



REFLECTION ON THE LIVING TRADITION

Introduction to the Proceedings of ‘Jesuit Education 21’

Martin R. Tripole, S.J.

Saint Joseph’s University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

[Editorial Note: In 2000, Saint Joseph’s University Press published the proceedings of a major conference on Jesuit higher education. The volume is one of the most significant documents for the history of the American Jesuits’ attempts to think through their apostolate of higher education in the post-Vatican II era. Father Tripole’s introduction to that volume not only helpfully summarizes some of the main themes and positions that emerged in the course of the conference—content still of great interest for reflection and debate today—but it offers a most informative condensed overview of the topic of social justice in the documents of the general congregations of the Society of Jesus in the twentieth century. Father Tripole’s introduction is presented here with some slight editorial adaptation, but it remains substantially as it appeared in the original publication. Added here are some retrospective reflections that Father Tripole composed in March of 2026, along with an appendix reproducing the conference’s program.]

Source: Martin R. Tripole, S.J., ed., *Jesuit Education 21: Conference Proceedings on the Future of Jesuit Higher Education* (Saint Joseph’s University Press, 2000).

To open “Jesuit Education 21” on June 25, 1999 at Saint Joseph’s University, more than 300 educators assembled in the state-of-the-art Wolfington Teletorium in the newly erected Mandeville Hall to engage each other on the topic of the hour. Faculty, administrators, staff, and students came from all but one of our 28 Jesuit colleges and universities, from 12 other Catholic schools and 11 non-Catholic schools in the US, and from 16 schools in foreign countries, to examine the past, to report on the present, and, most importantly, to speculate on the best ways to chart the course of Jesuit Higher Education in the twenty-first century. International calls asking for information about “Jesuit Education 21” provided early evidence of that level of interest, and when the Conference Office staff considered closing

registration a month early, they were counting respondents from 23 states and 15 foreign countries on 5 continents.

This is not the first time educators have gathered to discuss the future of Jesuit—de facto Catholic—education. Some groups were small—in July 1967, twenty-six men, both clergy and lay, met at Land O’ Lakes, Wisconsin; some were large—the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities attracted over 1000 to Washington in 1989. But at “Jesuit Education 21” in Philadelphia, where lay men and women outnumbered Jesuits in the ratio of 6 to 5, there were old issues to revisit and many new ones to explore. Official documents from General Congregations 28 through 34 of the Society of Jesus, as well as *Ex corde Ecclesiae*,¹ provide the background against which all of us concerned with Jesuit higher education today must face practical challenges: recruiting students, retaining highly qualified faculty, and paying the bills. The way we—both Jesuit and lay—meet these challenges now will determine the future of Jesuit education.

The purpose of this introduction is twofold: I. to delineate what led to the convening of that conference, and II. to highlight some of the major issues presented at that conference and found in this publication of the proceedings of that conference.

Background to the Conference

Why Was the Conference Held?

Its origins can best be traced by returning to statements made on the social apostolate by some of the recent General Congregations—conventions of Jesuit delegates from provinces of the Society of Jesus from all over the world assembled at the Jesuit headquarters in Rome. Usually, these Congregations meet at the death of the Jesuit General, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus who lives in Rome, to elect a successor.² They may also be convened to change the Constitutions or governing rules of the Society, or “for other matters of more than ordinary importance.”³

1 John Paul II, *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, Apostolic Constitution, The Holy See, August 15, 1990. https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae.html.

2 John W. Padberg, S.J., ed., *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts* (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), §677, p. 330.

3 “1. Formulas of the Institute of the Society of Jesus,” in *Constitutions*, §2, p. 5. For an extensive explanation of the Formula of the Institute and the Constitutions, see Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans., intro. and comp. George E. Ganss, S.J. (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), esp. 3–59.

According to Ganss, the Formula of the Institute, largely composed by St. Ignatius of Loyola, is included in the papal bull of Paul III founding the Society

The 28th General Congregation

There have been ten general congregations in the 20th century.⁴ The first of interest to us is the 28th General Congregation (March 12–May 9, 1938), which produced a document “On Ministries” that included Decree 29 with a section “On the Social Apostolate.”⁵

The decree states that “Apostolic social works . . . are everywhere to be strongly supported and reckoned among the more urgent ministries of our time,” and that the Society, in regions where it would be appropriate, should “stress the promotion of the religious, moral, and even temporal welfare of workers,” and “take special care” to provide them and their employers with “spiritual help” and an understanding of the “social doctrine of the Church.” Jesuits should erect “mission stations . . . in the countryside or the outskirts of large cities . . . where the needs of souls call for them,” but only until the secular clergy are able to administer to those needs. The decree asserts that “the principles of charity and social justice [should] be carefully impressed upon the minds of the students in our schools,” and that the “social doctrine of the Church” should be carefully taught to Jesuit scholastics in their training to be Jesuits.⁶

Thus, the decree gives an early indication of what the Society understood by the social apostolate, for whom it was intended, and who should be educated and trained for the ministry. Note that primary emphasis is placed upon education rather than action for justice, and upon spiritual support for workers and their employers.

of Jesus, *Regimini militantis Ecclesiae*, in 1540, and in revised form in Julius III's 1550 bull, *Exposcit debitum* (the reference here is from the latter bull). The Formula presented “the fundamental structure of the new order” and authorized more detailed directives to be composed called Constitutions (Ganss, 36). The Constitutions, written by Ignatius toward the end of his life (1491–1556) and approved and published in 1558 by the Society of Jesus (Ganss, 3, 53), are “the collection of statutes or ordinances composed by St. Ignatius of Loyola for the inspiration and government of the religious institute he founded” (Ganss, 35).

4 Much of this data is to be found in Padberg, “The General Congregations of the Twentieth Century,” in *Jesuits: Yearbook of the Society of Jesus 2000*, ed. José M. de Vera, S.J. (General Curia of the Society of Jesus, 1999), 7–22, here 7.

5 “General Congregation 28, Decree 29: Title III, On Ministries,” in *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations: A Brief History and a Translation of the Decrees*, ed. John W. Padberg, S.J., John L. McCarthy, S.J., and Martin D. O’Keefe, S.J., trans. Martin D. O’Keefe, S.J. (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), §2, nos. 5–10, pp. 606–7.

6 “General Congregation 28, Decree 29,” §2, nos. 5–10, pp. 606–7.

