section responds to that charge by (1) briefly reviewing the Society’s ongoing efforts to necessary knowledge and skills to carry out the university’s mission. See Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?,” 198; on the issue on who should teach in his university, he has even less to say (ibid., 199).

clarify its understanding of the close bond between the service of faith and the promotion of justice, (2) highlighting Fr. Ellacuría’s nuanced understanding of a faith that does justice, and (3) offering a creative way of putting faith and justice together.

In 1975, the 32nd General Congregation memorably asserted that “The mission of the Society of Jesus is the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement. For reconciliation with God demands reconciliation of people with one another.”

According to the congregation’s delegates, this promotion of justice “should be the concern of our whole life and a dimension of all our apostolic endeavors,” and even more emphatically, “the service of faith and the promotion of justice cannot be for us simply one ministry among others. It must be the integrating factor of all our ministries, and not only of our ministries but our inner life as individuals, as communities, and as a world-wide brotherhood.”

To re-express the Jesuit mission in this way “was received in the wider Jesuit world either with great enthusiasm or with confusion and division.” For those confused or distressed, many questions surfaced; two are of particular interest here: (1) “[w]hat is the meaning of justice in Decree Four?” And (2) “with all the emphasis on justice, did the role of faith get lost?”

---

43 GC 32, d. 4, n. 2; Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees and Accompanying Documents of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ (St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources [IJS], 2009), 298. See also, “Jesuits Today,” GC 32, d. 2, n. 2; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 291: “What is it to be companion of Jesus today? It is to engage, under the standard of the Cross, in the crucial struggle of our time: the struggle for faith and that struggle for justice which it includes.”

44 GC 32, d. 4, n. 47; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 309.

45 GC 32, d. 2, n. 9; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, 292.


In 2014, the Society’s Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat published a special document titled “The Promotion of Justice in the Universities of the Society.”48 The secretariat honestly acknowledged two realities. First, “the term ‘justice’ [in GC 32] was considered too ambiguous since it could be understood in various ways: as commutative, social, evangelical, Pauline, etc.”49 Second, many Jesuits viewed faith and justice as separate concerns and to propose integrating them was controversial in the Society.50 For critics, this proposed integration threatened the spiritual mission of the Society to proclaim the Gospel of salvation in Jesus Christ by undermining the primacy given by Ignatius in the Formula of the Institute51 “to strive especially for the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine.”52

As we know well, subsequent General Congregations, especially GC 34, endorsed GC 32’s decision to re-express the Jesuit mission and enriched our understanding of “faith” and “justice” as well as the close bond between the service of faith and the promotion of justice.53 The general congregations’ reflections on the “faith-justice commitment,” on the “faith that does justice,” or on the “justice that is born of faith” are, as the secretariat put it, “rich in content and subtly nuanced.”54 And so, while greater analysis of these reflections would be very helpful, I will forego that for the

---


sake of brevity. However, I would like to quote the following from GC 32, which very ably describes a faith that does justice:

A third characteristic of our world particularly significant to our mission of evangelization is this: It is now within human power to make the world more just—but we do not really want to. Our new mastery over nature and man himself is used, often enough, to exploit individuals, groups, and peoples rather than to distribute the resources of the planet more equitably.

. . .

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, in his selfishness, has done. Hence there can be no promotion of justice in the full and Christian sense unless we also preach Christ and the mystery of reconciliation He brings. It is Christ who, in the last analysis, opens the way to the complete and definitive liberation of mankind for which we long from the bottom of our hearts. Conversely, it will not be possible to bring Christ to people or to proclaim His Gospel effectively unless a firm decision is taken to devote ourselves to the promotion of justice.\textsuperscript{55}

To return to Fr. Ellacuría, his understanding of a faith that does justice echoes that of GC 32:

Our university is of Christian inspiration when it places itself in this preferential option for the poor.

. . .

