

## ***“To Have Courage and Prophetic Audacity”***

### Dialogue of Pope Francis with the Jesuits gathered in the 36<sup>th</sup> General Congregation

*On October 24, 2016, Pope Francis met the Jesuits gathered in their 36<sup>th</sup> General Congregation. A few minutes before 9:00 in the morning he arrived in an ordinary car. After greeting Father General and the others who were waiting for him, he went to the Aula of the Congregation where he joined the delegates in prayer. Then he gave a speech. After a break, he entered into a time of frank and cordial dialogue with the delegates, who spontaneously asked him some questions. The Pope did not want the questions to be selected beforehand, nor did he want to see them first. This gave life to a familial encounter that lasted about an hour and a half. At the end, Francis greeted those present one by one. We reproduce the questions and answers below. In the Aula, for practical reasons, the questions were asked in groups of three. The following text reproduces the Pontiff's answers in their entirety and, for ease of reading, separates the questions, giving the basic thrust of each one. The text preserves the tone and meaning of the oral conversation.*

\*\*\*

*Holy Father, you are a living example of prophetic audacity. How do you communicate that audacity so effectively? How can we do it, too?*

Courage is not just about making noise, but about knowing how to do it well, when and how to do it. First of all one must discern whether one should make noise or not. Courage is constitutive of all apostolic action. And today, more than ever, we need courage and prophetic audacity. We need a *parresia*<sup>1</sup> for today, the prophetic audacity of having no fear. It is noteworthy that this was the first thing that John Paul II said when he was elected Pope: "Do not be afraid". He knew all the problems of the Eastern countries and audacity led him to confront them all.

What is the prophetic audacity that is asked of us today? We must discern this. That is, where should this prophetic audacity be channeled? It is an attitude born of the *magis*.<sup>2</sup> And the *magis* is *parresia*. The *magis* is founded on God who is always greater. Looking at that ever greater God, discernment deepens and seeks the places to channel the audacity. I believe that this is your work in this Congregation: to discern "where" the *magis*, the prophetic audacity, the *parresia*, must be directed.

Sometimes, prophetic audacity joins with diplomacy, with a work of persuasion accompanied by strong signs. For example, prophetic audacity is called upon to combat widespread corruption in some countries. Corruption, to give an example, such as when the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Parresía* is a Greek word prevalent in the Greek text of the New Testament. It indicates the courage and sincerity of the testimony. It is a word widely used in Christian tradition, especially at the beginning, sometimes as opposed to hypocrisy.

<sup>2</sup> The *magis* (the more, the greatest) in the Ignatian tradition comes from the famous maxim "ad maiorem Dei gloriam" (to the greater glory of God) and synthesizes a strong spiritual impulse. The work of the Jesuit is characterized by this *magis*, a living tension that reminds us how it is always possible to take a step forward from where we are, because our walk is in line with an ever more explicit manifestation of the glory of God. With the discernment of spirits we learn to recognize the good that dwells in each situation and to choose what leads to the greater good.

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

constitutional period of a term of office ends and one seeks to reform the Constitution to remain in power. I believe that here the Society, in its work of teaching and raising social awareness, must work with audacity to convince everyone that a country cannot grow if it does not respect the legal principles which that country itself has put in place to ensure future governability.

*Father, the way in which colonizers treated indigenous peoples has been a serious problem. The appropriation of the land by the colonizers was a grave event whose repercussions are felt today. What do you think about this?*

In the first place, it must be said that today we are more aware of the significance of the richness of the indigenous peoples, especially when, both politically and culturally, other forces tend to suppress them even more through globalization conceived as a "sphere," a globalization where everything becomes standardized. Today, our prophetic audacity, our consciousness, must be on the side of inculturation. And our image of globalization should not be the sphere, but the polyhedron. I like the geometric figure of the polyhedron, because it is one but has different faces. It expresses how unity is created while preserving the identities of the peoples, of the persons, of the cultures. That is the richness that today we have to give to the process of globalization, because otherwise it is homogenizing and destructive.

The process of a standardizing and destructive globalization destroys the indigenous cultures that in fact should be recovered. And we must recover them with the correct hermeneutic, which facilitates this task. This hermeneutic is not the same as at the time of colonization. The hermeneutic of that time was to seek the conversion of the peoples, to widen the Church ... thus abolishing the indigenous independence. It was a centralist type of hermeneutic, where the dominant empire somehow imposed its faith and culture. It is understandable that people thought this way at the time, but today a radically different hermeneutic is necessary. We have to interpret things differently, valuing each people, their culture, their language. We have to help this process of inculturation, which has become increasingly important since Vatican II.

