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Introduction

Latin America is a region with some of the greatest economic and social inequality in the world. At the same time, its cultural identity is inseparable from the Catholicism that has permeated its culture since the Conquest. This historical and cultural conjunction brings deep questions about the Church and its educational institutions, as well as the efforts made to understand it, which can be said to have started with Max Weber’s classic The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. For there can be no greater tension between, on the one hand, the doctrinal bases of a faith founded on values of fraternity and communion among brothers, and on the other hand, socio-economic structures which the Catholic Church, since Vatican II, and especially through documents of the Latin American Episcopate – from Medellín (1968) to Aparecida (2007) – condemns as a social sin. Vatican II increased this tension, in particular for the religious orders running elite educational institutions throughout Latin America and also in other parts of the Third World (Smith, 1982), affecting their educational mission in ways that this chapter will analyse based on the experience of Chile.

With regard to this outlined socio-cultural backdrop, we intend to examine how different schools – historically serving the Chilean elites – deal in their mission statements with socio-economic inequalities and marked patterns of social segmentation
present in society; how they thematise dialogue between faith and culture; and how they conceive of, or do not refer to, preparation for political life. We will compare the mission statements with regard to these three dimensions of social formation, enquiring as to how the various educational projects relate to the teachings of Vatican II and Conferences of the Latin American Episcopate.

First, the chapter provides a very broad description of the distinctive characteristics of the congregations from which the educational projects will be compared. This is followed by a stylized description (selection of key quotations from official documents) of key features of Vatican Council II and Latin American Episcopate Conference orientations, in relation to three selected analytical dimensions: social inequality, politics, and faith and culture. A third section compares definitions of the current educational projects of these congregations, identifying their distinctive features and their relation to the Church Magisterium documents. A very brief concluding section questions the silences revealed in the mission statements of the examined institutions.

**Catholic religious orders and the impact of Vatican II on elite education in Chile**

In Chile, as well as in the rest of Latin America, the first schools were linked to the religious orders that arrived to the continent within the framework of the Conquest. Mercedarians, Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits arrived and established schools at the end of the 16th century. The first Jesuits arrived in 1593 and immediately started a double-purpose educational mission, which also characterized the work of other congregations: the education of Spanish and creole elites, as well as the indigenous population. The Jesuits were expelled by the Spanish Crown in 1767, and restarted their
activities in the country in 1856, at a time of significant influx of new religious orders coming from Europe to set up schools for the education of the new nation’s elites (Chile ended its wars of Independence from the Spanish Crown in 1818): Sacred Heart Nuns (1830s) and Sacred Heart Fathers (1850s), Sisters of the Divine Providence (1853), Don Bosco Salesians (1880s), and Divine Word Missionaries (1900), among others. Thus, Spanish, French, German and Italian religious orders competed for the preparation of the country’s small group of elites, significantly comprised of immigrants from these same countries. As we shall see, North American influence in Chilean Catholic education started in the 1940s (Aedo-Richmond, 2000; Martinez and Silva, 1971; Serrano, 2000).

From the viewpoint of this chapter and its questions about the current educational work of religious congregations with contrasting missions, the key historical event, loaded with implications for the relationships of the Catholic Church with the country’s elites, consists of the post-Vatican II and especially post-Medellín changes made by the religious orders that sustained the traditional schools with the greatest influence among the elites at the time: Colegio San Ignacio (Jesuits), St. George’s (Holy Cross Fathers), and Sagrados Corazones (Sacred Heart Fathers). The changes involved two directions, both traumatic to the groups traditionally educated at such institutions. The first was the democratization of enrolment, which had been explicitly requested by the Conference of Bishops at Medellín, through various strategies that sought to bring a dose of heterogeneity to the social make-up of the student body. This was accomplished by the North American Holy Cross Fathers giving scholarships to working-class students at their St George’s School, as well as by the Jesuits offering differentiated fees and also scholarships for students at their San Ignacio schools. The second change – and this
alternative also involved several female religious orders – involved congregations deciding in favour of focusing on pastoral activities in poor and marginalised areas, which also meant subordinating or abandoning their educational mission with the elites.\textsuperscript{vii}

The combination of these new orientations, which each congregation carried out inspired by their interpretation of Vatican II and Medellín,\textsuperscript{viii} along with the political and socio-cultural effervescence of the socialist revolution project of President Allende, came to a climax in the initiative to hand some schools over to the government, as was attempted by the Society of Jesus and the Sacred Heart congregations in 1971. According to Princeton University’s historian and political scientist Brian Smith:

\begin{quote}
The Sacred Heart Fathers and the Jesuits announced in early 1971 that they planned to turn over some of their private schools to the government so as to reorient them more toward service to the poor. The U.S.-based Congregation of the Holy Cross kept its one school (St George’s in Santiago) but raised tuition for rich students so as to give more scholarships to those from working class areas. (Smith 1982, 187)\textsuperscript{ix}
\end{quote}