For within this option, in theological terms, we favor placing faith in tension with justice. It is an indispensable, although perhaps not sufficient, condition of faith, that it be confronted with justice; the justice being sought is profoundly enlightened in turn by faith lived through the preferential option for the poor. We do not regard faith and justice as two separate

realities brought together by an effort of the will, but as two interrelated realities that form or should form a single structural totality, as liberation theology and other related theological movements have said repeatedly.\textsuperscript{56}

Furthermore, Fr. Ellacuría insisted that a university with a Christian inspiration is a place wherein

$$\text{[r]eason and faith merge . . . in confronting the reality of the poor. Reason must open its eyes to their suffering; faith—which is sometimes scandalous to those without it—sees in the weak of this world the triumph of God, for we see in the poor what salvation must mean and the conversion to which we are called.}$$\textsuperscript{57}

In post-war El Salvador (i.e., after 1992), continuing the legacy of its fallen leader, the UCA’s mission became defined by “what these [poor] majorities objectively need”\textsuperscript{58} and was promoted by exploring “the insights of the gospel and Catholic Social Teaching for building a more just, peaceful, and sustainable civil society.”\textsuperscript{59} Clearly, Fr. Ellacuría did not, and his UCA successors “do not regard faith and justice as two separate realities brought together by an effort of the will, but as two interrelated realities that form or should form a single structural totality.”\textsuperscript{60}

Of course, most, if not all, Jesuits would agree that the Christian promotion of justice must not be separated from “its wellspring of faith.”\textsuperscript{61} At the heart of doing justice is the transcendent truth which is God and God’s self-communication in Jesus Christ. For this reason, we

\textsuperscript{56} Ellacuría, “The Challenge of the Poor Majority,” in Hassett and Lacey, eds., Toward a Society, 175, quoted in Beirne, Jesuit Education, 220.

\textsuperscript{57} Ignacio Ellacuría, SJ, “The Task of a Christian University,” in Companions of Jesus, 147–51 at 149–50.

\textsuperscript{58} Ellacuría, “The University, Human Rights, and the Poor Majority,” in Hassett and Lacey, eds., Toward a Society, 214, quoted in Valiente, “The University as Agent of Social Transformation,” 298.

\textsuperscript{59} Valiente, “The University as Agent of Social Transformation,” 298.

\textsuperscript{60} Ellacuría, “The Challenge of the Poor Majority,” in Hassett and Lacey, eds., Toward a Society, 175, quoted in Beirne, Jesuit Education, 220.

\textsuperscript{61} GC 34, d. 3, n. 2; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 530.
must seek and teach a justice that is God’s as revealed in Jesus Christ—a Christian understanding of justice.

Some critics of GC 32 argued that excluding “the spiritual dimension of human-divine life from the direct focus” of our mission today was “shortsighted . . . [and] not particularly Christian.”\(^6^2\) While conceding that GC 34 broadened and deepened our understanding of justice by describing “‘that justice of the Gospel which is the embodiment of God’s love and saving mercy’”\(^6^3\) and encouraged “ever fuller integration of the promotion of justice into our lives of faith,”\(^6^4\) this essay acknowledges that more attention should be given to the role of faith in the promotion of justice. With this in mind, I will conclude this section with a brief discussion of one author’s effort to present the service of faith and promotion of justice as a new religious experience in our faith lives as Jesuits.

In an essay titled “Social Justice Activism as Religious Experience: The Transformation of the Jesuits,” Peter Bisson (can) argues that GC 34 has encouraged Jesuits to transform themselves into a religious community practicing a new form of religion called “engaged religion.”\(^6^5\) For Bisson,

GC 34’s integration of religious commitment and the commitment to social justice in “Servants of Christ’s Mission” was far more seamless than that in GC 32’s “Our Mission Today.” The language of “Our Mission Today” tended to be abstract and explanatory, and in some places read like a brief social analysis or political call . . . The language of GC 34’s “Servants of

\(^{6^2}\) Tripole, “Faith Beyond Justice,” 32.

\(^{6^3}\) GC 34, d. 2, n. 3; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 522, quoting GC 33, d. 1, n. 32. A footnote to this citation reads, “In other places in this present decree, this justice is also described as ‘the justice willed by God,’ ‘the justice of God’s kingdom,’ and God’s ‘justice in the world’” (522n3).

\(^{6^4}\) GC 34, d. 3, n. 3, in Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 530; italics added.

\(^{6^5}\) Bisson, “Social Justice Activism.”
Christ’s Mission” was much more experiential, less abstract and explanatory and more explicitly religious.

Through its recounting of twenty years of the promotion of justice in the service of faith as a religious experience, “Servants of Christ’s Mission” presents social justice activism as a medium of religious experience, thereby bringing justice and the secular into the primary religious level of interaction with the transcendent as did GC 32, but this time through experience instead of through explanation.66

The Jesuit commitment to promoting justice “has led to a new awareness of mission not as filling empty secular spaces with God, but as a response to the presence of God that is already there, most notably in the poor and marginalized.”67 In sum, appreciating the religious experience of social justice activism, as described by Bisson, adjusts our understanding of faith and puts faith and justice together in an original way. Consequently, the role of faith in the mission of the Society remains fundamental and is not lost. So too with the mission of Fr. Ellacuría’s university.