The 29th General Congregation

For the first time in the history of Congregations, the 29th General Congregation (September 6–October 23, 1946) produced a separate decree, Decree 29: “On the Social Apostolate.” Recognizing that much of the social order had collapsed as a result of World War II, the Congregation declared that a “center” of social action and studies is to be established in each province or region” of the Society. The center would be “capable of explaining and fostering the social apostolate and providing initiative and direction to the social action” of Jesuits. Provincials are told to “designate one or even more fathers to devote all their energy to this social apostolate” where “significant numbers of workers dwell.” The Congregation praises Jesuits “who exercise ministries involving greater self-sacrifice among workers.” Jesuits engaged in “spiritual ministries,” such as “directing the Spiritual Exercises [and] training young people,” are told to explain “the social teaching of the Church, by guiding the souls of the faithful towards social justice and social charity, and, finally, by establishing social projects by means of the members of our organizations.” All Jesuit scholastics are to be “instructed early on in social teaching,” and those who “seem to be more suited to the social apostolate” should be assigned “to special studies in the theory and practice of social activities.”⁷

What is especially to be noted in this decree of 1946 is the deeper commitment of the postwar Society to the social apostolate. Social action, however, remains a distinct ministry among others, and seems to be engaged primarily by certain Jesuits called to that ministry. Otherwise, the ministry is educational or instructional. Those faithful who are educated in the social apostolate, such as the young, are to be instructed in the social teaching of the Church so that they as a group may be more diligent in promoting social justice.

Social justice as a specific ministry within the apostolates of the Society is again to be noted in the “Instruction” of Father General Jean-Baptiste Janssens in 1950, written probably as a follow-up on the directives of the 29th General Congregation. While Janssens sees education for justice as a work of the Society, the actual promotion of justice is understood mainly as the work of the laity, to be entered into by Jesuits only until lay leadership is ready.⁸

7 “General Congregation 28, Decree 29,” §2, nos. 5–10, pp. 606–7; “General Congregation 29, Decree 29,” intro., §§1–4, nos. 5–10, pp. 638–39; see de Vera, *Jesuits*, 10–11.

8 Jean-Baptiste Janssens, “Instructio de Apostolatu Sociali,” *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu* 11 (1949): 710–26 (English translation: *Instruction of Very Reverend Father General on the Social Apostolate* [Woodstock College, 1950]).

The 30th General Congregation (September 6–November 11, 1957) reaffirmed the “mission to workers” of previous Congregations and urged that the mission be “fostered even more by the Society” through the education “of young working-class people.”⁹

The 31st General Congregation

The 31st General Congregation (GC 31; May 7–July 15, 1965; September 8–November 17, 1966) is perhaps most notable for two reasons: on May 22, 1965, Pedro Arrupe was elected Superior General, and the Congregation voted to open the ordered structure of life in the Society to experimentation.

Taking heed of the directive of Vatican II that religious life be updated and adapted to the needs of the modern world by returning to its originating spirit, this Congregation decreed that the Society of Jesus “renew itself and adapt its life and its activities to the exigencies of the Church and the needs of contemporary man” (D 1: “The Mission of the Society of Jesus Today” 1 [1]).¹⁰ With a view to this purpose, the Congregation boldly declared that “experiments in matters at variance with our own law may be instituted.” Even further, that

the entire government of the Society must be adapted to modern necessities and ways of living; that our whole training in spirituality and in studies must be changed; that religious and apostolic life itself is to be renewed; that our ministries are to be weighed in relation to the pastoral spirit of the Council [Vatican II] according to the criterion of the greater and more universal service of God in the modern world; and that the very spiritual heritage of our Institute, containing both new and old elements, is to be purified and enriched anew according to the necessities of our times (D 2: “The Renewal of Our Laws” 2–3 [19, 21]).

Decree 1 recognizes that “modern criticism and contemporary philosophy” have created a “crisis to which the Gospel itself and the Church’s doctrine have been exposed” (5 [12]). There is “the widespread criticism” that many Christians feel estranged from the world and its struggles by the life and teaching of the Church. The decree admits that members of the Society experience “a more universal desire for the ‘full and free life,’” and that the “contemporary ‘social and cultural transformation’” has created changed

9 “General Congregation 30, Decree 52,” nos. 1–2, p. 674.

10 Padberg, ed., *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: An English Translation of the Official Latin Texts of the General Congregations and of the Accompanying Papal Documents*, trans. Jesuit Conference (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1977). Sectional or paragraph references are indicated in the text, with continuing paragraph numbers throughout the volume noted in brackets.

conditions for religious life (5 [12, 11]). Therefore, the decree concludes that to fulfill its mission “in this new age,” the Society is in need of renewal and adaptation, so that “those things may be removed from our body which could constrict its life and hinder it from fully attaining its end” (7 [17]).

Thus, the 31st General Congregation threw open the doors of the Society to the broadest experimentation possible to adapt the Society to the spirit of the modern world and felt driven to do so by the spirit of Vatican II and the crisis brought on by the challenges to traditional modes of religious life created by the spirit of the new age.

The Congregation also significantly broadened the understanding of the social apostolate beyond that of the 28th and 29th General Congregations. In Decree 32 on “The Social Apostolate,” it understands the “scope of the social apostolate” no longer (i.e., in 1966) simply to be directed to “social works among workmen” or other especially needy groups, but to the erection of

a fuller expression of justice and charity into the structures of human life in common. Its goal in this is that every man may be able to exercise a personal sense of participation, skill, and responsibility in all areas of community life (1 [569]).

The decree directs the “social apostolate [not] be reduced merely to temporal activity” (3 [573]). The social apostolate is consonant with the mission of the Society because “social structures” influence the “‘humanization’ of social life” and the “moral and religious life” of every person (1 [570]). It is for this reason that in 1966 the social apostolate is raised up to be considered among the apostolates “having priority” (4a [575]) in the mission of the Society.

Though the social apostolate is still considered one among many, its importance is now stressed: in the course of training for Jesuits, “the social dimension of our whole modern apostolate must be taken into account” (4b [576]), and “some men” who are “endowed with truly outstanding gifts” should be “specifically destined for this apostolate” and sent for training “in the best universities” (4c [577]). The decree calls for “social centers” to be erected “by provinces or regions” to “carry on research [and] social education, both doctrinal and practical”; moreover, “social action itself” is to be carried on by at least some Jesuits “in brotherly collaboration with the laity” (4d [578]).

The 32nd General Congregation

The 32nd General Congregation (GC 32; December 2, 1974–March 7, 1975), probably the most innovative of the modern Society, was convened, not, as is usually done, to elect a new General, but to respond to the call to

adaptation to the modern world commissioned by GC 31, and in the face of a crisis of spirit and rapidly shrinking numbers caused by dwindling vocations and departing ranks.¹¹ The Congregation sought to update and revitalize the Society by returning to what it felt was the original spirit of Saint Ignatius.

