





# STUDIES

## in the Spirituality of Jesuits



Two Discussions:

I. On Spiritual Direction

II. On Leadership and Authority

PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIANITY

JAN 10 1972

BOSTON COLLEGE

Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,  
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*  
in the spirit of Vatican Council II

## THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

consists of a group of Jesuits from various provinces who are listed below. The members were appointed by the Fathers Provincial of the United States in their meeting of October 3-9, 1968. The purpose of the Seminar is to study topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and to communicate the results to the members of the Assistancy. The hope is that this will lead to further discussion among all American Jesuits -- in private, or in small groups, or in community meetings. All this is done in the spirit of Vatican Council II's recommendation to religious institutes to recapture the original charismatic inspiration of their founders and to adapt it to the changed circumstances of modern times. The members of the Seminar welcome reactions or comments in regard to the topics they publish.

To achieve these purposes, especially amid today's pluralistic cultures, the Seminar must focus its direct attention sharply, frankly, and specifically on the problems, interests, and opportunities of the Jesuits of the United States. However, many of these interests are common also to Jesuits of other regions, or to other priests, religious men or women, or lay men or women. Hence the studies of the Seminar, while meant especially for American Jesuits, are not exclusively for them. Others who may find them helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

### THE MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR ARE:

- William J. Burke, S.J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
- Thomas E. Clarke, S.J., Woodstock College, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027
- James J. Doyle, S.J., Bellarmine School of Theology, 5430 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60615
- John C. Futrell, S.J., School of Divinity, St. Louis University, 220 North Spring Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63108
- George E. Ganss, S.J., School of Divinity, St. Louis University. His address is: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine, St. Louis, Missouri 63108. (Chairman of the Assistancy Seminar and Editor of its Studies)
- Hugo J. Gerleman, S.J., The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Fusz Memorial 3700 West Pine, St. Louis, Missouri 63108. (Secretary of the Assistancy Seminar)
- John C. Haughey, S.J., America Staff, 106 W. 56th St., New York, N.Y. 10019
- David B. Knight, S.J., Loyola University, New Orleans, La. 70118
- Vincent J. O'Flaherty, S.J., Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri 64110
- John R. Sheets, S.J., Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
- John H. Wright, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 Le Roy Street, Berkeley, California 94709

Copyright, 1972, by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality  
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University  
3700 West Pine Boulevard  
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

# STUDIES

## in the Spirituality of Jesuits



Two Discussions:

I. On Spiritual Direction

II. On Leadership and Authority

Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,  
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*  
in the spirit of Vatican Council II



## C O N T E N T S

	Page
Editor's Foreword	iv
A DISCUSSION ON SPIRITUAL DIRECTION	
I. Introduction, by John H. Wright, S.J.	41
II. A Summary of the Discussion	46
A DISCUSSION ON LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY	
I. Introduction, by John R. Sheets, S.J.	53
II. Comments, from Different Points of View, by:	
A. William W. Meissner, S.J.	76
B. William J. Burke, S.J.	78
C. Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.	79
D. John H. Wright, S.J.	80
A Check List: Books Available from the Institute of Jesuit Sources	82
The Titles of the Previous Issues of These Studies	84

## Editor's Foreword

The ordinary procedure in the meetings of the Assistancy Seminar consists of discussing a paper or papers previously prepared and distributed by one of the members. However, on some occasions when time permits something else is added: round table exploration of one or another topic which seems currently important. Résumés of two such exploratory discussions make up the present issue of these Studies.

The first, on Spiritual Direction, was held on February 1, 1970. Father John H. Wright presented some brief and pointed introductory remarks, which were followed by free-ranging discussion. Subsequently he slightly revised his introduction and also compiled the summary of the remarks made in the discussion.

The second, on Leadership and Authority, took place on April 17 and 18, 1971. Father John R. Sheets introduced the topic, and others previously assigned offered comments from specific points of view: our invited guest, Father William W. Meissner, S.J., and our members, Fathers William J. Burke, Thomas E. Clarke, and John H. Wright. Father Sheets too subsequently revised his introduction into the form found below. The report on the remarks of the others present was compiled by the present editor.

Father Meissner has recently published a book pertinent to our topic: The Assault on Authority: Dialogue or Dilemma ? Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1971.



## A DISCUSSION ON SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

### I. Introduction by John H. Wright, S.J.

In the religious renewal of the Assistancy, the matter of spiritual direction is of the greatest importance. I wish to propose here (1) a description of spiritual direction, (2) an outline of its essential method, and (3) some questions which grow out of this.

1. Spiritual direction may be described as an inter-personal situation in which one person assists another to develop and come to greater maturity in the life of the spirit, that is, the life of faith, hope, and love. To oversimplify very much for the purpose of schematizing, we may say that spiritual direction concerns the development of faith by dealing with the prayer of the person being directed. It is concerned with the development of hope by considering his difficulties, sufferings, disappointments and problems. And it is concerned to develop the life of love by treating his life in the Christian community. Actually, of course, each of these things--prayer, difficulties, and life in community--each involves faith, hope, and love. But for purposes of discussion, we may put them under these headings.

It will be helpful, I think, to recall some fairly commonplace observations to clarify what spiritual direction is not. It is not primarily informative, though it may sometimes be the opportunity for supplying some kind of knowledge, especially theological information about the meaning of the Christian message. Neither is spiritual direction primarily therapeutic, though therapy, of course, may be called for in some cases. Psychological illness, if it is at all serious, needs someone who is trained professionally to handle such problems. And thirdly, spiritual direction is not primarily advisory. It is not the main function of the spiritual director to indicate to a man what he is to do next. Helpful suggestions are very much in place from time to time, but they are not the primary concern.

The primary function of spiritual direction is to provide assistance in two areas, that of clarification and that of discernment. I wish to develop these ideas in terms of the essential method which I think belongs to spiritual direction.

2. The fundamental method of spiritual direction is conversation. Conversation with another enables one to objectify, to conceptualize, and thus to understand one's own living of the life of faith, hope and charity. It is a fairly commonplace experience that if a person wishes to come to grips with, to appropriate, to make his own, what is going on within him, he must endeavor to express it, to conceptualize it, to frame it in some kind of words. Then, as a result of this, the person will be enabled, in the light of this conversation, to discern the movements and the guidance of God in his life. He will be able to see the divine initiative of loving invitation, in which God is seeking from him some kind of response.

Since the aim of this conversation is to enable the person being directed to objectify and thereafter to discern his own interior life, it seems clear that he is far more active than the director, for he is the one who must conceptualize. He is the one who must objectify and then finally discern. He is going to be assisted by the attention, questions, and trusting attitude of the spiritual director.

The relationship between the spiritual director and the one being directed is, in the terminology of Eric Berne and Thomas Harris, not a parent-child relationship, but an adult-adult relationship. It may at times, because of differences of development and maturity, participate to some degree in the parent-child relationship, but fundamentally it is not this. For there is no question of taking over uncritically the views, opinions or judgments of another simply because they are being proposed. It is important that every element of threat be eliminated from this situation of spiritual direction. The degree to which a judgmental attitude on the part of the director is present makes it that much more difficult for the individual to achieve the kind of insight into himself that he needs. This would tend to create the parent-child relationship and not the adult-adult relationship.

a. The objectification of experience, which the one being directed is attempting to achieve is never adequate and it is never presumed to be adequate. No one can really express in words the full insight, the complete range of experience that he has. Nevertheless, we can scarcely begin to understand truly what takes place within us except as the fruit of trying to objectify it. The very inadequacy of our formulation helps us to recognize the mystery in which we are involved in the personal relationship between ourselves and God.

It may be that for some, particularly those who have made some advance in the spiritual life, this kind of conceptualization can be achieved in some other way, for example, by keeping a journal. But in the truly formative period of the spiritual life, for most this would certainly be insufficient. At this time the individual must in a conversation endeavor to describe to someone else whom he trusts, whose acceptance he has experienced, the details of his life of grace. This means first of all speaking about his life of prayer. He should endeavor to do this in some detail, to attend even to such things as the hour of the day at which he prays, how much time he prays, where he prays, what is the subject matter of his prayer, what method he employs in praying, what insights he received, what affections come to him spontaneously and how the life of prayer overflows into his daily life, what effect it has upon his living. Besides describing his private prayer, he should speak of liturgical participation in the Eucharist and the sacrament of penance.

Besides the life of prayer, the one being directed should endeavor to gain some understanding of his suffering, of his experience of human finitude, his anxieties, his day to day depression. Sometimes the need for professional help may appear here when it becomes evident that the man's psychological state is something other than a normal period of desolation or discouragement that anyone may have to go through. In this connection it would be important to point out that some loneliness is a preparation for deeper union with God. If a person found no inner emptiness at all, there would be no sense of invitation to go deeper into the relationship with God. But this loneliness should never be a crushing or paralyzing

thing. It should not destroy the basic cheerfulness and optimism of life.