C. Problem Three: Is It Too Propagandistic?

Critics of Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a different kind of university have long argued it politicized the purpose of a university inappropriately and so threatened the traditional Jesuit mission in higher education. To understand how Fr. Ellacuría’s vision would challenge certain Jesuit traditions requires one to have a clear understanding of the status quo ante. Here, Michael Buckley (1931–2019) is most helpful.68 Fr. Buckley first recalls how GC 32 demanded that every Jesuit work, including the university, be evaluated and finally judged based on its service of faith


67 For this summary of Bisson’s article, see https://www.ignatianspirituality.com/ignatian-voices/voices-for-justice/.

68 See Buckley, The Catholic University, 105–28.
and its promotion of justice. This was a radical reorientation because “the heavy word ‘justice’ was given a new predominance . . . with all of its unsettling ambiguity, challenge, and historical heritage.”⁶⁹ He then identifies the potentially fatal objection to this reorientation:

[A] serious focus upon justice perverts not only the purpose of the Jesuits but the nature of their universities precisely as . . . [pluralistic fora]. The university is a place where one raises questions and conducts inquiry with a necessary pluralism of voices. It is not a place for indoctrination, social or political or economic. . . . Propaganda is not the function of the university. In many ways, it is the intractable enemy of the university.⁷⁰

Finally, Fr. Buckley asks the hard question:

Can you orient the university whose very life is open question and inquiry, can you orient this institution so that it deals with human misery, with the wants of the vast majority of human beings, and not destroy it, not betray its very nature as a university, not refigure it as a propaganda mill for a new political or social orthodoxy?⁷¹

Fr. Buckley’s characteristically razor-sharp analysis and final question, when applied to Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for the radical reorientation of a university’s mission, potentially undermines the relevance of his “different kind of university” on North American Jesuit campuses today. Hence, it requires a compelling answer.

The beginning of an answer can be found in the ongoing “search for a new humanism”⁷² that now characterizes much of North American Jesuit higher education. Writing in the late 1990s, Fr. Buckley proposed that contemporary humanistic education needed to reform

---

⁶⁹ Buckley, The Catholic University, 107.
⁷⁰ Buckley, The Catholic University, 109–10.
⁷¹ Buckley, The Catholic University, 111.
itself by featuring a serious concern about justice as an essential dimension. For him, “[a]ny justification of the promotion of justice as a commitment of the contemporary university must be grounded on the basic conviction that the university exists for the humane growth of its students.” This position makes sense, for most Jesuit schools still promote some of the basic aims of the studia humanitatis—“that is, the subjects that are about our human striving, failings, passions, and ideals—about wonder, as expressed especially in poetry, drama, oratory, and history.”

Yet, after GC 32, the medieval liberal arts and the Renaissance humanities—educational cornerstones when the Jesuits began their ministry of education—were judged deficient on Jesuit campuses. For, in many respects, this ideal of humanistic education was isolating the student and the institution from the ordinary life of those at the margins of society and so encouraging indifference and exploitation. What was generally lacking from this classical understanding of humanitas was any developed sensitivity to the “comprehensive care for the human.” So, for Fr. Buckley and others, the more complete humanistic ideal on contemporary Jesuit campuses must be “the development of humane students and for ‘a more humane society.’” This would necessitate Jesuit educators to ask anew what knowledge and skills are most worth having to advance this ideal.

In this same vein, in a recent Studies essay, eminent historian John O’Malley (umI) debunks the notion that the classical understanding of humanitas has no place on a contemporary Jesuit campus. Having re-

---

75 See Buckley, *The Catholic University*, 117.
76 Buckley, *The Catholic University*, 120.
77 Buckley, *The Catholic University*, 121; quoting GC 32, d. 4, n. 69.
78 GC 34 raised this very question in its decree, “Jesuits and University Life”: “As Jesuits, we seek knowledge for its own sake and at the same time must regularly ask, ‘Knowledge for what?’” See GC 34, d. 17, n. 409; *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, ed. Padberg, 630.
visited the tradition with great care, he concludes:

The aim of this humanistic education . . . was to produce the well-rounded and socially aware person, a person ‘out there,’ engaged in the affairs of the community, not a private practitioner sequestered in the cloisters known as libraries, classrooms, laboratories, or even surgeries, not somebody intent on using his (or, eventually, her) professional education exclusively for climbing the corporate ladder or even for advancing his or her profession. In this education the ethical element was crucial. The ideal graduates . . . were responsible participants in the community in which they lived, concerned for the common good and ready to make sacrifices for it. Those graduates were ready . . . to assume a leadership role as circumstances indicated. They were to be “men for others.”