I want to refer to attempts at inculturation that were present in the early days of the missions. These initiatives were born of an experience like that of Paul with the Gentiles. The Holy Spirit very clearly showed him that the Gospel was to be inculturated in the Gentile peoples. The same thing was repeated in the era of missionary expansion. Consider, for example, the experience of Matteo Ricci and Roberto de Nobili<sup>3</sup>. They were pioneers, but a hegemonic conception of Roman centralism stopped that experience, interrupted it. It prevented a dialogue in which cultures were respected. And this happened because they interpreted social customs with a religious hermeneutic. Respect for the dead, for example, was confused with idolatry. Here, hermeneutics play a central role. At this moment I believe that it is important, with this greater awareness that we have regarding indigenous peoples, to support the expression, the culture, of each one of them... and in the same way, evangelization, which also touches the liturgy and reaches the expressions of worship. And the Congregation for Divine Worship accepts this.

I end with a memory that touches on moral theology. When I was a student of theology, I was

---

<sup>3</sup> The Jesuits Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) and Roberto de Nobili (1577-1656) were true pioneers. Missionaries in China and India, respectively, they sought to adapt the proclamation of the Gospel to local culture and worship. But this caused some concern and, in the Church, voices were raised against the spirit of these behaviors, as if they were a contamination of the Christian message.

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

assigned to be a librarian. In reviewing a Mexican text on morality from the 1700s, written in a question-and-answer format, I found a question that said: "Is sexual union between a Spaniard and an indigenous woman a mortal sin?" The answer of the moralist, who was a Dominican, made me laugh: "The matter is serious, therefore it is a serious sin according to matter, but since the consequence of this would be one more Christian to enlarge the kingdom of God, it is not as serious as if it were in Europe."

*In your speech you clearly proposed a morality that is based on discernment. How do you suggest that we proceed in the field of morality with regard to this dynamic of discernment of moral situations? It seems to me that it is not possible to stay with an interpretation of a subsumed application of the norm which is limited to seeing particular situations as cases of the general norm.*

Discernment is the key element: the capacity for discernment. I note the absence of discernment in the formation of priests. We run the risk of getting used to "white or black," to that which is legal. We are rather closed, in general, to discernment. One thing is clear: today, in a certain number of seminaries, a rigidity that is far from a discernment of situations has been introduced. And that is dangerous, because it can lead us to a conception of morality that has a casuistic sense. It appears in different formulations, but it is always along the same line. I am very afraid of this. This is what I said in a meeting with the Jesuits in Krakow during the World Youth Day. There the Jesuits asked me what I thought the Society could do and I replied that an important task of the Society is to form seminarians and priests in discernment.

I and those of my generation, perhaps not the youngest here, but my generation and some of the later ones too, were educated in a decadent scholasticism. We studied theology and philosophy with manuals. It was a decadent scholasticism. For example, to explain the "metaphysical continuum" -- it makes me laugh every time I remember -- we were taught the theory of the "*puncta inflata*"<sup>4</sup>. When the great Scholasticism began to lose force, there arose that decadent scholasticism with which at least my generation and others have studied.

It was this decadent scholasticism that provoked the casuistic attitude. It is curious: the course on the "sacrament of penance," in the faculty of theology, in general - not everywhere - was presented by teachers of sacramental morality. The whole moral sphere was restricted to "you can", "you cannot", "up to here yes but not there". In an *Ad Audiendas* examination, a companion of mine, when asked a very intricate question, said very simply: "But Father, please, these things do not happen in reality!" And the examiner replied, "But it's in the books!"

It was a morality very foreign to discernment. At that time there was the "*cuco*"<sup>5</sup>, the specter of situational morality ... I think Bernard Häring<sup>6</sup> was the first to start looking for a new way to help moral theology to flourish again. Obviously, in our day moral theology has made much progress in its reflections and in its maturity; it is no longer a "casuistry."

---

<sup>4</sup> The Pope refers to the theories debates of the beginning of the 1600's in which Jesuits like Rodrigo de Arriaga were involved.

<sup>5</sup> Cuco could be translated as "bogeyman."