The Congregation admits that there is an “urgency” to respond to “a whole series of new challenges” to the mission of the Society (D 4: “Our Mission Today: The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice” 3 [49]). The Congregation accepts that it “must undertake a thoroughgoing reassessment of our traditional apostolic methods, attitudes and institutions with a view to adapting them to the new needs of the times and to a world in process of rapid change” (9 [58]).

To answer the needs of the modern world, the Congregation responded with a new (restored?) understanding of the mission of the Society: “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement” (2 [48]). This mission, which the Congregation saw as a share in the mission of the Church itself (13 [62]), was to promote justice as “an integral part” of the Society’s “priestly service of the faith” (18 [67]). So closely did the Congregation identify the promotion of justice with the life of the Jesuit that it answered the question “What is it to be a Jesuit?” with the response: “to engage, under the standard of the Cross, in the crucial struggle of our time: the struggle for faith and that struggle for justice which it includes” (D 2: “Jesuits Today,” 1-2 [11–12]).¹² Going beyond the understanding of the ministry of justice for Jesuits as expressed in previous Congregations, GC 32 understood the promotion of justice not as one apostolate among many, but as the principle governing the acceptability of all Jesuit apostolates, and, indeed, of Jesuits’ own inner spirituality:

11 Cf. Gabriel Codina, S.J., “A Century of Jesuit Education, 1900–2000,” in *Jesuits: Yearbook of the Society of Jesus 2000*, 44–61.

Codina states (54) that the total number of Jesuits in the world fell by almost 30% from 1965 to 1985. In 1999, the number is about 40% lower than the number at the peak membership year of 1965.

12 That the promotion of justice was integral to the Society’s “priestly service of the faith” (D 4:18 [67]) was perhaps not all that obvious to Paul VI. As is well known, the pope was troubled by developments at GC 32. As to the reason why, Padberg speculates: “He [Paul VI] may have thought that the congregation intended to take steps that would diminish the sacerdotal character of the Society and introduce a primarily political and social emphasis in Jesuit ministries” (“General Congregations,” in *Jesuits*, 16).

[. . .] the promotion of justice is not one apostolic area among others, the “social apostolate”; rather, it should be the concern of our whole life and a dimension of all our apostolic endeavors (D 4:47 [96]; cf. 4:65 [114]).

[. . .] the service of faith and the promotion of justice cannot be for us simply one ministry among others. It must be the integrating factor of all our ministries; and not only of our ministries but of our inner life as individuals, as communities, and as a world-wide brotherhood (D 2:9 [19]; cf. 2:30–31 [40–41]).

This promotion of justice movement was not without its critics.¹³ My own publication in 1994 argued that, while the social apostolate was an important and valid apostolate integral to the Jesuit mission as it was to the mission of the Church, it was being overstretched when considered as an apostolate that should inform all Jesuit life and mission activity.¹⁴ I argued that Father Arrupe himself had recognized by the early 1980s that the justice mission had been overextended, that there was need for further study of the movement and its theological foundations, and that GC 32’s understanding of justice represented for Arrupe “an option in the right direction,” but an option that was inadequate without going beyond justice “to crown it with charity.”¹⁵

The slogan that characterized the Society of Jesus’s new perception of its post-GC 32 apostolate was “the service of faith through the promotion of justice,” which was then shortened to the “faith-justice” movement.¹⁶ In practice, little attention was given to faith and much to justice, justified by the understanding that, in the practical order, the service of the faith was carried out by promoting justice. Apostolates that could not easily be subsumed under the rubric of justice felt threatened, and one of these was

13 Cf. Avery Dulles, S.J., “Faith, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission,” in *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education* (Jesuit Conference, 1990), 19–25.

14 Martin R. Tripole, S.J., *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective*, Series IV, 14: Studies on Jesuit Topics (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994). [Editorial note: This work has been updated and expanded by the author in a 30th anniversary edition: *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2024).]

15 Pedro Arrupe, S.J., “Rooted and Grounded in Love: An Address by Father Arrupe,” in *One Jesuit’s Spiritual Journey: Selected Letters and Addresses*, trans. Ruth Bradley, vol. 5 (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986), par. 67.

16 “So the promotion of justice . . . is to mark the Society’s whole mission and every Jesuit activity. The social dimension often labelled ‘faith and justice’ or simply ‘Decree 4,’ is born . . .” Michael Czerny, S.J., “A Jubilee of a Hundred Years: The Social Apostolate in the Twentieth Century,” in *Jesuits*, 101–7, here 104.

education, since it was not easy to explain, for example, courses in mathematics as study integral to the social apostolate.¹⁷

In the early 1990s, an awareness of the critical limitations of the social justice apostolate as characteristic of the Society's total mission became increasingly clear, and efforts were made to broaden the concept of justice so that it might become more inclusive.¹⁸ Few "faith-justice" critics were convinced by any of them. In *Faith Beyond Justice*, I argued that a better leitmotif to characterize the mission of the Society would be "the service of faith and the promotion of charity, of which justice is an integral part," or perhaps "the service of the faith through the promotion of a Christian and human culture," or simply "faith and culture," since inculturation of the Gospel seemed to be a goal more comprehensive than the promotion of justice.¹⁹

-
- 17 Even Michael Czerny, Secretary of the Social Apostolate in the Jesuit Curia in Rome, admits that "A unilateral emphasis on one aspect of the mission [of justice] generated friction, as traditional ministries felt underrated or threatened . . ." (Czerny, *Jesuits*, 104–5).

That education had reason to feel threatened is brought out by Codina: in his discussion of "The critical 1960s," he states:

"The 1960s did not treat education gently. Criticism of institutions took on a destructive tone and the school was not immune. The graffiti on the streets of Paris in May 1968 were an eloquent witness to the prevailing mentality. The educational institution was an easy target for those who were clamoring for social change. After all, by supposition, schools are incapable of confronting and changing the real situation; they are part of the system; they are elitist. From Cuernavaca (Mexico) on the other side of the Atlantic, Ivan Illich unleashed his anti-school anger, calling the school the 'sacred cow' and the reproductive organ of the establishment" ("Century," 53).

Undoubtedly the anti-institutional, social-oriented mentality of the 60s expressed here had an effect on GC 32 in its effort to make Jesuit spirituality relevant to "the needs and aspirations of the men and women of our time" (GC 32, D 4–3 [49]).