To be sure, Fr. O’Malley selected this most familiar Jesuit refrain to underscore his claim that this “moral imperative has been at the heart of the humanistic tradition from the very beginning” and to highlight his position that “the ‘promotion of justice’ was not as alien to the Jesuit tradition of schooling as some have argued.”

I would argue that twenty-first-century humanism as correctly understood and professed on Jesuit campuses today could complement Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a university. But for that to happen, this essay now needs to answer Fr. Buckley’s hard question. Fr. Ellacuría would insist that his university’s primary mission is to transform social structures. As such, it is not possible for the university not to be political, but its political mission is to be exercised as a university, doing what universities do—namely, “uncovering the truth about reality, making the truth known to society, and in holding all, especially the powerful, accountable to the truth.” In so doing, the university may need to take sides.

81 For Fr. Buckley’s hard question, see notes 68–71, above, with accompanying text.
82 Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 165.
83 See Ignacio Ellacuría, “The Challenge of the Poor Majority,” trans. Phillip Berryman, in Hassett and Lacey, eds., Toward a Society: “It is often said that the university
In doing what Fr. Ellacuría’s university does, and at times taking sides in the process, does that university become, in Fr. Buckley’s words, “a propaganda mill for a new political or social orthodoxy?” Not necessarily. For Fr. Ellacuría insisted that the university take sides in a university manner by attempting not to identify itself with any political party or social movement. His university’s mission is political, without being partisan or propagandistic. At times, this might prove difficult to realize; but the vision was clear: for the university “to be a creative and critical [consciousness and] conscience for the nation, and to dedicate its faith-inspired academic resources toward the emergence of a just society.” With some adaptation, Fr. Ellacuría’s social project for a Jesuit university thus could serve as a suitable premise for innovative strategic planning on North American Jesuit campuses today.

III. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision Translated for Use on Jesuit Campuses Today

Most university educators would agree that “[a] university . . . has multiple goals: to educate undergraduates, to pursue research, to train professionals, and to contribute to should be impartial. We do not agree. The university should strive to be free and objective, but objectivity and freedom may demand taking sides” (175). For more on the “political” nature of social projection, see notes 24–26, above, with accompanying text.

84 Buckley, The Catholic University, 111.

85 To be political is to be involved in government or public affairs, and to be partisan is to advance the agenda of a political party. To be sure, a natural tension exists between being political and being partisan; nonetheless, I argue here that the proper role of a university for Fr. Ellacuría was to promote social transformation without exclusively taking any one political party’s side. By preference, the university was on the side of the popular majority because it was unjustly oppressed.

86 Beirne, Jesuit Education, 229.
the community.” However, what universities claim to be teaching their students—specifically, to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems, and communicate clearly—is necessary, but not sufficient, for Jesuit universities. As radically student-centered institutions, what is the Jesuit difference—the “value added” of Jesuit higher education in North America today?

One answer is to ask how Jesuit educators might prepare their students to become agents of social change, to be trained and motivated to carry out the revised mission of Fr. Ellacuría’s university today. Thirty years after the murders of Fr. Ellacuría and his colleagues, Jesuit higher education in North America has judiciously translated important aspects of Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for use here. A few years ago, Jesuit curial officials readily endorsed the heart of that vision by stipulating that “the Society [of Jesus] should first discern what type of society we desire to create, and then determine what kind of university is required to make that possible.” This exercise would identify the raison d’être of Jesuit universities today.

For Jesuit universities worldwide, curial officials concede that “the commitment to justice has required a certain reorien-

—


tation,” especially about the social projection of the university as a transformative agent. Nevertheless, the university’s social project maintains a prominent place in describing the raison d’être of Jesuit universities today. GC 34 put it this way:

[O]ur basic Jesuit identity and mission of any university calling itself 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. A Jesuit university can and must discover in its own proper institutional forms and authentic purposes a specific and appropriate arena for the encounter with the faith which does justice.