<sup>6</sup> Bernard Häring (1922-1998), a Redemptorist, was a German moral theologian and not one of the founders of the "Academia Alfonsiana." His work had a significant influence on the preparation and development of Vatican Council II.

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

In the field of morality we must advance without falling into situationalism: but, rather, it is necessary to bring forward again the great wealth contained in the dimension of discernment; this is characteristic of the great scholasticism. We should note something: St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure affirm that the general principle holds for all but -- they say it explicitly-- as one moves to the particular, the question becomes diversified and many nuances arise without changing the principle. This scholastic method has its validity. It is the moral method used by the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. And it is the method that was used in the last apostolic exhortation, *Amoris laetitia*, after the discernment made by the whole Church through the two Synods. The morality used in *Amoris laetitia* is Thomistic, but that of the great St. Thomas himself, not of the author of the "*puncta inflata*".

It is evident that, in the field of morality, one must proceed with scientific rigor, and with love for the Church and discernment. There are certain points of morality on which only in prayer can one have sufficient light to continue reflecting theologically. And on this, allow me to repeat it, one must do "theology on one's knees". You cannot do theology without prayer. This is a key point and it must be done this way.

*About the Society there are many legends: positive ones, from those who like us, and stories that are a bit dark from those who do not. To you, who love us and know us well, I want to ask: what things would you like us to pay attention to?*

For me it is a bit difficult to respond, because it is necessary to see where the criticisms come from. It is difficult because, in my situation and in the environment in which I move, criticisms of the Society have a predominantly restorationist flavor. In other words, they are criticisms that dream of a restoration of a Society that perhaps was once attractive, because that was its time, but that is no longer desirable in our day, because God's time for the Society today is no longer that. I think this is the kind of argumentation behind the criticism. But the Society on this point has to be faithful to what the Spirit tells it.

Critiques also depend on who makes them. We should discern where they come from. I think that sometimes even the most malicious critic can say something that helps me. I think we have to listen to all the critiques and discern them, and not close the door to any criticism, because we risk getting used to closing doors. And that's not good. After discernment one can say: this criticism has no foundation and I can set it aside. But we must submit to discernment all of the criticism that we hear, I would say daily, personally, but always with good will, with openness of heart and before the Lord.

*We live in a world characterized by political and religious polarizations. You, in fact, have lived different experiences in your life, as Provincial and as Archbishop of Buenos Aires. From your experience, what suggestions for us can you make of ways to confront these situations of polarization, especially when our brothers are involved in them?*

I think that politics in general, big politics, has been increasingly degraded into small politics. Not only in partisan politics within each country, but also in sectoral politics within the same continent. I wanted to address this specific question - because I was asked - with the three speeches about Europe, the two in Strasburg and the one of the "Charlemagne" Prize. The French Bishops have just issued a communique on politics that takes up again or follows upon one from

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

fifteen or twenty years ago, "*Réhabiliter la politique*", which was very important. That declaration was timely: it gave force to politics, to politics as craftsmanship used to build the unity of peoples and the unity of a people with all the diversity that is within them. In general, the opinion I hear is that politicians are on the wane. Countries lack those great politicians who were able to spend themselves seriously for their ideals and were not afraid of dialogue or struggle, but went ahead, with intelligence and with the charism specific to politics. Politics is one of the highest forms of charity. Great politics. And in that I think that polarization does not help. On the contrary, what helps in politics is dialogue.

*What is your experience with the brothers in the Society, in terms of their role, and how can one attract those with the vocation to be a brother in the Society?*

My experience with the brothers has always been very positive. The brothers with whom I lived during my time as a student were wise men, very wise. They had a wisdom different from that of scholastics or that of the priests. Today, even brothers who have studied a great deal and who have leadership positions in the institutions still have an "I do not know what" that is different from the priests. And I think this has to be preserved, the wisdom, that special sapiential quality that comes from being a brother.

What's more, in the brothers I knew, I was impressed by their special sense, the ability to "smell" that they had when they said, for example: "Watch that father, I think he needs special help ..." The brothers I have known often had great discretion. And they helped! The brother realized, before any other community members, what was happening. I do not know how to express it, I believe that there is a specific grace here and we must find what God's will is for the brother right now, and we also have to find how to express it.