- 18 A most laudable example of this was the effort made by Seamus Murphy, S.J., "The Many Ways of Justice," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 26, no. 2 (1994): 1–39.
- 19 Tripole, *Faith Beyond Justice*, 40, 128 (2nd ed., 51, 115). Indeed, GC 32 had already seen the need for inculturation in its Decree 5: "The Work of Inculturation of the Faith and Promotion of Christian Life." The decree (of only three paragraphs), however, only began to understand the importance of inculturation, and saw it mainly as a work to be deployed for Third-World countries: "the 32nd General Congregation is aware of the great importance that must be given today to the work involving inculturation of both faith and Christian life in all the continents of the world, but especially in the regions of Asia and Africa and in some countries of Latin America" (1 [131]). GC 32 seems not to have recognized that inculturation in its broadest sense means integration of the Christian faith into the culture of every nation on earth. In addition, GC 32's primary concern was to promote justice, not evangelization.

The 33rd General Congregation

The 33rd General Congregation (GC 33; September 1–October 25, 1983) was aware of the criticisms leveled against GC 32's comprehensive use of the promotion of justice and tried to establish balance. Meeting mainly to choose a new Superior General (it elected Peter-Hans Kolvenbach on September 13, 1983), it also confirmed the teaching of GC 32 regarding the promotion of justice, while insisting that those ministering in the "traditional apostolates," such as education, should not feel threatened. Teaching is listed as one of "the educational and intellectual apostolates" that are "essential ministries" and have "great importance among the ministries of the Society" because they exercise "deep and lasting influence on individuals and on society" (D 1: "Companions of Jesus Sent into Today's World" (43–44 [46–47])).²⁰ At the same time, GC 33 continued to employ GC 32's comprehensive understanding of justice: all the traditional apostolates are seen as achieving their purposes by contributing "to strengthening the faith that does justice" (43 [46]). Thus, no attempt is made to confront the problem of how education, as well as the other traditional apostolates, is integral to the promotion of justice.

The 34th General Congregation

The 34th General Congregation (GC 34; January 5–March 22, 1995) constitutes a major advance toward the resolution of this problem.

As soon as GC 34 ended, a Jesuit suggested that I edit a book of essays by Jesuit educators, each of whom would delineate, in his own field of study and expertise, precisely how the teachings of GC 34 were relevant to Jesuit education. That work of twenty-seven essays appeared early in 1999.²¹ My own introductory essay argued that GC 34 broadened and deepened the concept of justice, making it more biblically sound by understanding the foundational concept of justice, and thus the norm for all Jesuit activity, to be "the justice of God's Kingdom" (D 2: "Servants of Christ's Mission," 11 [36])²² or "that justice of the Gospel" (3 [24]). According to GC 34, it is this

20 Donald R. Campion and Albert C. Louapre, S.J., eds., *Documents of the 33rd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus: An English Translation of the Official Latin Texts of the General Congregation and of Related Documents* (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1984). References are noted in the text.

21 Martin R. Tripole, S.J., ed., *Promise Renewed: Jesuit Higher Education for a New Millennium* (Loyola Press, 1999).

22 McCarthy, *Documents of the Thirty-fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus: The Decrees of General Congregation Thirty-four, the Fifteenth of the Restored Society and the Accompanying Papal and Jesuit Documents*, Series III, 14: Original Studies Composed in English, trans. Jesuit Curia (Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995). References are in the text.

justice, understood as God's redemptive righteousness which overcomes the power of sin and leads to salvation, that is to be promoted in the mission of the Society. This justice is, moreover, exercised by Christians in the comprehensive life of grace which permeates every area of life in the world through their mission activity. According to this view, promoting this kind of justice is the mission of Jesuit education, because the role of the educational apostolate is to enrich students' quality of life by humanizing and transforming their lives as human beings and as members of the Mystical Body of Christ. This transformed life is then brought to bear on the world wherever human beings seek to recreate it in the image of Christ and in conformity with his teachings. This humanizing and transforming activity is what I understand GC 34 to mean by inculturation. It is this concept of justice, then, that is the more comprehensive, in that it seeks to make every human life and activity consonant with the image and charity of Christ.

The effort for social justice is, then, one of the many important and necessary manifestations of God's power of justice at work in the world to transform specific unjust structures of society into works of charity. According to this view, social justice is situated in its proper context only when seen as part of the comprehensive work of God's saving grace in history. The apostolate of education, moreover, takes on as important a role as social justice in the inculturation process required by God's redemptive activity.²³ Nevertheless, according to GC 34, all are required: service of faith, inculturation, promotion of justice as social justice, and interreligious dialogue; and none may be overlooked as integral to the mission of promoting the justice of God's Kingdom.

This is my understanding of GC 34 and how it advanced our understanding of justice as the mission of the Society.

Jesuit Education 21

How Does All of This Lead to "Jesuit Education 21?"

One of the Jesuits who wrote for *Promise Renewed* said he thought all the essayists should get together to discuss the merits of the views presented in their papers on GC 34 and education. That set the spark for a conference, but originally for only the twenty-seven essayists and focused on GC 34. But it was that thought that mushroomed into the idea of a major confer-

23 Actually, the apostolate of education has probably an even more significant role to play than efforts at social justice in the inculturation process, because education seeks to transform the inner life of the individual into a being recreated in the image of Christ, whereas efforts at social justice are primarily oriented toward the transformation of social structures as expressions of recreated human life in action.

ence of Jesuit educators on the issues and problems that confront Jesuit higher education at the beginning of the new millennium. No major conference on Jesuit higher education had been held in the United States since Assembly 1989 at Georgetown University. It seemed that after a decade it was time for a new conference. And so, the idea of a get-together for twenty-seven Jesuits grew into a conference of about 300 persons involved in or interested in Jesuit higher education, who gathered to discuss virtually every conceivable issue confronting it today.

Thus, these proceedings include virtually all of the conference presentations, i.e., major "Session" papers and those of respondents (usually three); papers from concurrent meetings scheduled for two sessions (VI and IX) to enable four or five panelists in each of nine panels to discuss specialized questions about Jesuit education; finally, addresses of distinguished personages—keynote speaker Peter Steinfels of *The New York Times* and Archbishop Giuseppe Pittau, S.J., Vatican Secretary for Catholic Education—and homilies at the Sunday and closing liturgies. Many of the papers appear as they were presented at Saint Joseph's University in June 1999. Only one panelist and two respondents chose not to include their papers, and some presenters made minor revisions to reflect points raised in discussions during the conference. On account of time limitations, some papers were not presented in their entirety. Minimal editorial corrections were made to let the writers speak for themselves.