Moreover, recent general congregations have introduced and reinvigorated the notion that Jesuits desire a society that is “more just and more humane.” It makes sense, then, that various actors on Jesuit campuses have heeded Fr. Buckley’s appeal, echoed by other voices, to search for and to find a new humanism, the purpose of which is to form students “to be men and women of conscience, competence, compassion and commitment.”

But just how is a contemporary Jesuit university to achieve this ultimate learning outcome? Jesuit education has engaged mind, heart, and hands since the first Jesuit school opened in 1548. In 2000, Superior General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach (1928–2016) called

---


91 In a footnote to the term “social projection,” the Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat acknowledges that “this expression—proyección social—comes from Fr. El-lacuría,” and claims that “its use has become widespread among Jesuit universities” (Social Justice and Ecology Secretariat, “The Promotion of Justice in the Universities of the Society,” 36n30).

92 GC 34, d. 17, n. 7; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 630–1.

93 GC 32, d. 4, n. 69; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 302.

94 For Fr. Buckley on the search for a new humanism, see notes 72–80, above, with accompanying text.

for a new Jesuit educational standard: “to ‘educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world.’” “Tomorrow’s ‘whole person,’” he said, “cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world.” For that reason, he explained, students “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 in it constructively.” They should learn, he said, to “perceive, think, judge, choose, and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed.”

This educational strategy calls for personal transformation that would lead to transforming society. It promotes the humane development of students so that they can become agents of social change. The ideal of a personal transformation requires a rigorous education to prepare students to become ethical and compassionate leaders who will infuse society with faith and justice, informed by knowledge. Furthermore, academic, moral, and spiritual experience must then be integrated with and enhanced by learning outside the classroom in order for personal transformation to be effective. But it must be experiential learning in which immersion and reflection on experience are intertwined and focused on the needs and concerns that many in our world face, especially those at the margins of society.

On this note, the deployment of experiential learning, now common on most Jesuit campuses, combats the common talk of col-

---


97 Kolvenbach, “The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Higher Education”: “The students need close involvement with the poor and marginalized now, in order to learn about reality and become adults of solidarity in the future” (9).

98 See Buckley, The Catholic University: “But a humane sensibility must become an educated sensibility. It is not enough to feel deeply; one must also know” (122).
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leges and universities as intellectual ivory towers by vanquishing the traditional collegiate status quo of unworldly isolation. Moreover, experiential learning provides students with an “experience of the real.”

Why is this so necessary, yet not sufficient, for Jesuit educators? Dean Brackley (1946–2011) is helpful here: “The chief goal of [Jesuit] education is wisdom, not mere information. . . . Although reality is reasonable, it is naïve to suppose that reason alone will take us to it. Only an ‘enriched reason’ that engages the whole person—intellect, will and emotions—produces wisdom. This is reason rooted in experience and practice and nourished by contemplation, affectivity and imagination.”

This is an important insight, for many people mistake knowledge for wisdom. While knowledge is having information, wisdom is much more: it is the ability to discern which aspects of that knowledge are true, right, lasting, and meaningful to one’s life. The author of Proverbs captures this distinction most powerfully: “When wisdom comes into your heart and knowledge is a delight to you, then prudence will be there to watch over you, and discernment be your guardian.”


101 Prov 2:10–11. In presenting its universal apostolic preferences to the public (see notes 121–25 below, with accompanying text), the Society’s website tellingly highlighted these scriptural verses; see https://jesuits.global/en/uap/discernment-and-the-spiritual-exercises. The humanists thought likewise, wanting to inculcate the virtue of prudence or good judgment in students. On this point, see O’Malley, “Jesuit Schools and the Humanities Yesterday and Today”: “[T]he virtue the humanists especially wanted to inculcate was prudence, that is, good judgment, which expressed the wisdom that characterized their ideal leader” (31).
Fr. Kolvenbach famously suggested that the first and foremost measure of the success of Jesuit higher education “lies in who our students become.”102 And whom should they become? To the point, Jesuit educators should ultimately want their alumni/ae to be wise men and women for and with others.

IV. Fr. Ellacuría’s Vision and the Future of Jesuit Higher Education in North America

So, in the end, how should we identify the raison d’être of North American Jesuit universities today? This essay proposes the following response. First, recall GC 34’s clarity on this issue: “A Jesuit university can and must discover in its own proper institutional forms and authentic purposes a specific and appropriate arena for the encounter with the faith which does justice.”103 This charge invites innovative strategic planning in which a contemporary Jesuit university identifies what it is doing well and asks how it might better integrate a religious commitment with a commitment to social justice. One obvious way is to promote, in a more explicit and institutional manner, the humane development of its students so that they can become agents of social change helping to create a more just and humane society. For one university, this may require deep soul-searching; for another, a simple reorientation might do.