*I would like to hear you say when the prophecy of Isaiah will be fulfilled: "They will beat their swords into plowshares..." In my continent, Africa, we already have enough means to kill each of us ten times.*

Working for peace is urgent. I said, more than a year and a half ago, that we are in World War III, in bits and pieces. Now the bits are gathering more and more. We are in war. Do not be naive. The world is at war and several countries pay the price. Let us think of the Middle East, of Africa: there is a situation of continuous war. Wars that derive from a whole history of colonization and exploitation. It is true that countries have their independence, but often the country that gave them independence has reserved the subsoil for itself. Africa remains a target of exploitation for the riches it has. Even from countries that previously did not even think about this continent. Africa is always viewed from the perspective of exploitation. And clearly this provokes wars.

In addition, in some countries there is the problem of ideologization, which causes major fractures. I believe that working for peace at this juncture, besides being one of the beatitudes, is a priority. When will peace come? I do not know if it will come before the coming of the Son of Man, but I do know, on the other hand, that we have to work for peace as much as possible, through politics, through coexistence. It can come. It can. With the Christian attitudes that the Lord shows us in the Gospel, much can be done, much is done, and we move forward. Sometimes this comes at a high price, in first person. And still we go ahead. Martyrdom is part of our vocation.

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

*Can we be saved alone? What is the relationship between community salvation and personal salvation?*

No one is saved alone. I believe that this principle must be kept very clear: salvation is for the People of God. No one is saved alone. The one who wishes to save himself, along his own path of fulfillment, will end with that adjective that Jesus uses so many times: hypocrite. He ends in hypocrisy. To be saved alone, to attempt to save oneself, with an elitist attitude, is hypocrisy. The Lord has come to save everyone.

*Is it good to study theology in a real-life context?*

My advice is that everything that young people study and experience in their contact with different contexts, be also subject to personal and community discernment and taken to prayer. There must be academic study, contact with real life not only at the periphery but at the boundary of the periphery, prayer and personal and community discernment. If a community of students does all this, I am at peace. When one of those things is missing, I start to worry. If study is lacking, then one can say nonsense or idealize situations in a simplistic way. If there is no real and objective context, accompanied by those who know the environment and help, foolish idealisms can arise. If there is a lack of prayer and discernment, we can be very good sociologists or political scientists, but we will not have the evangelical audacity and the evangelical cross that we must carry, as I said at the beginning.

*The Society, after GC 35, has gone some way toward the understanding of environmental challenges. We received "Laudato si" with joy. We feel that the Pope has opened doors for dialogue with institutions. What more can we continue to do in order to continue to feel involved in this issue?*

*Laudato si'* is an encyclical on which many have worked, and the scientists who worked on it were asked to say well founded things and not simple hypotheses. Many people worked on the encyclical. My work, in effect, was to set the guidelines, to make a few corrections and then to prepare the final edition, yes, with my style and elaborating some things. And I think we must continue to work, through movements, academically and also politically. In fact, it is evident that the world is suffering, not only because of global warming but because of the misuse of things and because nature is mistreated.

One must also take into account, in the interpretation of *Laudato si'*, that it is not a "green encyclical". It is a social encyclical. It begins with the reality of this moment, which is ecological, but it is a social encyclical. It is evident that those who suffer the consequences are the poorest, those who are discarded. It is an encyclical that confronts this culture of discarding people. We have to work hard on the social part of the encyclical because the theologians who worked on it were very concerned to show how much social impact the ecological facts have. It helps a lot to look at this as a social encyclical.

*Does Pope Francis want a poor Society for the poor? What advice do you give us for walking in that direction?*

I think that on this point of poverty St. Ignatius has gone far beyond us. When one reads how

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

he thought about poverty, and about that vow that requires us not change poverty unless to make it more strict, we have to reflect. The view of St. Ignatius is not just an ascetic attitude, as if to pinch me so that it pains me more, but it is a love of poverty as a way of life, as a way of salvation, an ecclesial way. Because for Ignatius, and these are two key words that he uses, poverty is both mother and bulwark. Poverty nurtures, mothers, generates spiritual life, a life of holiness, apostolic life. And it is a wall, it defends. How many ecclesial disasters began because of a lack of poverty, including outside the Society, I mean in the whole Church in general. How many of the scandals which I, unfortunately, have to find out about, are born of money. I believe that St. Ignatius had a very great intuition. In the Ignatian vision of poverty we have a source of inspiration to help us.