Highlights of the Conference

It would be impossible to summarize the conference in this introduction. The reader should also be made aware that these papers contain so many new ideas and new ways of examining old issues that they should remain a source of study among educators for many years to come. My only purpose here will be to highlight some of the major issues presented at the conference, especially where the differing views presented show the need for continuing dialogue.

Faith and Justice

A major issue of conflict remains the role that faith and justice should play in Jesuit higher education today.

John McDade's paper ("Jesuit Higher Education and Dialogue with Culture") is important because he was one of the major writers of the first five foundational theme decrees of GC 34. McDade's position is that Liberation Theology's emphasis upon "structural inequality" was "a major influence [in GC 32] on how the Society considered the promotion of justice." For McDade, however, the justice to be sought is more than social

justice; it is “*the human good*,” by which he means the “life directed toward, and embodying, the wholeness and consummation of the resurrection of Christ.” According to McDade, this understanding of justice “touches on moral values, on our account of human nature, on how we live together, on hope, purpose and fulfillment.” McDade shows how GC 34 clarified GC 32’s concept of justice by bringing out the other (richer) dimensions of justice that, in his view, are to be found in GC 32 but were not elaborated upon afterward. McDade sees this larger concept of justice as adding “new dimensions to the Society’s commitment to justice particularly suited to the central problematic of faith today.”

It is to the more overtly political understanding of justice found in GC 32 that Joe Fitzmyer (“What Do the Scriptures Say About Justice?”) and one of his respondents, Stanley Marrow, react. For Fitzmyer, the biblical word usually translated as “justice” in both Old and New Testaments is more properly translated as “righteousness,” whose primary meaning describes a quality of God as well as right relationships among humans, and which in Paul denotes a quality of God experienced in faith that leads to release from sin and to salvation.

For Marrow, the “slogan” of “faith and justice” can only with difficulty be justified by scriptural exegesis. The expression is of “recent provenance,” he argues, whose meaning can only be determined by knowing its author. Dick Clifford and Mark Smith, however, argue from the opposite position. Clifford feels that while the concept of social justice as such is not to be found in the Scriptures, its roots may justifiably be traced to “founding moments” in the Bible where “the just God liberates people from oppressors” and “forms them into a just community.” Smith finds “four marks of social justice in Scripture,” deeply rooted in Israel’s way of life in the community and in its response of a just way of life offered to God in worship.

In a remark during a question-and-answer session, McDade suggested that more study is needed of the role of justice in the Jesuit apostolate. This seems to be where the discussion rests as of now.

Secularization

Another major issue of contention at the conference was the role of secularization in Jesuit higher education.

In his provocative presentation “Catholic Identity vs. Secularization: Whose Choice?” Bill Byron distinguished *secularization* from *secularism*. Secularization for Byron is “a good thing, a sign of maturity and human progress,” because it means that the “basic mission of evangelizing culture” is no longer wielded by the Church in its authoritative control over education, but by “faith-committed, church-related colleges and universities”

themselves. In this way, according to Byron, institutional autonomy and academic freedom may be preserved, while boards of trustees, administrators, and above all faculty who “love the Catholic intellectual tradition” will freely communicate that tradition and advance it.

A significant number of other speakers, however, seemed to equate secularization with secularism, and saw it as cutting into the Catholic identity of our schools. According to Joe Appleyard, one of the respondents to Byron, the generation which accepts the Catholic perspective is passing on and is being replaced by those who rarely understand the fact that faith and spirituality have a role to play in higher education.

Perhaps one of the most serious critiques of the movement toward secularization in our schools was provided by Avery Dulles. In his panel presentation on “The Role of Theology in Jesuit Higher Education,” Dulles argues that theology “should hold a place of primacy in Jesuit university education,” and that it should “serve as the principle of integration for the curriculum as a whole.” But it is unrealistic to see that as a possibility today or in the future. Instead, Dulles sees theology marginalized by the tendency to fit Jesuit schools into the pattern of secular institutions. Hiring and promotion policies are based solely on academic standards, and the recruitment of students takes no account of religious convictions. Dulles wonders if theology can survive in so many of the Jesuit schools that “have traveled so far down the road to secularization.”

Jesuit-Lay Collaboration

The conference strongly stresses the need for Jesuit-lay collaboration in Jesuit higher education, with certain ominous indications of what might happen if that need is not met.

Brennan O'Donnell, in his talk on “Jesuit-Lay Collaboration,” strongly supports Jesuit presence in higher education, and provides a ringing endorsement of the values for which Jesuit education is well known. But O'Donnell also recognizes with great regret the diminishing presence of Jesuits in education and seeks to determine how lay people can best maintain the Jesuit ideals. What he considers “the greatest shortcoming” in Jesuit-lay collaboration is the “relative failure thus far to challenge a majority of the faculty to think of their day-to-day teaching and scholarly life as shaped by their being at a Jesuit institution.”

Faculty, according to O'Donnell, tend to develop their scholarly lives as a professional pursuit of scholarly excellence, uninfluenced by their Jesuit institutional setting—unlike their Jesuit colleagues, whose scholarly lives (if any) are internal to their Jesuit mission. For O'Donnell, something similar needs to be true for lay people in Jesuit schools. It is not enough for

O'Donnell for lay faculty to express their commitment to Jesuit education in extracurricular programs such as service projects. Faculty, he states, need to "feel themselves engaged as faculty—as intellectuals, scholars, researchers, teachers," and many "want to participate much more fully in the intellectual culture that the Jesuit university claims to promote." As ways to foster this involvement, O'Donnell suggests "hiring for mission" where faith and reason are taken seriously, and faculty development "in research and teaching in organic relation to the Jesuit university's mission."

Respondents such as Peter Ely supported O'Donnell's position, stressing the fact that Jesuit institutions can and will lose their religious identity if they do not seek to ensure it in their hiring processes. And Darla Germeroth, stressing that she is neither Jesuit nor Catholic, strongly argues that "hiring for mission" is "crucial to maintain the values of Jesuits in higher education."

The importance of scholarship to Jesuit education is underscored by the addition of a panel not originally scheduled for the conference: "Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Scholarship, Research, and Publication." Mike Fahey recognizes that his views in favor of "an apostolate that is explicitly intellectual" (words borrowed from Father General Pedro Arrupe) will not be popular among many post-1960 Jesuits inclined to more active involvement in student needs. And John Haughey vigorously asserts that the intellectual pursuit of the truth cannot be alien to the struggle for social justice. Finally, Archbishop Giuseppe Pittau, Secretary of the Vatican Congregation for Catholic Education, stresses in his address that a Catholic university must be noted for the scholarship of its faculty or it fails in its service to its students.