The initiative did not prosper,\textsuperscript{x} and after the 1973 \textit{coup d'état} the Jesuits continued and later expanded their activities in the field of education, whereas the fathers of the Sacred Heart (\textit{Sagrados Corazones}) Congregation did not return to run the schools they had sustained for more than a century, instead transferring them to the Diocesan Church of Santiago.
The initial response by part of the Catholic elite to these events was to move their sons and daughters to newly set up schools by the Opus Dei. One decade later, in another socio-political setting (not threatened by a socialist revolution but corresponding instead to the triumph of Pinochet’s neoliberal revolution in economics and authoritarian rule in politics and culture), they moved their children to schools founded by the newly arrived (during the 1980s) Legionnaires of Christ, a religious movement of recent Mexican origin.

It has been almost half a century since the evoked processes that produced a division in Catholic education of the elite in the country so profound that it continues in the present day. To examine these processes, we ask: What are the principles and formative criteria declared in the educational mission statements of key congregations, two at each side of the divide established in the 1970s? On the one hand, there are the educational projects of two religious congregations with century-old origins, Society of Jesus and Order of the Holy Cross, and on the other, the two contemporary religious movements Opus Dei and Legionnaires of Christ. As mentioned, we are interested in the relation between their declared educational purposes and the Magisterium of the Church regarding poverty, injustice, inter-cultural dialogue, and politics.

To begin, we will briefly refer to the origins of the four congregations, as well as some basic features of their presence in Chilean education today, to give some context to the interpretation of their educational projects and how they relate to the Church’s Magisterium.

Society of Jesus
The Society of Jesus was founded in 1540 by Saint Ignatius of Loyola and a group of students at the University of Paris. Its origin is viewed as one of the Catholic Church’s answers to the schism of Protestant Reform. God, the human person, and creation are the three fundamental pillars of Ignatian experience. Ignatius defined a need for the strong and prolonged preparation for an embracing of creation by ‘contemplatives in action,’ and the missionary zeal of the Society soon became central to the Society’s preference for work at the frontiers, both material and symbolic. The order established itself as the leading order in the education of European Catholic elites for almost three centuries, with its curriculum, the *Ratio Studiorum*, becoming notorious for its conjunction between classical culture and Catholic doctrines (Durkheim 1977). Characterized by the intellectual weight of their preparation, Jesuits give much importance to constant socio-cultural analysis in order to have the necessary tools to enlighten and substantiate their work, where great relevance is given to interdisciplinary and inter-cultural dialogue and the Christian faith.

At present, the Jesuits in Chile, together with the two traditional San Ignacio schools in the capital, directly run another eight schools from the north to the south of the country, along with a network of associated Ignatian Schools (*Red Educacional Ignaciana*). Their mission is to ‘offer comprehensive quality education for boys, girls, youth, and adults, through educational communities that experience the society based on fairness and solidarity that we aspire to build, that contribute to improving national education, and collaborate with the evangelizing mission of the Church.’

_Holy Cross_
The Congregation of the Holy Cross was founded by Blessed Basilio Moreau on 1
March 1837 in Sainte-Croix, on the outskirts of the city of Le Mans, France. The
Congregation focused early on primary, secondary, and university education,
becoming a Missionary Congregation of educators. The Congregation of the Holy
Cross celebrates diversity as wealth, with differences seen as a gift for service.

Its history began with a group of missionary priests sent to the United States
who settled in Indiana, where they founded what was to become the largest
Catholic University in that country, Notre Dame. The priests who came to Chile in
1943 to take charge of St George’s College came from the congregation’s group
in New Orleans, Louisiana, in the United States (St George’s College 2003). The
spirit of service and the pluralist and pragmatic disposition of the Holy Cross priests
quickly had an impact, and by the 1950s the school had 1,100 students.

In the 1970s, the school became co-educational and the community acutely
experienced the socio-political conflict of the time. According to their own records:
‘The St George’s educational community sought to respond to the sign of the times
and the teachings of the document on education by the Latin American Episcopal
Conference held in Medellín’ (St George’s College 2003, 7). However, ‘Some
families did not share the educational plan of the school and withdrew their
children. In 1973, several educational institutions were intervened by the Military
Government, among these, Saint George’s College.’