And finally, the one being directed should endeavor to objectify and to narrate how he gets along with others. He should tell whether he is developing an attitude of kindness and openness, patience, tolerance and cooperation, or whether there are very strong elements of selfishness, possessiveness, manipulating others, endeavoring to make his own point of view and his desires prevail independently of what may promote the common good. In all of this, the director may assist the one whom he is directing by asking appropriate questions which will enable him to recognize what is taking place within himself. Through this objectification then, a man is enabled to appropriate his own inner life.

b. Spiritual direction is also concerned with discernment. Concomitantly with the process of objectifying there should be that of discerning. The purpose of this is not that the individual may determine the measure of his spiritual development, but rather that he may discover how he ought to respond to God. By discerning what are the movements of the Holy Spirit within him, what are the attractions of the grace of God, he is enabled to see how God is guiding him and where, therefore, he must follow. Discernment, likewise, is chiefly the work of the one being directed. The spiritual director does not form his own judgments in this matter and then inform the one being directed, but rather he helps the man to discern. Sometimes this may be very obvious. The very objectification may make it clear which are the inspirations of the Holy Spirit and which are delusions and deceptions. At times, however, it may be problematic and obscure. And then, I think, the spiritual director can be positively helpful, provided he himself is led by the Spirit. To render this kind of assistance, it is not enough to have bookish knowledge about spiritual things, the movements of the Spirit, and the rules of spiritual discernment. The director himself must have a real sensitivity to the Holy Spirit and to the guidance of the Spirit in his own life. This will mean that he will have some acquaintance with the normal pattern of the development of the spiritual life, especially the life of prayer. If he lacks this, he will not be able to appreciate what is being described to him by the one whom he is

directing. He must know what to look for in terms of the fruits of the Spirit and works of the flesh as they are described by St. Paul in Gal. 5: 19-23. But apart from certain extraordinary cases of scruples or similar disturbances, the spiritual director cannot simply demand obedience to his discernment but must lead the individual to discern himself. He can do this by questions, by instructions on the principles of discernment, by suggestions, but in the end the man himself will have to identify within him what really is the invitation of the Holy Spirit to which he is called upon to respond.

One consequence of having a relationship like this with a spiritual director is the possibility of great flexibility in living the life of the Spirit. It makes it possible to organize one's life in a very flexible way and still remain honest, still remain free of self deception and delusion, able to avoid such facile slogans as, "My life of prayer is just what I do for other people." If a person is willing to objectify in some detail his internal life of faith, hope and charity and to make an honest effort at discernment as he speaks about this with someone else, he will not easily be deceived in matters such as the time to be given to prayer, or the frequency of participation in the sacrifice of the Mass. These things will not be matters of inflexible rule but they will be matters in which honest, genuine discernment of the motions of the Holy Spirit takes place.

3. I wish, then, against the background of these remarks to propose questions for discussion.

First, does a person ever completely outgrow the need or the usefulness of living in this kind of situation; that is, of having a spiritual director? It is clear that during the period of a man's formation spiritual direction is indispensable; but when the period of formation is over, when a man has his last vows and is living in a regular community, is spiritual direction now completely superfluous? Or is it still genuinely helpful and profitable, so that it should be recommended to everyone in the Assistancy that he have someone to whom he goes at times and describes as best he can the development of his life of grace, his faith, hope, and love?

Second, if spiritual direction is primarily assisting someone to objectify and to discern in the life of grace, can this be done also in groups? Is it possible for a group of people who trust one another to discuss together what is their life of prayer, what are their particular problems, what is their life in community. There is no question of going into confessional matters, but of discussing the life of the spirit and the growth of faith, hope and charity. Is it possible that mutual communication at this level could be a matter of great assistance in the life of grace?

## II. A Summary of the Discussion

The discussion which followed these remarks ranged over a wide field. The following summary, without producing an artificial unity or giving the names of those who proffered opinions, attempts to bring observations on the same topic into relationship with one another and to highlight the main points or opinions expressed.

1. Is it not necessary at times for the spiritual director to take the initiative, to endeavor to make a breakthrough, to overcome routine when nothing seems to be going on?

In this case the director should ask questions to find out why nothing is going on. St. Ignatius thought in a retreat, if there are no experiences of consolation and desolation, the director should find out what the man is doing, how he is performing the exercises. Something of the same thing is true here; for frequently it means that the man has not really got any insight into what is happening, into what he is doing. However, we should observe that there are periods in which growth is so gradual that it is not possible to observe progress. The man is able to live in community in an open, loving, supportive fashion and to do his work. This is evidence of a very fruitful life of prayer. The director should not feel, in these situations, that he is doing nothing, for, in some sense, this is to miss the point. In spiritual direction, it is the man who is being directed

who is most active, and the sincerity and honesty in which he objectifies his own situation to another gives him an insight into himself which he could not have alone.

At times, of course, it may become clear that some kind of breakthrough is indeed necessary. But it is not possible for the director simply to say this. He must endeavor to lead the other by questioning, suggestion and encouragement.

2. It was said that the relationship between the spiritual director and the one he is directing should be an adult-adult relationship; but should not the spiritual director have some kind of ascendancy?

The case here seems to be very similar to the educational situation. Some kind of ascendancy on the part of the teacher is helpful. But finally, the one being educated is not just supposed to take over the judgments and observations of the teacher, but to make his own judgments and to achieve his own development. In the parent-child relationship, the child simply takes over someone else's valuation, judgments and principles, and he acts upon them without ever having really reflected upon them, without making them his own by a personal appropriation. You must indeed have respect for your spiritual director and a recognition of the fact that he accepts you, that he is worthy of your trust, and that he has wisdom and understanding.

3. This relates, I think, to the question raised a moment ago (above in 3, on page 45), whether every Jesuit would profit by having a spiritual director. If this is the case, then evidently it is not necessary always to find someone who is farther along than you are. It is necessary to find someone whom you recognize as a spiritual man, a man of prayer, a man whom you respect. If he is older and farther advanced, this may be an advantage, but it is not necessary. Whoever does help me to objectify my situation and to discern, is indeed a spiritual director as we have described him.

Is not the relationship you have described very often that which obtains between the confessor and the penitent? Here there is not just a question of confessing moral failures, but of taking a measure of the whole life of prayer. Most Jesuits probably do have a regular confessor, but it

is hard to say how much of this goes on. It is likely that normally there is an accounting of small failures and a renewal of sorrow, but not any extensive or detailed discussion of the life of prayer; though it may be that this is beginning to happen more frequently in the confession situation.

Perhaps the relationship between Christ and the Apostles, as described in the Gospel, can be some kind of help, or image, for the kind of relationship there should be between the spiritual director and those whom he directs. This was very much an interpersonal relationship. They were really friends. From the outlines in the Gospel we have the impression that there was real give and take of intimacy and trust and friendship, and yet, this man was God. He was their master and Lord. John could put his head on His breast at the Last Supper. It is not, perhaps, too much to ask that the spiritual director become in a sense a sacrament for the individual whom he directs, that he manifest through his compassion, his listening, the presence of God. The spiritual director does not merely listen, but he has the desire to bring this man to the Father. At times too he will express himself very directly and function as a guide, though the individual himself should do the discerning as much as possible. It is necessary for the director to develop a kind of sixth sense so he will know when it is required for him to step in and say what is to be said.

It seems, in the light of all that we have been saying, that any Christian who takes his Christian life seriously, should have some kind of spiritual director. And yet, in the providence of God, something like this is very rarely available, even to the seriously committed Christian. I wonder how unavailable it is. If people are leading the life of the Spirit, and are serious about it, can they not talk to one another about what is going on and receive some sort of enlightenment and help and strength from one another? The very effort to conceptualize will give them insights that they would not have otherwise. A husband and wife, who are endeavoring to live a serious Christian life, could speak to each other about their life of prayer, and even have a life of prayer in common to a very great extent. This would be, in some sense, a matter of spiritual direction.

But to speak simply to a companion, a peer, may be to speak to another



who has the same kind of blind spots that you have. This makes one proviso necessary. When there is question of a peer group, it is necessary that they have reached some real maturity. Novices could not well act as spiritual guides for one another, nor juniors, nor scholastics generally, because often much necessary insight would be lacking.

4. It seems possible, as time goes on, that we begin to think of ourselves as having so much competence and experience that we feel unable to go to someone else and ask his help and advice. It is questionable then whether this is the unavailability of spiritual directors or simply a matter of human pride. We recognize that in seeking a spiritual director we need to find someone who will not merely sit there and listen, but who will, by his personality and presence, tend to draw more out of us. He must be someone whom you can trust; someone whom you recognize accepts you. But is it not possible that this relationship be built up gradually? If you are concerned to have a particular person as your spiritual director, since you recognize that he is prayerful and competent, you could, over a period of time, build up a relationship with him. Thus, it would not be a desperate situation, but the ordinary needs of life that would bring you to a spiritual director, the ordinary needs that you have for understanding yourself, your interior, and of discerning the presence and the activity of God.

5. Some of this points to a common weakness of Jesuits, a kind of individualism that makes it difficult for many to pray in groups or to share their spiritual insights with one another. Praying in a group could be a remedy for this individualism and enable Jesuits to profit by spiritual direction. It seems, in some ways, that we are moving into an era that has much to do with groups and that much of our spiritual direction may well be accomplished in the future in groups. It will never completely take the place of the one to one relationship in a situation of spiritual direction, but one of the tasks facing us is to create an atmosphere in community where one can express himself, not just to one individual but to the group, very personally and intimately and be accepted by that group. This tendency is very noteworthy in the younger men. They are reacting against a depersonalized hotel existence. At the same time there is

occasionally some distrust beneath the comraderie which is often in evidence. It might be said in summary that while a person is learning, a one to one situation is desirable, but a final fruit of this should be the possibility of fraternal direction in common.