Note that in promoting the personal transformation of its students the university itself becomes a project of social transformation, serving as a nonpartisan and critical consciousness and conscience for the nation by mobilizing its faith-inspired academic resources in search of a better world. Though “almost anathema to the post-modern academy,”104 this different kind of university would insist on making normative claims both in serving faith and promoting justice, such as maintaining a generous place for religion in the public

103 GC 34, d. 17, n. 7; Jesuit Life and Mission Today, ed. Padberg, 631.
104 Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 170.
square and promoting the idea of human dignity. Both Frs. Ellacuría and Buckley would approve.

And what traditional Jesuit phrase best captures this new university way of doing faith-justice? This essay champions the phrase “to love and serve in all things” [“en todo amar y servir”]. To deliver a transformative education in the Jesuit tradition, as mentioned earlier, requires the integration of academic, moral, and spiritual learning—the union of mind, heart, and soul. For Fr. Brackley, “Education of the whole person in the Ignatian style . . . helps students discover their vocation in life, above all their *vocation to love and serve.*”

Of course, this phrase is from the Contemplation to Attain the Love of God, the final exercise in the *Spiritual Exercises.* Here, David Fleming (1934–2011) is very helpful for discussing what Ignatius might mean by *to serve* and how we might follow his lead. At the outset, it is noteworthy that Fr. Fleming begins his analysis of Ignatian service by detailing Ignatius’s mystical experience at La Storta and so reminding us that Christian service ultimately flows from the wellspring of faith, as discussed above. He then identifies several Ignatian ways of serving:

> First, by looking at God who is the first to serve, we begin to learn about service. Second, from God, we learn that love is the foundation and love is the stimulus for service. Love is expressed in deeds—in acts of service—more than in words.

---


106 Brackley, “Higher Standards for Higher Education,” 6, citing Paul Crowley, SJ, italics in the original.

107 *Spiritual Exercises* 233; Louis J. Puhl, SJ, *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: A New Translation, Based on Studies in the Language of the Autograph* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1951): “Second Prelude. This is to ask for what I desire. Here it will be to ask for an intimate knowledge of the many blessings received, that filled with gratitude for all, I may in all things love and serve the Divine Majesty” (101), italics added.


109 See notes 61–64, above, with accompanying text.
And yet our service should speak out and communicate the love that is at its source. Third, service cannot be restricted to certain actions or deeds, to certain results or accomplishments. From Jesus and the gospels, we learn that to follow is to serve, to be available is to serve, to believe and to trust is to serve, to accompany is to serve, to forgive and to be compassionate is to serve, and to celebrate the Eucharist is to serve. We also learn that to serve is always to share what we have been given. That is why serving always follows upon loving—because lovers share their gifts.\(^{110}\)

For Fr. Fleming, “[t]he Spanish verb ayudar, meaning to help, is the kernel of all Ignatian service. Ignatius always wanted ‘to help souls.’ . . . ‘To help’ is hardly an exalted notion of service. It does not conjure up great deeds and accomplishments. But it is a way of serving as God serves.”\(^{111}\) These themes of service shape the Ignatian worldview and, as organizing principles, should inform Jesuit higher education. Fr. Kolvenbach would agree:

[W]e must ask ourselves whether our students deepen their sense of wonder and curiosity, cultivate their ideals, widen their understanding of human life and their sympathy for others. Does the education we offer enable them to learn how best to ordain their lives to what is best for themselves and good for other men and women? In an institution of higher education the knowledge gained through inquiry brings with it the responsibility of acting justly for the common good. But the ethical ideal proposed by our schools should be of a higher level than that of liberal education. We and our students should continually be asking ourselves if the choices we make are leading us to the ideal of service as proposed by the Gospel: “Whoever would be great among you must be your servant.” (Mark 11:42)\(^{112}\)

What does this mean in the concrete? It means that the Jesuit university

---

\(^{110}\) Fleming, “‘Here I Am,’” 106–7.