Ex corde Ecclesiae

Even while the conference was in session, American Bishops were meeting to draft a document on the application of *Ex corde Ecclesiae* to the United States, to be presented for a vote at the November 1999 meeting of the US Catholic Conference of Bishops in Washington. While Archbishop Pittau, whose congregation must receive and appraise the application, chose not to address the issue directly, it surfaced repeatedly in other presentations and discussions. A separate panel addressed an issue intrinsically related to *Ex corde Ecclesiae*: "Jesuit Higher Education and the Church: Is It Time for a New Land O' Lakes Statement?"

A word about Land O' Lakes. Twenty-six top educators met in 1967 in Land O' Lakes, Wisconsin, to draw up a statement that stressed the need to maintain the Catholic identity of Catholic higher education in the United States. At the same time, the educators argued that if Catholic education is

to survive in the United States, Catholic institutions need autonomy vis-à-vis their founding religious orders, and their faculties need freedom from any controlling authority from outside the institutions (namely, from the hierarchy). Jesuit schools immediately set in place Jesuit-lay boards of trustees that became governing bodies with right of ownership. All of this was done apparently without the approval of the Jesuit Superior General or the Vatican. The purpose of the panel discussion, therefore, was to consider whether this apparent alienation from Church authority and ownership was indeed valid, and if so, whether Jesuit higher education should be reincorporated under Church authority as a way of checking increasing secularization.

What made the issue even more critical at the conference was the incident which had recently occurred in St. Louis, when Saint Louis University decided to sell its university hospital to a non-Catholic organization. The archbishop of St. Louis initially objected, leading to the involvement of the Vatican in the discussions. Thus, tied in a massive knot were the issues of academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and secularization.

The conference was fortunate to have Paul Reinert, a member of the Land O' Lakes conference, present. He strongly reasserted the value of the Land O' Lakes Statement, which he saw as preparing in some way for the more recent Vatican position presented in *Ex corde Ecclesiae*. Larry Biondi, president of Saint Louis University, also strongly supported the "separate incorporation" of Jesuit institutions and their right to act autonomously.

The major supporter of the Vatican position of maintaining controlling authority was panelist James Conn, a canon lawyer. The resulting presentations and discussions make for valuable reading on this timely topic, made even more important now by the passage on November 17, 1999 of the document called *Ex corde Ecclesiae: An Application to the United States*, requiring, among other things, "that a Catholic professor of a theological discipline" teaching in a Catholic university obtain a *mandatum* from the local ecclesiastical authority acknowledging that the professor "is a teacher within the full communion of the Catholic Church," and that the professor recognize his or her "commitment and responsibility to teach authentic Catholic doctrine and to refrain from putting forth as Catholic teaching anything contrary to the church's magisterium."²⁴ This issue still has to run its course, but the readings of Sessions XI and XII in these proceedings will provide timely grist for discussion.

24 National Conference of Catholic Bishops, "*Ex corde Ecclesiae: An Application to the United States*," *Origins* 29, no. 25 (1999): 402-9.

Catholic Identity

Throughout the conference, one thing stands out: how strongly the participants stressed the need to maintain Catholic and Jesuit identity. The importance of the Jesuit identity was clear, even among the lay members of the conference.

Occasionally one hears talk that faculty and students are happy to be teaching or studying at Jesuit institutions but not necessarily pleased that these institutions are identified with the Catholic Church (see Peter Steinfel's talk). That kind of talk was quickly put to rest. Archbishop Pittau made it clear that there could be no Jesuit university independent of the Church: "We should make it very clear," he stated, "a university or a college may call itself a Jesuit university or a Jesuit college only if it is faithfully and visibly Catholic. . . . the Jesuit Catholic identity . . . has to permeate the whole university."

Regardless of the positions they took in their applications to the United States of *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, speakers remained strongly in favor of Catholic identity.

Byron, who favors easing Church authority over schools, argues that the Catholic identity should be freely promoted by lay and religious collaborators who "love the Catholic intellectual tradition." Tom Rausch, while not exactly sure how "hiring for mission" should be implemented, nevertheless concludes that "without a strong presence of committed Catholics on a university faculty, it is difficult to maintain that the institution has a Catholic identity."

Yet the participants were realistic in their appraisals of the presence of Catholic identity within Jesuit institutions and made cautious, critical statements about the future of that identity.

Peter Steinfels, the keynote speaker, feels there is a "new generation of college and university presidents, both Jesuits and non-Jesuits," who "want to make consolidating their institutions' religious mission and Jesuit and Catholic identity an essential part of their own legacy." Yet he fears that, for all their efforts, their institutional strengths make it too easy to "avoid the religious issue" by recasting mission and identity into purely humanistic and secular categories of growth. While Catholic schools *are* doing better, says Steinfels, the results "remain like beachheads, still isolated conquests" not yet breaking out into secure territory "emanating from their religious tradition."

Rausch, while accepting that his own institution has a "strong Catholic identity," pointedly criticizes its lack of imprint on the curriculum and the lack of a Catholic atmosphere in student living facilities: "the cultures of our resident life communities are not much different from what one would find at any secular university." Bill Spohn finds that "On most campuses, undergraduates are quarantined into a youth culture that hampers moral development," so that "many college students regress into adolescent behavior"

Repeatedly, speakers found that the role of the administration in Jesuit schools was crucial to setting the Catholic tone of the institution. Respondent Tim Lannon made a study of the role of university presidents in establishing Catholic identity. What he notes is that "presidents at Catholic universities can make a difference in promoting Catholic identity, if that is a presidential priority." Instead, presidents tend toward "an accommodationism in their rhetoric, thereby diminishing a distinctive Catholic identity." Thus, while the Jesuit General Pedro Arrupe urged our schools to "form men-for-others; men who will live not for themselves but for God and his Christ," the rhetoric on campuses today is to form "men and women for others" with "little if any mention of the religious connection, 'for God and his Christ.'"

Joe O'Hare, in agreement with Byron, argues that "It is the faculty, above all, who must play a critical role" in supporting and contributing to the "distinctive mission" of Catholic higher education. This means that the survival of Catholic education will be largely dependent upon whether "the wider American Catholic community," especially its educated laity, remains committed "to the Catholic religious and intellectual tradition" and "a relationship to the Church." While O'Hare offers no guarantees that Jesuit education will have a place in the future of American higher education, he found the discussions at the conference gave him every reason to hope that the "Ignatian call at its heart, is worth the gamble of a lifetime."