6. It has been suggested that the manifestation of conscience, in a broader sense, could handle much of the matter of spiritual direction. There is a problem here, however, that as soon as the spiritual director becomes a man who has authority, you have introduced into the situation, whether you want to or not, an element of threat. The superior always has to be concerned with the common good of the whole, and the question necessarily continues to enter in concerning this man's qualifications. It becomes a problem for a man to be as frank and open and honest as he would be in a situation where there is no threat. At times, the younger men seem to be quite open and not to be bothered by this element of authority in the one with whom they are speaking. Nevertheless, at other times this does seem to be a major consideration, even in the novitiate. No universal solution from this point of view seems possible therefore.

7. In answer to the question of whether everyone should have a spiritual director, it is at least useful that each should have someone who knows him well, so that when something does come up he can go to one who will have the context, at least to some extent, of the particular problem or difficulty about which he wishes to consult. Further, many older men as well as recently ordained priests need spiritual direction.

8. Some qualities of a spiritual director seem to be these. He should have sympathetic understanding so that the person who consults him will feel that he is being accepted without being judged. He should also have a wisdom so that he not only understands the particular problem or situation but is able to relate it to a broader development. He should also have a genuine spirituality; that is, a real sensitivity to the spirit. He should not be precipitous, but prudent and prayerful. These seem to be the qualities which are most important in a spiritual director. They will give him an uncomplicated basic attitude which comes from being led by the Spirit. And they will develop a high regard for the integrity of

another and a respect for his distinct characteristics.

9. If we ask whether every Jesuit is a potential spiritual director, or whether there is a special charism that only some possess, we meet a real problem. Someone observed that out of eighty Jesuits in a particular community, he discovered only three whom he felt he could relate to as a spiritual director. But this may well be a matter of personalities rather than of competence of all these seventy-seven others.

10. One could ask further: How important is the priesthood for being a spiritual director? Is friendship between the director and the one being directed an asset or a debit?

In some scholasticates, it has been found very helpful to associate members of the faculty directly in the matter of spiritual direction of scholastics. This tends to emphasize the importance of spiritual direction. If the spiritual directors themselves get together once or twice a month to talk about spiritual matters and to pray together, this also underlines the importance that is attached to this matter. It tends to develop within the community a spiritual atmosphere in which one is able to speak even in a large group about matters which are very personal and spiritual.

Some aspects of being a spiritual director can be taught, and even non-priests can exercise this function. Very ancient tradition has unordained monks and also nuns acting as spiritual directors. It is important that our priests regard spiritual direction as important. They are men of the Church and it would be unfortunate if only a few Jesuits were spiritual men, or if the community as a whole could manifest a concern only for the superficial, for who won an athletic contest, for example. When the source of difficulty in a matter of spiritual direction and the living of the spiritual life lies in a poor community, it seems that there is very little that can be done.



## A DISCUSSION ON LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY

Introduction by John R. Sheets, S.J.

In its meeting of April 17 and 18, 1971, the Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality held a discussion on leadership and authority. In addition to the regular members of the Seminar Father William W. Meissner was present to give his own contribution. His remarks touched on some of the points covered in his recent book, The Assault on Authority: Dialogue or Dilemma? (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1971). Several of the members took a particular aspect of leadership and authority to present as their own input. Father Burke approached the topic with special reference to various authors who have treated it. Father Clarke viewed it from the Ignatian sources. Father Wright presented in capsule form ideas from a symposium on the subject of leadership and authority held at Alma in 1964.

I was asked to start the discussion by presenting a position paper. That fact accounts for disproportionate lengths in the following reports. My own paper was expected to attempt to develop the topic at some length. For this reason it takes the lion's share of the space in the presentation that follows. In this written presentation it is not possible to recreate the informal atmosphere and the tone of dialogue and discussion which characterized our meeting.

### I. Leadership and Authority: Distinct but Complementary Roles

We can begin by asking some questions concerning leadership and authority. Hopefully the subsequent presentations by the other members of the group will throw some light on the answers to these questions. First of all, is there a distinction between authority and leadership? If so, how could such a distinction be described? How are leadership and authority related to each other? Is it possible for leadership and authority (if they are distinct) to be at odds? How can leadership and authority be brought together in order to achieve the best possible results? What

is the basis for leadership and for authority? What are the main problems involved in leadership and authority? To what extent do leadership and authority take their shape from the particular period of history where they are found?

These are some of the questions that come to mind concerning authority and leadership. We hope that asking all of these questions will not give the impression that we shall come up with answers to all of them. We would like, however, to probe into these questions and at least attempt to come up with some conclusions. Hopefully, my conclusions and also the processes by which I arrived at them will be tested, supplemented, and if necessary corrected by the various points of view from the other members.

#### A. The Relationship between Leadership and Authority

We can anticipate our conclusion by putting it at the very beginning of the inquiry. Leadership and authority are not the same. They are, however, closely related. Both can be defined as personal powers effecting converging unity. The origin and nature of these respective powers are not the same, and the way they effect unity is not the same. However, both modalities (that of leadership and that of authority) are necessary if the unity to be attained is to engage the whole person and open him to the totality of the union to be achieved, and not merely to an aspect of it.

Anticipating much of what will be said later, we can say that not every leader is an authority. However, it is possible (and desirable) that an authority have the characteristics of a leader as well as be an authority. These are ideas which we would like to try to clarify.

##### 1. Leadership

First of all we can consider some general characteristics of leadership, then speak of some specific types, then move on to consider authority.

Like many elementary experiences leadership is a phenomenon which is obvious until we try to describe it. History is filled with people who are considered leaders. However, when we look at the wide variety of persons

covered by this term "leader," we begin to wonder if they have anything at all in common. There are military leaders, social and political leaders, religious leaders, intellectual leaders, not to speak of boy scout leaders, orchestra leaders, business leaders, and the like. All of these have something in common, but at the same time they are so different. This leads us to the realization that leadership is an analogous notion.

If leadership is an analogous notion, then there is a common denominator underlying all the varieties of leadership we mentioned. This common denominator would seem to be a power to draw others beyond the point where they presently find themselves to a point of greater realization of their common aspirations. It is a power to draw others toward a center of closer unity, a unity which is always converging.

By its very nature leadership implies a certain standing out from the group which is led, as well as a standing ahead. This implies both a distance from the group, as well as an identification with the group. The idea of distance implies that the leader already has a high degree of realization of the goal to be attained. At the same time he is identified with the aspirations of the group.

The leader is an effective symbol incarnating the aspirations of the group. He renders present the goal in a hopeful way. In him others see their own hopes as realizable. The leader is a provocative and evocative symbol of what the group wants to be or to attain. While he stands within the group, he has at the same time a certain transcendence, being ahead of the group, as one who has already realized the goal to a large extent, and who now acts as a focal point drawing others to the realization of the same goal. The leader stands with his face toward the group, as drawing them. But at the same time he is the corporate face of the group toward the goal, and he serves as the representative of the group to others. He is the symbol of the realizability and tangibility of the goal. In brief, the leader is a symbolic, effective presence, whose power to lead comes from the fact that he can draw into a focus the common aspirations of a group, at a point beyond where they find themselves, because of the fact that the goal of their aspirations is

already realized in himself to a large degree. Thus he renders that goal present to the group in a tangible and attractive way.

## 2. The Components of Leadership: Ethos, Pneuma, Logos

Leadership has three basic components: ethos, pneuma, and logos. Authority, on the other hand, belongs to the realm of nomos (law). We shall speak of authority later. At present we would like to investigate the components of leadership that will be found in various proportions wherever genuine leadership is present. All of these elements are always found together. They are distinguishable but not separable. However, there are different types of leadership depending on which one of the characteristics is most prominent.

Ethos is that aspect of leadership which has to do with values. In a very particular sense it has to do with those values which concern moral choices. Where ethos is the dominant note, the group, goal, leader, and means, are all linked together in a vital network of common values. The leader himself is in some way the embodiment of these values. By his imaginative and creative living of these values he draws others to their attainment. His own convictions are magnetic. They are not like money kept in a vault which one can withdraw when he needs the cash. His appropriation of the values acts as a powerful drawing force, bringing the aspirations of the group to a convergent unity. This aspect of leadership is seen in those who are religious leaders, such as Ignatius, Francis of Assisi, to name but a couple of examples. Similarly this aspect of leadership is found in those who are great social leaders like Gandhi and Martin Luther King. The strength of this leadership depends on two things: the leader's personal appropriation of the values, measured by the degree he will sacrifice himself for them, and the extent to which he can set others afire with these same moral values.

Pneuma, in the second place, is that aspect of leadership which has to do with the power transmitted by the leader, and the power that is aroused in the group. It has the characteristics of inspiration, enthusiasm, energy, movement, and momentum. In itself it is like the wind, which can either bring a soft and gentle rain, or can whip up a destructive



storm. This aspect of leadership seems to be in a particular way the realm of the demonic. The importance of discernment of spirits is found with particular urgency here. There is a hypnotic effect in pneuma that can blind a person to ethos (values) and logos (judgment). It is like a sailing vessel where the tremendous power of the wind takes over, and the navigator and helmsman are helpless in the presence of such power.