Clericalism, which is one of the most serious illnesses that the Church has, distances itself from poverty. Clericalism is rich. If it is not rich in money, it is rich in pride. But it is rich: there is in clericalism an attachment to possession. It does not allow itself to be nurtured by mother poverty, it does not allow itself to be guarded by the wall of poverty. Clericalism is one of the forms of wealth that we suffer from most seriously in the Church today. At least in some places of the Church. Even in the most everyday experiences. The poor Church for the poor is the Church of the Gospel, the Sermon on the Mount of the Gospel of Matthew, and the Sermon on the Plain of the Gospel of Luke, as well as the "protocol" according to which we will be judged: Matthew

25. I believe that the Gospel is very clear about this and it is necessary to walk in this direction. But I would also insist that it would be good for the Society to help deepen Ignatius's vision of poverty, because I believe it is a vision for the whole Church. Something that can help us all.

*You spoke very well of the importance of consolation. When you reflect at the end of each day, what things give you consolation, and what things take consolation away from you?*

I am talking to family, so I can say it: I am rather pessimistic, always! I am not saying that I am depressive, because that is not true. But it is true that I tend to focus on what did not work well. So for me consolation is the best antidepressant I have ever found! I find it when I stand before the Lord, and let Him manifest what He has done during the day. When at the end of the day I realize that I have been led, when I realize that despite my resistance, there was a driving force there, like a wave that carried me along, this gives me consolation. It is like feeling, "He is here." With regard to my pontificate, it consoles me to feel interiorly: "It was not a convergence of votes that got me into this dance, but that He is in there." This consoles me. And when I notice the times when my resistances have won, that makes me feel sorrow and leads me to ask for forgiveness. This is quite common ... and it does me good. To realize that, as St. Ignatius says, one is "all impediment," to recognize that one has his resistances and that every day he lives them and that sometimes he overcomes them and sometimes he does not. This experience keeps one in his place. This helps. This is my personal experience, in the simplest possible terms.

*The exhortation "Evangelii gaudium" is very inspiring and encourages us to talk more about the theme of evangelization. What do you mean by the last words, in which you exhort us to continue the debate?*

One of the dangers of the Pope's writings is that they create a little enthusiasm, but then others

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

come along and the preceding ones are filed away. That is why I think it is important to continue working, hence that final indication that meetings are to be held and the message of *Evangelii gaudium* is to be deepened: it expresses a way of facing different ecclesial problems and evangelization for the Christian life. I think that you were referring to an exhortation that is at the end, and that comes from the *Aparecida* document. In that passage, we wanted to refer to *Evangelii nuntiandi*, which continues to have the freshest timeliness, as it had when it first came out, and that for me remains the most important pastoral document written after Vatican II. However, it is not mentioned, it is not cited. Well, the same thing can happen with *Evangelii gaudium*. A few days ago I read that it would be necessary to take up again the point about the homily in *Evangelii gaudium*, because it had passed into silence. There is something that the Church has to correct in her preaching and that takes away a clericalist element. I believe that *Evangelii gaudium* has to be deepened, it must be worked on by groups of the laity, of priests, in the seminaries, because it is the evangelizing breath that the Church wants to have today. In this we have to move forward. It is not something finished, as if we were to say, "that's over, now comes *Laudato si'*". And then, "that's over, too, now it is on to *Amoris laetitia*." By no means! I recommend *Evangelii gaudium* to you as a framework. It is not original, in this I want to be very clear. It puts together *Evangelii nuntiandi* and the *Aparecida* document. Although it came after the Synod on Evangelization, *Evangelii gaudium's* strength was to return to those two documents, to refresh them, and to offer them again in a new presentation. *Evangelii gaudium* is the apostolic framework of the Church today.

*The Church is experiencing a decline in vocations, especially in places where she has been reluctant to promote local vocations.*

It happened to me in Buenos Aires, as Bishop, that very good priests, more than once, chatting with me, said: "In the parish I have a layman 'who is worth gold!'" They would describe him as a first-class layman and then ask, "Do you think we can make him a deacon?" This is the problem: the layman who is valuable, we make into a deacon. We clericalize him. In a letter I recently sent to Cardinal Ouellet, I wrote that in Latin America, the only thing more or less saved from clericalism is popular piety. In fact, since popular piety is one of those things "of the people" that priests did not believe in, lay people were creative. It may have been necessary to correct some things, but popular piety was saved because the priests did not get involved in it. Clericalism does not allow growth, it does not allow the power of baptism to grow. The grace and evangelizing power of the missionary expression comes from the grace of baptism. And clericalism controls this grace badly and gives rise to dependencies, which sometimes have whole peoples in a state of very great immaturity. I remember the fights that took place when I was a student of theology or a young priest and the base ecclesial communities appeared. Why? Because the laypeople began to have strong leadership, and the first ones who felt insecure were some of the priests. I am generalizing too much, but I do this on purpose: if I caricature the problem it is because the problem of clericalism is very serious.