It is that relationship to the Church, however, that could cause problems. If by relationship to the Church, O'Hare means "institutional Catholic Church," think again, says Frank Fennell. He made it clear that at his institution (Loyola University Chicago), "if you want to talk about hiring Catholics for mission, it is about twenty-five years too late. . . . If you were to tell faculty tomorrow to 'hire for mission' with an emphasis on Catholic rather than, or over and above, Jesuit, . . . the present faculty simply will not do it." According to Fennell, Jesuit institutions will remain Catholic "only in a more inclusive, less juridical sense," where Catholic means something like seeing "the world as 'profoundly sacramental,' 'secular mysticism,'" love showing itself "'in deeds,' 'the need for a countercultural critique, 'a principle of ultimate meaning,' or 'compassionate service.'"

And so, six months after the closing liturgy of "Jesuit Education 21" on June 29, we review these papers and responses as the proceedings go to press. Clearly there is no question about the strong emphasis placed on Catholic identity by those currently engaged in Jesuit Higher Education. But while the emphasis is on Catholic identity, do we need to get ready for a new definition of what that means?

And if the answer to that question is “yes,” how will we define Catholic identity in the year 2000 and beyond?



Addendum: Retrospective Reflections (2026)

[Editorial Note: After revising his introductory essay on Jesuit Education 21, Father Tripole composed the following summary thoughts as he looked back on his earlier work and on the conference’s five highlights. His succinct review clarifies the position to which he has come after almost three decades of further observation, experience, and dialogue.]

Faith, Justice, and the Society’s Mission: The Overlooked Pivot of GC 34

When I first considered calling for a conference on Jesuit higher education at Saint Joseph’s University in the summer of 1999, my reason for doing so was not to focus first on issues regarding the nature of Jesuit higher education, but on a preliminary question whose answer would be crucial for understanding the purpose of Jesuit higher education: *What was the Jesuit mission?* No one seemed to notice the transformative revision that General Congregation 34 (1995) had made of GC 32’s 1975 declaration in answer to this question. The earlier congregation had stated that the Jesuit mission was “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is the absolute requirement.”²⁵ Five years had passed since GC 34, and still no one seemed to have registered what that congregation had done. Ever since GC 32 had impelled the delegates to approve this “faith/justice” formulation, many Jesuits, including myself, had found the declaration unsatisfactory for obvious reasons: It seemed to reduce the fundamental mission of the Jesuits—a religious institute—to a secular operation. Wasn’t the promotion of justice primarily the work of civic institutions? Nevertheless, Jesuits by and large came to accept the “faith/justice” slogan. It had its merits. After all, it was so benign a formulation of what Jesuits do that not even the most hardened atheist could contest it. Who is opposed to being just? But was the slogan accurate? Was the nature of the Jesuit mission properly defined as serving faith by promoting justice?

Some of the delegates at GC 34 realized the ill effects of the “faith/justice” formula. One of the delegates, John McDade (who gave a paper at our conference and argued in informal discussion that GC 32’s mission statement was leading to a left-wing “politicization” of the Society), sought to correct the secularizing effect of the “faith/justice” formula by proposing a more adequately comprehensive statement of the Jesuit mission. In GC 34’s Decree 2: “Servants of Christ’s Mission,” of which McDade was the primary author, the delegates affirmed that the Society’s “vocation” or mission was

25 “General Congregation 32, Decree 4,” no. 2.

“to serve faith and promote the justice of God’s Kingdom.”²⁶ That is quite a different statement. The decree does not deny that efforts to promote social justice are a valuable and important apostolate of the Society, but it makes this only one of many apostolates, not the nature of the mission of the Society as such. The new, more comprehensive formulation, gives primacy to the spiritual and sacramental apostolates enumerated in the Formula of the Institute in 1540 which St. Ignatius composed when establishing the Society, a document further elaborated in a 1550 version: The ministries of the Society, according to GC 34, are directed to whatever services—“whether works of pastoral service, academic scholarship, spiritual ministry, or education”—that free humankind from slavery to sin, and lead to the fullness of life in the Kingdom of God.²⁷

I had hoped that GC 34’s new, more comprehensive revision of the Society’s mission would be brought to light in the presentations and discussions at our 1999 conference, but this did not come to pass. The discussions on the “faith/justice” formula were mainly provoked by Joseph Fitzmyer’s paper, supported by Stanley Marrow’s response, that there was no clear and direct scriptural support for faith/justice as it was being purveyed. This insight implied that GC 32’s formulation of the Jesuit mission should be dropped, though not everyone agreed. The discussion was most enlightening, but if it led many at the conference to abandon GC 32’s “faith/justice” formulation, it did not lead to an awareness of the new and more appropriate formulation approved by GC 34. Still today, only a handful of Jesuits seem to realize that the Society has enacted into its bylaws a new, more accurate, and more spiritually centered understanding of the nature of the Jesuit mission.

Catholic Identity

Since the time of the conference, *Catholic identity* (the fifth highlight of the conference) in Jesuit schools seems to be eroding, due to an increasing *secularization* of our institutes (the second highlight), little *Jesuit/lay collaboration* (largely as a consequence of diminishing Jesuit presence) (the third highlight), and a failure to implement the guiding role of the Church in Catholic education called for in *Ex corde Ecclesiae* (the fourth highlight). The fervor generated by the conference initially seemed to provoke a strong push to maintain Catholic identity in Jesuit schools, but not everyone agreed; the naysayers were prominent among those who thought Catholic identity was no longer attractive to prospective students. Some pointed out that Jesuit presence was closely bound up with Catholic identity, so that if the latter faded, so would the former (Archbishop Pittau). This is probably proving to be true.

26 “General Congregation 34, Decree 2,” no. 11.

27 “General Congregation 34, Decree 2,” no. 10.

Joseph O'Hare, then president of Fordham University, argued that Catholic and Jesuit identity would survive only if a "critical mass" of Jesuits remained on the campus and were strongly supported by Catholic administrators and especially "faculties" committed to the "distinctive mission of Catholic higher education." O'Hare was right, because that critical mass of Jesuits has largely faded, and so, it can be reasonably argued, has the commitment of faculties.

An omen of what was to come was forcefully presented at the conference and announced without any fear of contradiction by Frank Fennell, at that time an administrator at Loyola University Chicago. Fennell stated in his paper that, at his institution, the faculty hire for Jesuit, not for Catholic "mission." (I wonder if even that remains true.) However, the "*Jesuit* educational vision," according to Fennell, describes a system at his institution that is not Catholic in the traditional sense of the term, and nor does Fennell imply that it is; rather, he calls it a "*Catholic* way of looking at the world." Borrowing expressions from other presenters, especially O'Hare, who rooted his vision in Ignatian principles, Fennell describes the Catholic vision dispensed at his university simply as seeing the world in a way that is "profoundly sacramental," having a "secular mysticism," with love showing itself "in deeds," providing "a principle of ultimate meaning," or in Fennell's own words, putting an "emphasis on compassionate service."