Ethos and logos act as channeling structures for pneuma. The leadership which can inspire followers with enthusiasm is like the power to open the sluices of a dam. Unless the forces that are released are controlled, there is a devastating flood.

On the other hand, leadership of ethos and logos would be stagnant without the characteristic of pneuma. Leadership must transmit inspiration. It must release the powers of the spirit within the group. In the case of pneuma that which links leader, those led, the goal, and the means is the same dynamis, the same power. It is from communication of this power to the group that leadership constantly overcomes the inertia of the group. Leadership taps the hidden resources of spirit in the group, brings them into active engagement. It acts like a torch to set others afire. Such leadership galvanizes people who are moderately interested into a band of crusaders.

We have commented on the ambiguity of this particular characteristic of leadership. Under the influence of powerful inspiration the temptation rises to begin a holy war on others. This is always a sign of the demonic. Where the holy war is declared first of all on oneself, and a holy peace declared on others, we have a sign of the Holy Pneuma. There is a difference between a mob with a cause, and a holy people with a mission. One is a destructive power. The other shows the strength of its power very often by using means which seem to be powerless in order to accomplish its goals.

In the third place, logos is that characteristic of leadership related to judgment. This aspect of leadership can be described in various ways: reason, rule, guidance, orientation, balance, discretion, prudence, savoir-faire, intelligence, knowledge. This has to be a characteristic

wherever genuine leadership is found. But in certain cases leadership is based mainly on the characteristic of knowledge. It is the person's pre-eminent knowledge or prudence which constitutes his leadership. Sometimes we see the intellectual leadership in one person, and the leadership of inspiration largely in another. An obvious case is that of Marx and Engels. Marx was the theoretician, and Engels the propagandist of Marxism.

Under the characteristic of logos we find many types of leadership, ranging from the theoretician to the tactician. In every case, however, the power of the leader is seen in the power of his judgment to give a constant and consistent shape to the aspirations of the group. When this particular quality disappears, leadership is gone. If the group still retains its pneuma, it will become a destructive force when the leadership of reason goes, unless it is replaced by another leader who has the power to mold the enthusiasm of the group and teach them the measured steps they have to take to get to the goal.

Genuine leadership, as we have said, comprises all three of these characteristics of ethos, pneuma, logos. However, they are found in varying degrees, very often with one of the characteristics assuming a particular prominence to the point where one might be designated according to one of these, as a moral or ethical leader, a charismatic leader, an intellectual leader.

### 3. Authority

Authority is a particular mode of leadership that can impose nomos, law, obligation. Our supposition is that there are two distinct species of leadership coming under the one genus. There is first of all the leadership we have spoken of above, with the characteristics of ethos, pneuma, and logos; then there is the leadership of nomos. We can describe the difference between the two when we realize the different ways in which they effect the convergent unity. The leadership we have spoken of above works by drawing others to an effective realization of the goals. It transmits attraction. The leadership of authority has as its specific characteristic the transmission of the imperative. It does not merely

exhort or persuade, but it commands.

The distinctive characteristics of these two modes of leadership seems to be rooted in the very structure of personhood as a created exemplatum of the divine exemplar. It is a favorite theme of both Augustine and Aquinas that God does not only give man a share in his existence. He also shares his power to communicate existence. Among the various ways of communicating existence, there is the particular mode of communicating existence by being a focal point of unity. This is not the same, of course, as communicating existence in the sense of having a child, for example. In another sense, however, it is the communication of an existence-in-union. To draw others into a new mode of union or communion is a way of communicating existence.

God's own orientation toward creatures is shown in the twofold way that he draws all things to himself, first of all through the attraction of his goodness. But while he draws all things by attraction, including persons, he draws persons in another way also. He draws them by compelling them. Of course, when we speak of God compelling, we do not mean to deny human freedom. It is God's power to command human freedom, which, while leaving man free, imposes an obligation to do God's will.

The whole world is brought to a convergent unity through God's attraction and through his commanding. Both of these are ways in which the knot of unity is being tightened through time and space.

God has shared these power to communicate existence-in-closer-unity with man. Leadership is the sharing in God's goodness to attract. Authority is the sharing in his power to command. Each of them are modes effecting unity from different points of view. Each of them is necessary. The whole world is moved both by the desirability of God's goodness and at the same time by the seriousness of that goodness, which is another way of saying that the whole world lies under the compelling influence of God. He has graciously shared both types of influence with man.

There are those, of course, who would disagree with our analysis of authority and leadership which we see as based on an ontology. Depending upon their own particular point of view, it is possible for some to

view these ideas only from the perspective of sociology or psychology. Some would see authority merely as a pragmatic answer to getting things done with a minimum of waste. However, we would see authority and leadership as flowing from man's created sharing in God's own power to communicate existence.

There is no doubt that leadership and authority take on different tonalities depending on the particular point of history where they are found. However, it seems that they are realities which are rooted in the very nature of created existence, if one is willing to admit that created existence mirrors forth the uncreated existence of God, whose providence is drawing all things to a goal. Men are not only provided for by God, but they are sharers in his power to provide. One of the main ways in which they provide is through the leadership of attraction and the leadership of authority. Both are modes of providing for greater and greater union, in one way through attraction, in another through command. It is in this way that God's own providence is effective, both attracting and commanding. In a sense man is God's vicegerent on earth. He not only provides for other men, but he provides for God, by drawing men closer to the unity which is willed by God's providence.

#### 4. Leadership and Authority "in the Lord."

In this real order God's providence is exercised in history through Jesus Christ. He is the one who has completely provided God for man, and man for God. It is through him that the divine plan is realized. He is the one who is the embodiment of God's attractive, redemptive goodness, on the one hand, and on the other, he is the one who transmits the divine imperative. He is supreme leader in every sense. The idea of Christ's leadership is thematic in the letter to the Hebrews. "Let us not lose sight of Jesus, who leads us in our faith and brings it to perfection" (Heb. 12:2). Christ is the one who goes before us, drawing us to himself into the sanctuary where he continually intercedes for us. Forming one community with believers of all ages, we find in Jesus our common attraction, and our common Lord.

Because of the incarnation and redemption there is no such thing as

an attraction and a command to a unity which is merely formal. All leadership and authority are "in the Lord." The unity to which they lead are "in the Lord." There is no such thing as a purely secular authority or leadership, or a purely secular center of unity. All authentic leadership, as well as all authentic unity brought about by leadership, is in some way "in the Lord," since the whole of the universe is "in the Lord." "In him were created all things in heaven and on earth . . . all things were created through him and for him. Before anything was created, he existed, and he holds all things in unity. . . . God wanted all perfection to be found in him and all things to be reconciled through him and for him, everything in heaven and everything on earth, when he made peace by his death on the cross" (Col. 1:15).

There are, of course, degrees of this authentically Christic leadership and unity. They range from the remote, anonymously Christic form, through the natural forms of leadership which are taken up "in the Lord," up to the form of leadership and authority which is in the Church, which is not only "in the Lord," but "from the Lord."

Because of the incarnation and redemption, and the sending of the Spirit, every mode of leadership has a new dimension, even though it is not explicitly recognized. Paul frequently brings out this new dimension in his letters where he speaks of obedience "in the Lord." "Be considerate to those who are working amongst you and are above you in the Lord as your teachers" (1 Thess. 5:12). "Wives, give way to your husbands, as you should in the Lord. . . . Children, be obedient to your parents always, because that is what will please the Lord. . . . Slaves, be obedient to the men who are called your master in this world . . . out of respect for the Master. Whatever your work is, put your heart into it as it were for the Lord and not for men, knowing that the Lord will repay you by making you his heirs. It is Christ the Lord you are serving" (Col. 3:18); see also Eph. 5:21; 6:1).

The total force of God's goodness is rendered attractive in the flesh of Christ, as that flesh submitted to the Father's will, even to the death of the cross, and was raised to the right hand of the Father. "And when

I am lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all men to myself" (John 12:32). The world moves forward to its ultimate end through the powerful attraction of Christ. All genuine leadership is moving the world at least in a remote way to the climax of that attractive presence.

God's own imperative for the world is embodied in Christ to be transmitted to the world. "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, make disciples of all the nations. . . . And know that I am with you always; yes, to the end of time (Matt. 28:18). God's imperative is not a blind force commanding some type of an ethical action. The seriousness and the concern of his love turns an exhortative into an imperative. His own ultimate concern is that men be fulfilled in his Son. His command to do is only a function of his will that we be, that we take on the image of the Son.

All genuine authority in some way is transmitting this imperative to take on the image of the Son, just as all genuine leadership is drawing us to that image. But it is in the Church that we see and experience in a direct and explicit way both the leadership of attraction and the leadership of authority of Christ.