With regard to local vocations, I say that the vocational decline will be spoken of at the next Synod. I believe that vocations exist, you just have to know how to propose them and how to attend to them. If the priest is always in a hurry, if he is involved in a thousand administrative things, if we do not convince ourselves that spiritual direction is not a clerical charism, but a lay charism (which the priest can also develop), and if we do not call upon the laity in vocational discernment, it is evident that we will not have vocations.

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

Young people need to be heard; and the young can be tiring. They always come with the same issues and you have to listen to them. And of course, for this you have to be patient, to be seated and to listen. And also to be creative: you have to put them to work on things. Today, always having "meetings" no longer makes much sense, they are not fruitful. Young people should be sent on activities that are missionary, catechetical, or social, and these do a lot of good.

Once I came to parish on the periphery, in a shantytown. The priest had told me that he was building a meeting room. And since this priest also taught at the state university, he had aroused enthusiasm and desire among both boys and girls to participate. I arrived on a Saturday and they were working as masons: the engineer who was running everything was Jewish, one of the girls was an atheist and the other, I do not know what, but they were united in a common job. This experience led to the question: can I do something for others and with others? You have to put young people to work and listen to them. I would say these two things.

Not promoting local vocations is suicide, it is directly sterilizing a Church, the Church who is mother. Not promoting vocations is an ecclesial tubal ligation. It does not allow that mother to have her children. And that is serious.

*Digitalization is the typical feature of this modern age. It creates speed, tension, crisis. What is its impact on today's society? What can be done to have both speed and depth?*

The Dutch, thirty years or more ago, invented a word: "rapid-ize." That is, a geometric progression in terms of velocity; and it is this "rapid-izing" that turns the digital world into a potential threat. I do not speak here of its positive aspects because we all know them. I also emphasize the problem of liquidity, which can cancel out what is concrete. Someone told me a while ago of a European bishop who went to see a businessman friend. He showed the bishop how, in ten minutes, he was completing an operation that made some profit. From Los Angeles he sold cattle to Hong Kong and in a few minutes had a profit that was immediately credited to his account. The liquidity of the economy, the liquidity of labor: all this causes unemployment. And a liquid world. One wants to call for a "return", although I do not like the word because it is a bit nostalgic. "Volver" is the title of an Argentine tango! There is a desire to recover the concrete dimension of work. In Italy, 40% of young people aged 25 and under are unemployed; in Spain 50%; in Croatia 47%. It is an alarm signal that shows that this liquidity creates unemployment.

Thank you for the questions and the liveliness of the conversation, and forgive me if I have spoken too freely.

\*\*\*

*At the end of the dialogue, Fr. Arturo Sosa, S.J., Superior General of the Society of Jesus, greeted the Pope with these words:*

*Holy Father, at the end of these two sessions, on behalf of all the companions gathered in the 36th General Congregation, I want to thank you from my heart for your fraternal presence among us*

## COMPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

*and, thanks be to God, for speaking freely! Thank you for your contribution to our discernment.*

*We are grateful that you have confirmed the invitation to live our charism deeply, walking with the Church and so many men and women of goodwill, moved by compassion, determined to console by reconciling, sensitive to discern the signs of the times.*

*To walk without giving in to the temptation to stay in one of the many beautiful corners we find along the way. To walk, moved by the freedom of the Children of God that makes us available to be sent anywhere, encountering a suffering humanity, following the dynamic of the incarnation of the Lord Jesus, relieving the suffering of so many brothers and sisters, placed, like Him, on the cross.*

*We will walk together, according to our way of proceeding, without dissolving the tensions between faith and justice, dialogue and reconciliation, contemplation and action ... A path that leads us to a deep encounter with the human richness expressed in cultural diversity. We will continue our efforts of inculturation in order to better announce the gospel and to show forth the intercultural face of our common Father.*

*We will faithfully follow your advice to join in your unceasing prayer to receive the consolation that will make of each Jesuit, and of all men and women who share the mission of Christ, servants of the joyful news of the Gospel.*

*With grateful hearts, we now would like to greet you personally.*

*(Original: Italian)*