\(^{111}\) Fleming, “‘Here I Am,’” 106.

described in this essay, redefined per Fr. Nicolás’s challenging ques-
tion,113 would do well to promote societal change in favor of equality
and justice with its teaching, research, and social projection, animated
by its Jesuit inspiration of loving and serving in all things. To consider
what kind of social projection is appropriate for North American Jesuit
universities, “individual universities would need to take up the task of
detecting where reality is fundamentally just or unjust—a constitutive
component of Fr. Ellacuría’s model—and respond accordingly.”114

There is no denying that questions raised about social projec-
tion that North American Jesuit universities might exercise are not
trivial and demand answers. Most
important among these is the is-
sue of context.115 The lived reality
of Jesuit universities today is very
different from Fr. Ellacuría’s UCA
in two ways: (1) the political, cul-
tural, and economic contexts are
unmistakably different; and (2) the social force of most contemporary
Jesuit universities is easily eclipsed by the UCA’s national influence
demonstrated in the 1980s.

To be clear, that influence was so pervasive in El Salvador that
government soldiers murdered the UCA Jesuits. Moreover, Jesuit
universities today are organized very differently than the UCA was
and, for one thing, are more obliged to donor and corporate mon-
ey. For that reason, to question the suitability of social projection in
North America, educators need to answer certain questions that did
not concern Fr. Ellacuría and his fellow UCA leaders, such as “Who
speaks for the university? How [to] take into account the various

113 For Nicolás’s question, see notes 2–3, above, with accompanying text.
114 Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,” 168.
115 David Gandolfo disagrees: “The possible relevance of Ellacuría’s model does
not hinge on the similarity or dissimilarity existing between the different contexts of
Ellacuría’s UCA and universities in the United States today. Rather, it depends on the
prior option to make actual context—historical reality—the horizon of all of a given un-
iversity’s operations” (Gandolfo, “A Different Kind of University within the University,”
168).
stakeholders and constituencies? How [to] ensure accountability and the right to dissent?”

To answer these important questions is beyond my present purpose. Instead, I propose the following hypothetical case promoting the use of social projection by Jesuit universities in North America. Viewing the website of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU), one observes the AJCU Migration Resource Directory. Were AJCU to marshal these efforts in research, scholarship, teaching, and service at twenty-seven Jesuit colleges and universities in order to proffer potential solutions for our country’s migration crisis, this would perhaps constitute social projection on a national scale of which Fr. Ellacuría would approve. One might even claim that AJCU, acting this way in response to a reality that is unjust, would satisfy Fr. Ellacuría’s vision for a different kind of Jesuit university in North America.

In practicing social projection, Jesuit university leaders might recall Pope Saint John Paul II’s clear instruction in *Ex corde Ecclesiae*: “If need be, a Catholic University must have the courage to speak uncomfortable truths which do not please public opinion, but which are necessary to safeguard the authentic good of society.” For him, a Catholic University . . . will seek to discover the roots and causes of the serious problems of our time . . . such as 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.

---

117 See https://migrationdirectory.ajcunet.edu/.
118 Moreover, in my opinion, many Jesuit universities are now practicing a form of social projection in addressing the sexual abuse crisis in the Catholic Church.
120 John Paul II, *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, 32.
Fr. Ellacuría would have endorsed this understanding of a university’s mission, whereby the contemporary Jesuit university models for its students, by its teaching, extracurricular activities, research, and social projection, how to speak truth to power as it tries to find a better world.

Conclusion

This essay has argued that Fr. Ellacuría’s vision of a Jesuit university, with its newly redefined mission, should play a vital role in implementing the Society’s worldwide apostolic preferences. On February 19, 2019, Superior General Arturo Sosa (b. 1948) promulgated the Universal Apostolic Preferences for the Society of Jesus, 2019–29. At the end of a sixteen-month process of discernment and election, the Society presented to Pope Francis (b. 1936) four universal apostolic preferences. Of relevance here is the second preference, “To walk with the poor, the outcasts of the world, those whose dignity has been violated, in a mission of reconciliation and justice.” As to this preference, Fr. Sosa writes, “The path we seek to follow with the poor is one that promotes social justice and the change of economic, political, and social structures that generate injustice; this path is a necessary dimension of the reconciliation of individuals, peoples, and their cultures with one another, with nature, and with God.”