All other forms of leadership are in a sense "natural" forms that are taken up into Christ's own leadership. They come as it were "from below," and are taken up into what comes "from above." But leadership and authority in the Church are totally from above. Not that they enter into time and history as some foreign element. But they are the extension of the mystery of the incarnation and redemption. The Church sacramentalizes Christ's authority and his leadership, as it sacramentalizes every aspect of Christ. The Eucharist is a helpful comparison. The reality of the Eucharist, Christ, is totally from above, though the elements which are changed into his body and blood come from the work of human hands. In a similar way, Christ's own authority and leadership are sacramentalized in the Church. Within the Church there are different levels on which this takes place. The sacramentalization of his authority is found in a special way in those who succeed in the role of Peter and the apostles, who are effective symbols of Christic unity, having the authority to transmit

the imperative of Christ's leadership.

The leadership of attraction is also sacramentalized in the Church. This is not limited to those who have the leadership of authority. It is found wherever the attractiveness of Christ is rendered present, and visible in a person.

The leadership of attraction where it is specifically Christic comes about because there is a new ethos, a new pneuma, and a new logos. The leadership of authority directs its imperative according to a new nomos, which is that of the unity of all men in Christ. Let us comment briefly on the new ethos, pneuma, and logos, and then briefly on the new nomos which is transmitted by ecclesial authority.

First of all there is a new ethos. The values of Christ subsume the ethos of mere morality, and draw morality within the larger context of holiness. It is no longer simply a question of the pursuit of values which are good, and avoidance of what is evil. Rather the ultimate value is seen to be in the holiness that comes from being-with, from communion with the Son. What took place in St. Paul in a dramatic way takes place in every Christian in a genuine but perhaps undramatic fashion. He described how all of his old values were transformed through his union with Christ. What he used to value he considers now only as refuse (Phil. 3:7).

Similarly there is a new pneuma. The Holy Spirit is the power who is given to us to create communion. He is not a blind force, but he has the eyes and the heart of the Son, and by his very nature leads all things to their Christic unity. Leadership in the Lord draws on the new energies of the Spirit given to us in such abundance between the first and second coming of Christ. A new type of fire burns in the heart of the Christian leader, the fire of the Holy Spirit. Such a leader attempts to transmit this gentle violence to others, to ignite them with this same fire.

Again leadership in the Lord has a new logos. "In your minds you must be the same as Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5). "We are those who have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2:16). The one who has the mind of Christ draws all things into a unity that comes from a faith-insight. Such a leader has a "feel" for the things of Christ, and for the paths that lead

to greater union in Christ.

There is therefore a special Christic modality to all leadership and authority, but this is conscious and overt and in a special way sacramentalized in Christian leadership and authority. This does not come from absorbing certain cultural attitudes, but from being drawn into the orbit of Christ's own power to attract and command. Christian leadership and authority participates in the drawing and centering power of Christ himself.

Christian authority is under a new nomos, and transmits the imperative of that nomos. This is not only the "law of love" in the sense of attraction. It is the law of love insofar as it imposes the obligation that governs the mode in which what is vaguely called the "law of love" operates effectively. Law without love is sterile structure. Love without law is willful and capricious.

In any case, both leadership "in the Lord" and authority "in the Lord" have the same purpose, to bring men to that converging unity which we call the Kingdom of Christ. They are different modalities of the power to effect that Christic unity. They support each other. We are under the attraction of Christ through those who mediate this attraction, while at the same time we are under the imperative of Christ, through those who mediate this imperative.

As was said above, we all feel more at home with attraction than we do with compulsion. Leadership resonates with our self-will, while authority suggests the giving up of my self-will. Perhaps these two aspects of leading will never be perfectly at home in our fallen human nature. If we were perfectly at home in the Son, as he himself was perfectly at home in the Father, then there would not be that unnatural tension in our hearts between freedom and authority.

The ultimate answer to the problem of freedom as responding to an appeal, and freedom as responding to obligation, lies in the relationship of the self to the one who is appealing and the one who is commanding. If we looked at this process as taking place in one and the same person, there would be no contradiction between what he does because



he responds to a certain attraction, and what he does because he imposes an obligation on himself. The tension is resolved because one and the same person is both the one who responds, as well as the one who imposes obligation on himself. If for example a person were attracted to marriage, and also imposed on himself the obligation to get married, there would not be the tension we ordinarily experience between attraction and obligation.

If we understand our relationship to Christ and to the Father properly, then we see that there is ultimately no objective basis for this tension, because the command and the response are coming from the same person. Christ commanding is ourselves responding. The law of Christ is not something alien to us, or imposed from without. It is the law of our being, rendered visible and audible, in a special way in the Church, which mediates the law of Christ. In our Head, we command ourselves. As members, we obey the law of our being, expressed through our Head, Christ.

This is not some trickery with language. If our true image is that of the Son, then it is not an imposition to have our true image imposed on us. "And we, with our unveiled faces reflecting like mirrors the brightness of the Lord, all grow brighter and brighter as we are turned into the image that we reflect; this is the work of the Lord who is Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:18). A law which imposes on us the exigencies inherent in our humanity, is not an imposition on our genuine humanity, though it may irritate in us what resists such congenial imposition. Similarly, and much more radically, the law which imposes on us the demands of sonship coming from our relationship with Christ is not a genuine imposition, but an exposition of what we are, put in the imperative to become what we are. Augustine as usual puts it quite succinctly: "When you found him displeasing, it was your corruption which he displeased" (Sermon 58).

This is the ultimate answer to the problem of freedom and authority. These are not intrinsically antagonistic aspects of human existence, even though in practice they are often at odds. Genuine authority "in the Lord" is only the external ordering of the intrinsic ordering of all things in Christ and for Christ. The source of our freedom is also the source of authority, one and the same person who compels us sweetly from within and

who compels us stringently from without.

Yet in our lives in practice there will always be an uneasy truce between these two aspects of our being drawn to Christ. We all suffer more or less from a schizoid mentality, where we feel an antagonism between freedom and law. All of us suffer to some extent the same feeling experienced by Jeremias. He "did and he didn't" want to preach the word of God. He felt an ambivalence in carrying out the mission he was given. "I used to say, 'I will not think about him, I will not speak in his name any more.' Then there seemed to be a fire burning in my heart, imprisoned in my bones. The effort to restrain it wearied me, I could not bear it" (Jer. 20:9). All of us feel to some extent the "threat" of authority to our own freedom, just as Jeremias felt his whole being threatened by the mission given to him by God.

Before moving on to the next section, it might be helpful to sum up what we have said so far. We spoke of leadership and authority as being defined by two main ideas: first of all, they are powers, secondly, they are powers to effect convergent unity. As powers, they have different modes of effecting the same unity. Leadership emphasizes power to effect unity through the appeal of attraction. Authority is a power to effect unity by declaring the imperative. We spoke, then, of the three components of leadership, ethos, pneuma, and logos. The leadership of authority, on the other hand, has to do with nomos. Though these words are translatable into English by words which are more or less their equivalent, we prefer to keep the Greek words because they seem to be richer than our English words. They are what could be called primordial words, with many overtones.

We saw that both modes of leadership are rooted ultimately in a sharing in God's own power to provide for others. He provides, both through the attraction of his goodness (in this sense "leading" the world), and through the imperative of his will written on our hearts, expressed in law mediated by legitimate authority.

We saw how all aspects of leadership take on a different dimension after the incarnation. Leadership and authority are "baptized." They

are "in the Lord." This is true in a remote sense of leadership wherever it is found authentically. But in a special way it is true where leadership is the extension of Christ's own drawing as well as the power to apply his own imperative to each moment of history, as we find with authority in the Church.

Finally we saw that the ultimate resolution (though this remains largely theoretical for us in this life) between freedom and authority comes from the fact that the one who commands is commanding himself, because it is Christ who commands, and it is Christ who obeys. It is our genuine Self who obliges us, since Christ is our genuine Self, and his genuine Self in us, through his Spirit, who responds.

In the light of these remarks it is easy to see how Ignatius expressed an authentic vision of leadership and authority. He spoke so often of seeing the superior as Christ. He even spoke of obeying the cook in the kitchen as Christ our Lord. He had the mystic's sense of the dimension added to, and embracing all natural leadership and authority, through the incarnation. Now such leadership and authority are "in the Lord." This means that it is Christ drawing and Christ commanding through human leaders and human authorities. He never saw this as meaning that superiors had a "hot line" to Christ. But he did see them as the symbol of Christ's own drawing and commanding power, effectively present. Ecclesial authority is in a special way from Christ, for Christ, and in Christ. It is a share in his own modality of drawing men to the Father. Authority in religious life has an "ecclesial" shape. It is in a special way related to authority in the Church.

#### B. Some Differences between Leadership and Authority

We would like to point out some differences in the way that leadership and authority achieve this convergent unity. In some respects this is saying in different words what we have already spoken of above. At the same time it will help us see more clearly their distinct but complementary roles.

In the first place, leadership depends to a large extent on natural endowment. It is the expression of the "attractive" side of a person's

gifts--his intelligence, vivacity, goodness--and the extent to which these gifts serve as a focal point for drawing others. Authority, on the other hand, is not based on personal endowment. It derives its power to unite not from the outstanding nature of the gifts one has, but from the fact that a person is "invested" with a power along a different line from that of personal attributes.