It seems to me this vision as a whole can be reduced to what I would call "Christianity-lite." It tends to avoid the "troublesome" features of traditional Catholicism that emphasize the need to respond to the call to Jesus Christ under the sign of the Cross with a way of life that leads to salvation through faith in Christ and ultimately to lasting membership in God's eternal Kingdom. Fennell's idea of Catholicism, stripped of these distinctively Catholic and Ignatian dimensions, is neither Catholic nor Jesuit. It is nothing more than secular humanism with at best a soft Christian coating. It is this Catholicism-without-Christ, in my view, that is mitigating Catholic presence at our universities today and resulting in the growing loss of authentic Catholic identity.

My conclusion is that these remarks raise both good and bad aspects. The Good: GC 34 has restored the mission of the Society of Jesus to its wholeness—promoting the development of the educational, spiritual, and sacramental life of others, as God leads us toward our ultimate goal of union with him in his Kingdom. The Not-So-Good: the basic foundations of our educational and ecclesial systems will continue to erode until there can be found those spirited lay and religious persons eager to revitalize the Catholic and Christian life of our communities.



Appendix: From the Table of Contents for “Jesuit Education 21”

[Editorial Note: Listed below are the titles, presenters, respondents, and panelists as given in the published volume. Not all presenters submitted a paper for publication, and some did not present but did submit a paper for publication.]

Introduction: Martin R. Tripole, S.J.

Friday, June 25, 1999

Greetings: Nicholas S. Rashford, S.J. / Charles L. Currie, S.J. / Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J. (video) / Most Reverend Joseph F. Martino

Session I

Keynote Address: A Mission for Jesuit Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century / Peter Steinfels

Saturday, June 26, 1999

Session II

What Is Jesuit Higher Education—The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice? / Robert J. Araujo, S.J.

Respondents: Denise Carmody / Francis X. Clooney, S.J. / James L. Marsh

Session III

Jesuit Higher Education and Dialogue with Culture

The Jesuit Mission and Dialogue with Culture / John McDade, S.J.

Respondents: Thomas J. Maloney, S.J. / John J. Pauly /

Katarina Schuth, O.S.F.

Session IV

Jesuit-Lay Collaboration

From Omaha to Philadelphia and Beyond: Jesuit-Lay Cooperation in Twenty-First Century Higher Education / Brennan O'Donnell

Respondents: Dominic J. Balestra / Peter B. Ely, S.J. / Darla Germeroth

Session V

What Do the Scriptures Say About Justice? / Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

Respondents: Richard J. Clifford, S.J. / Stanley B. Marrow, S.J. /

Mark S. Smith

Session VI

Late-night Special (concurrent meetings)

1. *Media and Technology: Instruments for Growth, Instruments for Destruction?*
 - Panelists: Timothy K. Casey / Dennis C. Smolarski, S.J. / Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
2. *The Role of Philosophy in Jesuit Higher Education*
 - Panelists: Ronald Anderson, S.J. / Elizabeth Murray Morelli / Robert J. Spitzer, S.J.
3. *The Role of Theology in Jesuit Higher Education*
 - Panelists: Paul F. Aspan / Avery Dulles, S.J. / Gerald M. Fagin, S.J.
4. *Student Everyday Life: How Catholic Is It?*
 - Panelists: Judy M. Deshotels / Brian B. Pinter / Lucien T. Roy

Sunday, June 27, 1999

Session VII

How Humanistic Is the Jesuit Tradition?: From the 1599 Ratio studiorum to Now / John W. O'Malley, S.J.

Respondents: Joseph J. Feeney, S.J. / Aldo D. Scaglione / Paul J. Shore

Sunday Liturgy / Homilist: Francis F. Burch, S.J.

Session VIII

Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Scholarship, Research, and Publication

Panelists: Paul G. Crowley, S.J. / Michael A. Fahey, S.J. / John C. Haughey, S.J. / John P. Langan, S.J.

Session IX

(concurrent meetings)

1. *Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Administration*
 - Panelists: J. Robert Barth, S.J. / John C. Hollwitz / John J. Piderit, S.J. / Nicholas S. Rashford, S.J.
2. *Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Business and Economics*
 - Panelists: Nancy Ruth Fox / Kathleen Kane / Gregory N. P. Konz, S.J. / Paul D. McNelis, S.J.
3. *Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Humanities*

- Panelists: Carol Nevin Abromaitis / Anthony C. Daly, S.J. / Frederick A. Homann, S.J.
- 4. *Jesuit Higher Education and the Role of Science*
 - Panelists: Robert C. Baumiller, S.J. / Frank R. Haig, S.J. / James F. Salmon, S.J. / L. Pearce Williams
- 5. *Does Jesuit Higher Education Change Students?*
 - Panelists: John M. Bradley / Tara E. Czechowski / Cheryl A. Deckert / Damian Servidio

Session X

Catholic Identity vs. Secularization: Whose Choice? / William J. Byron, S.J.
 Respondents: J. A. Appleyard, S.J. / Timothy R. Lannon, S.J. / Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.

Monday, June 28, 1999

Session XI

*The Role of Catholic Higher Education in the Future Life of the Church
 Nature and Mission of the Catholic Colleges and Universities* / Archbishop
 Giuseppe Pittau, S.J.

Session XII

*Jesuit Higher Education and the Church: Is it Time for a New Land O'Lakes
 Statement?*

Panelists: Lawrence H. Biondi, S.J. / James J. Conn, S.J. / William J. Currie, S.J.
 Honored Guest: Paul C. Reinert, S.J.

Session XIII

Developing a Moral Conscience in Jesuit Higher Education / William C. Spohn
 Respondents: Lisa Sowle Cahill / David Hollenbach, S.J. /
 Richard G. Malloy, S.J.

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Session XV

What Are the Odds of Jesuit Higher Education Surviving in America? /
 Joseph A. O'Hare, S.J.

Respondents: Francis L. Fennell / Scott R. Pilarz, S.J. / Stephen Schloesser, S.J.

Session XVI

Does Jesuit Higher Education Have a Future on the International Scene?

Panelists: Charles J. Beirne, S.J. / Gabriel Codina, S.J. / Daniel G. Ross, S.J. / John W. Swope, S.J.

Closing Liturgy / Homilist: James R. Stormes, S.J.

Correspondence:

Martin R. Tripole, S.J., Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA, USA; email: mtripole@sju.edu