Moreover, the role for Jesuit universities is clear: “Accompanying the impoverished requires us to improve our studies, our analysis, and our reflection in order to understand in depth the economic, political, and social processes that generate such great injustice; we

---


A. To show the way to God through the Spiritual Exercises and discernment;

B. To walk with the poor, the outcasts of the world, those whose dignity has been violated, in a mission of reconciliation and justice;

C. To accompany young people in the creation of a hope-filled future;

D. To collaborate in the care of our Common Home [1, italics in the original].

122 Sosa, “Universal Apostolic Preferences,” 3, boldface in the original.
must also contribute to the elaboration of alternative models.\textsuperscript{123} Later in his letter, Fr. Sosa stresses the importance of the intellectual apostolate for the entire Society:

At the same time, responding to the call of the universal apostolic preferences necessitates that we strive more than ever for the intellectual depth that our foundational charism and tradition demand; such depth must always be accompanied by an attendant spiritual depth. The Society is committed to the intellectual apostolate because intellectual depth should characterize all forms of the apostolate of the Society of Jesus. We want to continue serving the Church through the intellectual apostolate, expressing our faith with intellectual consistency.\textsuperscript{124}

Intending to deepen the processes of personal, communal, and institutional conversion, the universal apostolic preferences, in Fr. Sosa’s concluding words, “seek to unleash a process of apostolic revitalization and creativity that makes us better servants of reconciliation and justice.”\textsuperscript{125} In turn, this aspiration is today’s higher standard for the universities of the Society. To press forward with this standard, leaders of contemporary Jesuit universities ought to heed the challenge that Pope Francis makes in his 2018 apostolic constitution on ecclesiastical universities, \textit{Veritatis Gaudium}.\textsuperscript{126} The Pope calls for a “radical paradigm shift” or a “‘bold cultural revolution’” at ecclesiastical universities, such that those universities can form leaders who are able to address a “true epochal shift” in society due to “‘the rapid pace of change and degradation.’”\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{123} Sosa, “Universal Apostolic Preferences,” 4, boldface in the original. The Society’s website also gives six priority issues specifically for Jesuit higher education: (1) civic and political leadership formation, (2) formation of Ignatian leadership, (3) education for those at the margins, (4) economic and environmental justice, (5) inter-religious dialogue/secularism, and (6) peace and reconciliation advocacy (https://www.jesuits.global/ministries/higher-education/).

\textsuperscript{124} Sosa, “Universal Apostolic Preferences,” 9, boldface and italics in the original.

\textsuperscript{125} Sosa, “Universal Apostolic Preferences,” 4.


\textsuperscript{127} Francis, \textit{Veritatis Gaudium}, 3, quoting encyclical letter, \textit{Laudato si’}, 114, 61. Pope
At the time of this writing, these shifts include the effects of the novel coronavirus pandemic. On December 14, 2020, the US began administering the first Covid-19 vaccinations as the nation’s coronavirus death toll surpassed 300,000, with the number of daily new cases and deaths surging in the prior weeks. This mass immunization campaign is the United States’ most ambitious “since polio shots were rolled out in the 1950s.” While this was great news for a shattered country, the pandemic’s relentless toll on US universities was also evident, having unleashed a “long and damaging crisis.”

Since March 2020, universities have “eliminated salary increases, reduced pension contributions, and eliminated some positions” while beginning “a longer and more difficult process of examining the enrollment, revenues, and the costs of various academic programs, and analyzing which could be cut.” To be sure, the pandemic has changed higher education forever; as an illustration, many universities will make online learning part of their “new normal” after experiencing the benefits first-hand, despite the hastiness of the original transition.

Francis offers four criteria to guide this new approach to learning, which he writes are rooted in the Second Vatican Council’s teaching and are inspired by the changes that have taken place over the last fifty years:

1. the presentation of “the ever fresh and attractive good news of the Gospel of Jesus Christ;”
2. a dedication to “wide-ranging dialogue” and the “culture of encounter;”
3. a commitment to inter-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary approaches to study; and
4. an emphasis on “networking” with other institutions to promote studies of mutual interest.

Catholic World News, “New papal document seeks ‘paradigm shift’ at ecclesiastical universities,” January 29, 2018, https://www.catholicculture.org/news/headlines/index.cfm?storyid=35219. These criteria are available to leaders of all Catholic universities and, with the respective differences having been considered, should not be overlooked.


Certainly, 2020 was a very tough year. If pandemic-related illness, death, social isolation, and economic hardship were not enough, do not forget our nation’s ongoing troubles with racial injustice and political chaos. But there is hope on Jesuit campuses. To address these issues, faculty and administrators would do well to consider following the lead of Fr. Sosa, channeling the wisdom of Pope Francis, and endorsing Ignacio Ellacuría’s idea of a university in responding to the challenges confronting higher education today by championing the value added of Jesuit higher education.
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