This "investiture" with authority takes place in different ways depending on the nature of the authority. Parental authority comes about from having a child. Jurisdictional authority comes from having an office. Ecclesial authority comes from the ordination called "holy ordination," that is, the sacrament of orders, where a person is drawn into Christ's own ordination to the Father and the Church. In whatever manner this "investiture" takes place, it is not the same as that which is based on natural endowment.

This is seen in the fact that the power of a leader is directly proportioned to the attracting force of those characteristics on which his leadership is based. This power increases or diminishes along with the force of that attraction. The power of authority, on the other hand, is not in itself increased or diminished by the attractiveness of the one in authority. The source of authority remains as a certain constant within the variability of a person's qualities of leadership. For this reason, St. Ignatius warned his followers not to confuse the "personal authority," that is a person's qualities as leader, with the authority that comes from "investiture." "They should not merely consider the person of the one they obey, but see in him Christ our Lord, for whose sake they obey" (Letter on Obedience, no. 3).

A second difference between leadership and authority, related to the first, comes from the fact that leadership has a certain life span. It emerges, reaches fruition, declines, and dies. It partakes of the transientness of any living symbol which is based upon the force of attraction of gifts that share in the ebb and flow of all transient things. Today's leader can be tomorrow's spectator. Leadership demands a constant freshening of the gifts which form the basis of his leadership. Otherwise

leadership loses its appeal and dies.

Authority, on the other hand, has a certain agelessness like Melchizedek. His "personal authority" might increase or decrease, but his power to transmit the imperative remains as a constant, provided of course that his own powers to judge remain unimpaired. This comes from the fact that a person is taken into a kind of order which is beyond that of his personal endowment. As long as he is within that order, though he himself ages, and his own gifts might decline, his authority remains.

Another difference between leadership and authority is seen in the respective correlatives of leader and authority. The correlative of leader is follower, while that of authority is subject.

Today we are particularly nervous about such words as "subject," "inferior," "superior." We like to transpose such terms into those that are more congenial, which in some way horizontalize all of our relationships. We like to see all of our relationships in terms of arm-in-arm, and face-to-face, and side-by-side. In any kind of organization we have to be co-workers, co-members, cooperators, associates on an equal basis, partners with everyone else, where the main function of authority is service.

Maybe some of this is an over-reaction to too much verticality in our lives in the past, and there is no use in rubbing salt into our sensitive wounds by using vocabulary which many might find abrasive. However, it is necessary to keep in mind, no matter what terminology we use, that by its very nature authority implies subjection of one's will to another, just as leadership implies having followers. We can no more drop the idea of subject when we are speaking of authority than we can drop the idea of follower when we are speaking of leader.

A further difference between authority and leadership is seen in the different ways in which we react. Authority in a sense is always guilty until proven innocent, while leadership is always innocent until proven guilty. A person in authority seems to embody in some way the sign of contradiction of Christ's own authority. As one whose function is to transmit the imperative, and in this way to effect an ever convergent unity, he becomes not the symbol of unity, but the symbol of oppression

in the minds of many. He is in a way exempted from the very civilities which we accord to everyone else. He bears the brunt of the uncharitableness of many who claim to live by the law of love.

The leadership of attraction does not meet with the same type of resistance. This is possibly true because such leadership does not threaten us as much. There is always a trapdoor which we can use to escape from leadership, but there is no way out when we are under someone in authority.

For this reason those who are authority figures seem to evoke greater antagonism in proportion to their power to unite effectively. Where authority is minimal, there is scarcely any antagonism. Where authority is great, as say, for example, in that of the Holy Father, the antagonism is greatest.

It is possible to explain this perhaps because of three reasons. First of all, the power of the demonic manifests itself greater when faced with greater efforts to bring about the centering of all things to the Father in Christ. We see this in the resistance to Christ himself. "We do not want this man to rule over us (Luke 19:14). The action of the Jews in preferring Barabbas, a robber, a revolutionary, and a murderer, is symbolic of much of the response of mankind to the authority of Christ. For this reason, the Church will also be resisted until the end of time. "If you belonged to the world, the world would love you as its own; but because you do not belong to the world, because my choice withdrew you from the world, therefore the world hates you. . . . If they persecuted me, they will persecute you too" (John 15:18). To the extent that authority mediates the imperative of Christ to the world will it arouse resistance.

The second reason for such antagonism toward authority is psychological. Fear plays a great part in the lives of all of us. We have as many causes to fear as there are things or persons who threaten us. The threat does not have to be on the level of physical punishment, but it is found on any level where the presence of someone or something jeopardizes my own existence, in what I have, or what I am, or what I shall be. This is the problem with authority figures. They act as a kind of a symbolic colleague

of all the threats a person feels. The greater the authority the more can the person serve as the antagonistic symbol of all that arouses fear.

For this reason a person feels more threatened by authority than he does by leadership. Authority implies subjection to the will of another, while following a wonderful leader gives a person a certain self-satisfaction of belonging. A follower shares in the glory of his leader. The idea of subjecting one's will to another, however, does not have the same connotations.

The third reason why authority meets with resistance comes from the very nature of authority which implies the transmission of the imperative putting an obligation on our freedom to obey. There is nothing we prize more than our independence. For this reason, there is nothing which threatens us as much as authority which claims to make our freedom a dependent freedom. It is not freedom as such that we prize so highly. It is the independent use of our freedom.

For this reason we are not threatened but rather challenged by ethos, pneuma, or logos. On the contrary, we are threatened by nomos. If we only realized, however, that we only become genuinely free to the extent that we become dependent, then at least the theoretical aspect of our resistance to legitimate authority would be solved. "Dependence" does not mean the substitution of what comes from another to take the place of what should come from myself. This would create a dependence which contradicts the very nature of person. An illustration might help. An artist, for example, depends on his inspiration to paint. It is his very dependence that sustains his creative effort. He cannot create independently of his inspiration. There is a certain parallel in the type of dependence of human freedom on that nomos which is not simply impersonal, but which is the expression of Christ's ethos, pneuma, logos. Christian freedom is mature to the extent that one subjects himself to his inspiration.

Many other differences, I am sure, could be pointed out between leadership and authority. Hopefully we have commented on the main ones. We saw that leadership depends on the attractive power coming from natural endowment, while authority comes from "investiture," a being taken into

a certain order which gives a person both the right and the duty to transmit the imperative that brings about convergent unity. Again, we saw that strength of leadership is directly proportioned to the vitality of the gifts on which it is based, while authority has a certain constancy which is independent of personal attributes. Further, the difference is seen in the correlatives of leadership and authority. In the one case the correlative is follower, and in the other, subject. This led us to inquire into the phenomenon of resistance to authority, which is not found in a similar way in the relationship of follower to the one who leads. We suggested three reasons for this: firstly, the demonic discentering power which is antagonistic to the Christic centering power; secondly, the fact that authority serves as a symbol of a threatening presence, and takes on the image of all that one fears; and finally because authority by its nature demands a dependent freedom, while there is nothing we prize so much as our independent freedom.

### C. Problems of Leadership and Authority

The question of the problems of leadership and authority is a topic that would require a paper in itself. Without claiming to exhaust the subject, we can at least attempt to single out some of the main problems. These problems can be distinguished as they touch authority or leadership in themselves, or in their relationship to each other.

First of all, speaking of the problems of leadership, the main problem is to find suitable leaders. Perhaps this is so obvious an observation that it could go unsaid. But it is an important fact. In a sense leaders are born, not made, though this should not be taken too strictly. A leader is like an artist. He is endowed with certain gifts which develop more or less according to his opportunities to foster them.

It seems that in the Society we have always been blessed with leaders. This is due in God's providence to the type of man we have attracted, and the kind of training given to our men. As a matter of fact it seems that the esprit de corps of the Society comes more from the leaders it has had in the various fields of education, social reform, missionary work, and the



like, than from those who are superiors.

At this point we should perhaps make explicit a caution which we hope has been assumed throughout. Our description of the distinction and differences between leadership and authority should not be taken to mean that a person in authority is some kind of a spiritual antenna transmitting imperatives to his subjects. Hopefully there will also be found in him in more or less degree the qualities of leadership we described.

We stated above that our esprit de corps in the Society comes largely from the leaders with whom we have been blessed. At the same time we should realize that leadership can flourish only because it is one of the functions of authority to promote the conditions conducive to the fostering of leadership. In the Society it has been the constant insistence of authority that has maintained the high level of training--a level which alone can produce the kind of leadership that the world needs.

Besides the problem of finding suitable leaders there is a problem of maintaining leadership. The leader has to remain ahead of the group in order to attract. He has to freshen his gifts by assimilating all that is valuable from his cultural milieu. It is possible that leaders today are like the glowworms that last only for a few hours. Perhaps one reason for this is the fact that they do not keep their own gifts alive by the work that is necessary to grow continually.

Passing on to the problems of authority, we are sure to find agreement when we say their name is legion. It is not necessary to develop this point at length. First of all, there are the perennial problems. Authority can, for example, become impersonal and consider itself only as a means to keep good order so that the whole machine might run smoothly. It can isolate itself from the members of the community, setting itself apart, considering itself as something like an officer in relation to the enlisted men. It can adopt a certain privileged status, where it sees others in some way as its servants.

These and others are perennial problems facing authority. There is, however, a problem which is peculiar to our own times. It is the temptation to abdicate the specific nature of authority. Many in authority

today see their role only as advisory or exhortative. If this is literally true, then they are not really in a position of authority, but have reduced authority to what we have called leadership. The specific nature of authority as authority is to transmit the imperative that brings about unity. While authority may not often transmit such an imperative, it belongs to its very nature. To transmit an imperative, however, one does not have to use imperative language. It can be transmitted through requests, advice, counsel, where, however, a person can pick up the signals that in this case the superior is not just acting as a co-ordinator, but as making his will manifest in regard to a particular mode of action. If a person is attuned, he can pick up the imperative in the exhortative. In a somewhat similar fashion the meaning of Christ's parables was picked up by those attuned to the meaning, and missed by those who were not.

We would like finally to speak of some problems between leadership and authority. All of the problems touch on the complementarity of their relationship. In some respects it is the same problem as that described by the relationship between the charismatic and the institutional. It is not easy to harmonize ethos, pneuma, and logos, with nomos, when these are embodied not in one and the same person, but in different persons, as is normally the case.

First of all, it is easier to get followers than it is to get subjects. Leadership appeals to our sense of expanding freedom. Authority connotes an ever diminishing freedom in the one obeying. For this reason, authority frequently finds itself on the defensive where leadership has become strong and is asserting its independence. In a way authority is at the mercy of leadership, unless of course the one in authority can exercise leadership on an equal or superior level to that of the competing leadership.

Unless leadership shows a high degree of responsibility to authority, it becomes divisive. How many times we have witnessed this in the history of the Church, as well as in the history of religious communities. Our recent history is full of such examples particularly in religious congregations where a certain group with strong leadership took over, often

in opposition to authority, with the result that the community was fragmented to a point where it is highly doubtful whether it can continue to survive for any length of time.

Though it may sound undiplomatic in this ecumenical age, it seems to me that we have a prime example of this in Martin Luther. His qualities of leadership were extraordinary. But they were developed and gained momentum by isolating themselves from the complementary role of authority.

The mutuality of these respective roles of leadership and authority is not easy to work out in practice. Yet, unless authority fosters leadership, and leadership is open to authority, we have civil war, where the blood of brothers is spilt upon the battlefield of one's own community. The energies that should be directed outward to building the earth and the Kingdom of God are wasted on internecine strife, and we have one more verification of Mephistopheles' words in Gounod's Faust: "Et Satan conduit le ball!"

## II. Conclusion

It would be interesting if we had the time and space to attempt to speculate on the qualities of the ideal leader and the ideal authority. Such a description would certainly have to see the Christic unity effected by leadership and authority as effective to the extent that the leader is both drawn by Christ, and draws others to him by the transparency of his own life to the ethos, pneuma, and logos of Christ. Christian authority is effective to the degree that it is faithful both to the content of Christ's imperative and to the way that he transmitted this imperative, through suffering service. Christian authority is only fully credible if one lives according to the nomos which he transmits.

In this age of specialization it is necessary to realize the distinction between authority and leadership. At the same time, in this age of fragmentation, it is necessary more than ever to realize their mutual complementarity. If the Society of Jesus is to move forward, and bring the Kingdom of Christ closer to realization by its own leadership in the world, then we have to have leaders who are truly leaders in the

best sense of the term, who share their God-given gifts with us and with others. Our training must promote leadership, not in the sense that every Jesuit will be recognized as a great leader, but in the sense that we have to stand ahead in order to draw others to closer unity. We cannot give what we do not have. We cannot draw others to a level which we do not possess ourselves. Similarly those who have authority over us in the Lord have to continue to minister to us what is our right and their duty, to mediate to us the imperative of Christ.

Hopefully our superiors will also possess a large degree of leadership. In any case, it is their function to foster this leadership among the community. What we have said can be summed up in the words of St. Paul: "There is a variety of gifts but always the same Spirit; there are all sorts of service to be done, but always to the same Lord; working in all sorts of different ways in different people, it is the same God who is working in all of them. The particular way in which the Spirit is given to each person is for a good purpose. . . . Be ambitious for the higher gifts. And I am going to show you a way that is better than any of them" (1 Cor. 12:4-7, 31). He goes on to describe the meaning of Christian love which is the source, the life force, and the goal of Christian leadership and authority.

## II. Comments after the Introduction, from Different Points of View

### A. By William W. Meissner, S.J., Psychiatrist

He approached the topic from the viewpoint of his studies in psychology and psychiatry, and began by treating the distinction between authority and leadership. Only in the last fifteen or twenty years has this distinction been grasped and made truly functional by those interested in this problem and its ramifications.

Our thought should be about different levels. There is a strong tendency, especially in the Society of Jesus, to think of authority in terms of formal organization, our hierarchical structure as spelled out in the Constitutions. But there is also a level at which that authority

is translated into execution. One problem is that what is dictated by or deducible from the formal structure is completely different from what goes on in the order of exercising authority. Authority does not function in the way the formal treatises might lead one to think.

The formal approach to authority regards it as investing an individual with power to influence the behavior of others, in certain loci within the organizational structure, by reason of office. It is based on law. But there are many other bases on which such influence can be exerted; for example, power to reward, or to punish, or power of expertise of knowledge.

One of the most important bases is what is called referent power. Individuals identify with each other. They share in common goals and values; and this sharing gives them a common point of reference with one another, especially in what they are trying to do together. Here, therefore, leadership is set up on a different basis than authority. While authority remains in the appointed superior, leadership is diffused throughout the group; and it involves the contribution which each member makes to the goals of the group. It consists in the ability of each member of a group to contribute to its group goals. Here leadership almost becomes synonymous in concept with membership. There are various ways of contributing: "push-influence," influence by drawing out others, and so on.

Father Sheets' remarks brought these reflections to my mind. The classic treatises on leadership (of Plato, Macchiavelli, and the like) treat of the leader as an individual and his characteristic traits. But when you try to pick leaders by singling out these traits, this approach falls flat. Thirty or forty years ago, for example, in 1941 when the military wanted to find leaders fast and train them as officers, they asked: How do you identify such potential leaders? They shifted from a trait-approach to a situation-approach: How do men act in certain situations? The disconcerting discovery was this: In different situations, different men showed different capacities for leadership. Some good in one situation were poor in others. Hence, leadership came to be recognized as something exercised in and by a group. You do not have a well-functioning

group unless leadership is being exercised in it, in terms of there being some differentiation of function in the members. The composition and goals of the group elicit or facilitate certain qualities of leadership among certain apt members. Only when all these factors are in conjunction does the leader emerge.

Studies on how to pick leaders are now in unsatisfactory flux. These seem to be the only factors which turn up consistently: The leaders are intelligent, discerning and imaginative persons, convinced of and committed to the goals of the group, and recognized by the members as being committed. Thus the leader becomes one whom the group selects because he is capable and committed.

This raises a question for leadership in the structure of the Church or the Society, where the leader has traditionally been an authority figure, one simply appointed from outside the group. That procedure leaves a gap, and the question arises: will the group by its consensus endorse the externally appointed authority-figure as also its leader? Sometimes it does; but sometimes too it does not, and then he finds it difficult to exercise any function of true leadership.

B. By William J. Burke, S.J.

He presented various ideas of modern authors on leadership and supplemented them by discriminating observations of his own. Leadership must be distinguished from organizational apparatus. The leader must exercise a prophetic role which will often involve him in a dialectic of tension with his community. He cannot be merely the embodiment of the group's transient desires, since these may be only compensations or short-lived enthusiasms. His vision will at least involve the ability to foresee the future effects which logically will flow from present decisions. Leadership is impossible wherever those who are led have neglected or failed to achieve their own personal maturity. It is also impossible wherever they have failed to understand the mode of their membership in the group.

Transposition, without correction, of the canons of business leadership into the area of religious leadership appears unwise. The leader may be the victim of the group; he must sacrifice for them in the Old Testament

sense. In a way, it seems doubtful that anyone should "follow" anyone else. The leader encourages and empowers each individual to confront his own providential destiny.

The leader must confront and redeem the Demonic force, since his leadership is not solely tactical and natural. He is involved in the mystery of the lives and other powers in the members of the group. He must conciliate and mediate the qualitatively different powers of Apollo and Dionysus. The power of leadership is, perhaps, best given to the joyful man.

Some sources used are: Aquaviva, John of Salisbury, Aristotle's Politics, Tamkien, Philip Slater, Theodore Roszak, Edward Alber, John Gardner, John Galbraith, Erik Erikson, Gandhi, and others.

C. By Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.

He spoke from the viewpoint of one exploring (1) the model of the superior suggested in the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus (especially, for example, in [423-428, 666-667, 723-735]), and (2) modifications of that model which are possibly desirable today.

In the context of Ignatius' vision of the Society as dedicated to "the service of the Church through the aid of souls in companionship" (as described in John C. Futrell, S.J., Making an Apostolic Community of Love, page 14 and passim), the superior, particularly the superior general, emerges as the one who is especially concerned for the universal good. He has both (1) a directive, goal-orientated role and (2) a unitive, community orientated role. I have the impression, possibly superficial, that in Part IX of the Constitutions, Ignatius' accent is on the directive rather than on the unitive function; or, perhaps better, that it is the strong distinction of a united apostolic effort which is the main focus of the Superior's concern.

In the light of the distinction between authority and leadership, it should be said that leadership is dealt with throughout the Constitutions, not merely in Part IX.

What I find missing, understandably, in Part IX of the Constitutions and present in contemporary thinking about the leadership which authority

can exercise, is an attentiveness to the evocative character of such leadership.

However, two ideas found in Part IX chime in with more modern notions of the exercise of authority: (1), place is made for consultation; (2), it is recognized for example, in the argumentation for the value of a lifelong term for the general that the general, to be effective, must possess a certain prestige (auctoritas, [721]). That is, there must be factors besides sheer juridical empowerment which invite a positive response to his leadership from the members.

D. By John H. Wright, S.J.

In 1964 a symposium was held at Alma, California, on "Leadership and Authority in the Modern Society of Jesus." Father Wright briefly reported and commented on what each of those words came to mean in that symposium:

Leadership -- is the capacity to influence others in a given situation toward some goal or objective. This can be realized in many different ways. The chief ones are: (1) the "charismatic." This is not a collection of unusual personal traits but a matter of (a) seeing and articulating a goal, (b) being and seen to be unselfishly dedicated to that goal, and (c) being genuinely involved with one's followers and thus able to release their creative powers; (2) the "administrative." This senses a practical way of achieving a goal on which the group is already determined; and (3) the "executive." This is ability to gather cooperation in working toward a goal.

And -- that is, to be distinguished from, although it is often united with:

Authority -- the capacity to speak for the whole group. The person with legitimate authority may be designated in many different ways, but his effectiveness supposes always the consent of the group. This consent is not necessarily the source of his authority but is the indispensable condition of its effectiveness, even if the consent is grudgingly given. As one speaking for the whole group he can bind its members to its goals and methods.

In -- this indicates embodiment within an institution. An idea



cannot survive effectively without institutionalization. And probably it can effectively survive institutionalization itself only if the members are more alive to the goals of the group than to group's survival as a group.

The -- this indicates a definite, actually existing body of men.

Modern -- that is, a Society continuous with our past history through identity of the Ignatian spirit continuously transmitted, yet a Society open to new goals and to new means. This develops through sincere searching, and sometimes in reaction to a depersonalized institutionalism.

Society -- that is, (1) an institutional structure or organization, (2) a community bound by a common spirit and goal, (and 3) a "family" gathered in Christ, by the Spirit, under God our Father. A superior is expected to function on each of these levels of the Society; but he must function first at the deepest level, "family." Likewise, each Jesuit exercises some leadership on all three levels as well.

Of -- that is, we belong not to ourselves but to Christ.

Jesus. He is the leader through his Spirit, the model through his life and death, and the head through his grace. Our response of dedication and obedience, made to leadership and authority, is his life in us.

*The books available from the Institute of Jesuit Sources:*

Saint Ignatius of Loyola

## The Constitutions

of the

## Society of Jesus

*Translated, with an Introduction  
and a Commentary, by*

George E. Ganss, S.J.

Cloth, \$14.50

Paperback, \$3.50

Pages xii + 420

*The first English translation of the  
entire corpus of St. Ignatius' Con-  
stitutions, which are a classic of  
spiritual doctrine and of the law of  
religious institutes.*

## Making an Apostolic Community of Love

*The Role of the Superior  
according to  
St. Ignatius of Loyola*

JOHN CARROLL FUTRELL, S.J.

Cloth, \$8.50

Paperback, \$3.00

Pages vii + 232

*The theory and practice of spiritual  
discernment, especially for community  
decisions.*

## A Modern Scriptural Approach to the Spiritual Exercises

DAVID M. STANLEY, S.J.

Originally given as a retreat to Jesuit  
scholastics, this work  
explains what the modern approach in  
scriptural study is  
is a concrete example of its use in  
making or directing a retreat  
presents up-to-date scriptural and doc-  
trinal foundations for prayer

Cloth, \$7.50

Paperback, \$3.50

Pages xvi + 358

*"... the spirituality flows immediate-  
ly and smoothly from the biblical  
interpretation. This is genuine biblical  
spirituality..."*

Current Scripture Notes

## The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice

*A historical study by*  
JOSEPH DE GUIBERT, S.J.

W. J. Young, S.J., Translator

PART I: St. Ignatius, 1491-1556, his  
personal interior life

PART II: Developing the spiritual  
heritage

PART III: Some general aspects

Extensive Bibliography and Index

Cloth, \$14.00

Pages xxv + 692

*The most comprehensive and scholar-  
ly work available on the topic  
Expounds St. Ignatius' spirituality of  
apostolic activity*

## ORDER FORM

The Institute of Jesuit Sources  
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University  
3700 West Pine Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Gentlemen:

Please send me the following books:

Totals at  
list prices

\_\_\_\_\_ copies of *St. Ignatius: Constitutions. Trans, Intro., Commentary*, by G. E. Ganss, S.J., at list price

cloth bound, at \$14.50 each \_\_\_\_\_

paperback, at \$3.50 each \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ copies of *Making an Apostolic Community of Love: The role of the Superior according to St. Ignatius*, by John Carroll Futrell, S.J., list price

cloth bound, at \$8.50 each \_\_\_\_\_

paperback, at \$3.00 each \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ copies of *A Modern Scriptural Approach to the Spiritual Exercises*, D. M. Stanley, S.J. at list price

cloth bound, at \$7.50 each \_\_\_\_\_

paperback, at \$3.50 each \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ copies of *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, De Guibert-Young, cloth bound, at \$14.00 list price \_\_\_\_\_

Total at list prices \_\_\_\_\_

Policy on **DISCOUNTS**, to educators, libraries, schools, others

On orders \$15 or more: 10%

On orders \$25 or more: 20%

Total if there is a discount \_\_\_\_\_

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY AND STATE ..... ZIP CODE .....

---

**FORTHCOMING BOOK**

about Easter, 1972

A History  
of the Society of Jesus

William V. Bangert, S.J.

These pages 82 and 83 give a check list of all the books at present available from the Institute of Jesuit Sources.

This Institute, which publishes books, is distinct from the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality, which publishes the series of brochures, Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits. However, both organizations have many purposes in common. Hence many readers of these Studies will probably find it useful to have the list presented here.

## THE TITLES SO FAR PUBLISHED IN THIS SERIES

These Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits are presently published at irregular intervals, usually three or more a year; but the volumes are numbered according to the years. Thus, those published in 1969 make up Volume I, those in 1970 Volume II, and those in 1971 Volume III.

## The Numbers Published So Far Are These:

- Vol. I, no. 1 (September, 1969). John R. Sheets, S.J. A Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit: His Challenges and Opportunities
- no. 2 (November, 1969). George E. Ganss, S.J. The Authentic Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Some Facts of History and Terminology Basic to Their Functional Efficacy Today.
- Vol. II, no. 1 (February, 1970). William J. Burke, S.J. Institution and Person.
- II, no. 2 (April, 1970). John Carroll Futrell, S.J. Ignatian Discernment.
- II, no. 3 (September, 1970). Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J. The Response of the Jesuit, as Priest and Apostle, in the Modern World.
- Vol. III, no. 1 (February, 1971). John H. Wright, S.J. The Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation.
- III, no. 2 (April, 1971). Vincent J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Some Reflections on the Jesuit Commitment.
- III, no. 3 (June, 1971). Thomas E. Clarke, S.J. Jesuit Commitment--Fraternal Covenant? John C. Haughey, S.J. A New Perspective on Religious Commitment.
- III, no. 4 (September, 1971). Jules J. Toner, S.J. A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will.
- III, no. 5 (November, 1971). John R. Sheets, S.J. Toward a Theology of the Religious Life. A Sketch, with Particular Reference to the Society of Jesus.
- Vol. IV, no. 1 (January, 1972). David B. Knight, S.J. Saint Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty
- IV, no. 2 (March, 1972). Two Discussions: (1) Spiritual Direction. (2) Leadership and Authority.



# THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

## P R I C E S    a n d    S U B S C R I P T I O N S

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS, as the masthead inside the front cover explains in greater detail, is published by this Seminar. From the nature of the case these studies are focused on Jesuit problems and interests. But others who find these essays interesting or helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

Presently the PRICE is 25 cents per copy, plus the mailing costs.

SUBSRIPTIONS will be accepted for the issues of one academic year. The number of issues each year cannot be stated definitely now, but probably it will be five. These subscriptions must run from each November through the following October, because changes in our mailing list can be made only once a year. Subscriptions received here after June 1, 1971, must be paid in advance, at \$1.65 inside the United States, and \$1.85 outside.

### TO THOSE WHO DESIRE TO SUBSCRIBE:

It will greatly facilitate our office work if you use the form below.

----- Cut off here -----

The Secretary of the Assistancy Seminar  
Fusz Memorial  
3700 West Pine Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Dear Father:

For the enclosed \$ \_\_\_\_\_, please add the following name to your list of subscribers:

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRINT your name here

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Zip code

The American Assistancy Seminar  
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University  
3700 West Pine Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Non-Profit Organization  
U. S. POSTAGE

**PAID**

St. Louis, Mo.  
Permit No. 134