After three years of military intervention, when the school no longer
belonged to the Church, the government returned it to the Archdiocese of Santiago
that ran it for six years. The Congregation of the Holy Cross recovered the institution in 1987.

**Opus Dei**

Opus Dei was founded in 1928, by Spanish priest (now Saint) Jose María Escrivá de Balaguer, while he was doing spiritual work in Madrid. On 16 June 1950, Pope Pious XII granted definitive approval of Opus Dei, which allows married people to join the organization, and secular clergy to be admitted to the Priestly Society of the Holy Cross.

Since its initial decade, the focus of Opus Dei has been on encountering Christ through work, family life, and in all other day-to-day activities. Its evangelizing mission promotes and encourages a life coherent with the faith in all circumstances, and above all through the sanctification of work: ‘work well done conducts to God.’

In Chile, the first Opus Dei priest (Adolfo Rodríguez) arrived in 1950, and the first schools were opened in 1969 and 1970. They received immediate support and expanded quickly and substantially in terms of enrolment and influence. This was a direct result of the above-mentioned 1970s crisis in elite group relationships with traditional Catholic schools, which at the time were moving towards the democratization and pro-equity orientations promoted by Vatican II, and especially by the Medellín Conference of Latin American Bishops in 1968.

During the 1980s, Opus Dei founded Universidad de Los Andes, and during the 1990s, the congregation set up the Nocedal and Almendral technical/vocational schools located in disadvantaged areas of Santiago. It is through these initiatives that they began
to offer education at both ends of the income, power, and status stratification of Chilean society.

*Legionnaires of Christ*

The movement of the Legionnaires started in January 1941 when Mexican priest Marcial Maciel founded the Legion of Christ in Mexico City. His main interest was to form Catholic leaders. In Chile, the congregation arrived in 1981, when the then Archbishop of Santiago, Cardinal Raúl Silva, asked the Legionnaires of Christ to direct the Instituto Zambrano, a traditional Catholic school serving working-class groups in the central area of the city. Subsequently, on 10 March 1986, the Legionnaires founded a school for the elite, Colegio Cumbres, inaugurated under the leadership of two consecrated Regnum Christi devotees (the lay branch of the Legionnaires).

Legionnaires acquired the Finis Terrae University in 1988 and expanded their educational work in the schooling system, founding the elite-serving schools Cumbres, Everest, and Highlands in Santiago, as well as the schools San Isidro and La Cruz outside the capital.

As can be seen in Table 11.1, in terms of the number of schools and enrolment of the four congregations, Legionnaires of Christ is the only one that does not have schools serving lower or middle income groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congregation</th>
<th>Year of arrival in Chile</th>
<th>Total # of Schools</th>
<th>Lower &amp; middle income schools</th>
<th>Elite schools</th>
<th>Total enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Novices</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Missionaries</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Jesus</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Dei</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legionnaires</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors, based on Ministry of Education, [http://www.mime.mineduc.cl/mvc/mime/portada](http://www.mime.mineduc.cl/mvc/mime/portada), as well as data collected directly from Congregations’ sources.

**Mission: Magisterium definitions**

It is a task far beyond the limits of this chapter to account for the Magisterium of the Church with regard to the three dimensions through which we wish to compare the four congregations’ educational projects. Instead, we attempt in this section to show the broadest features of the normative horizon established therein with regard to social inequality and injustice, politics, and the dialogue between faith and culture, which supposedly informs the educational projects in the Chilean case.

*Vatican II*

Vatican II, in the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes* on the Church in the Modern World (1965), makes explicit its shift towards the world and the embracing of humanity and its history, denouncing as a grave error the separation of religious life and commitment to ‘the earthly city.’ Its commitment underlies the shift towards valuing cultures, the role of laymen in the Church, the importance given to politics, and preference for the poor:

This council exhorts Christians, as citizens of two cities, to strive to discharge their earthly duties conscientiously and in response to the Gospel spirit. They are
mistaken who, knowing that we have here no abiding city but seek one which is to come, (...) think that they may therefore shirk their earthly responsibilities. For they are forgetting that by the faith itself they are more obliged than ever to measure up to these duties, each according to his proper vocation. [...] This split between the faith which many profess and their daily lives deserves to be counted among the more serious errors of our age. (Second Vatican Council 1965, para. 43)

Regarding faith and culture, the shift established by Vatican II is declared in terms that value the richness of human cultures and calls for a ‘living exchange between the Church and the diverse cultures of people.’ Thus:

… from the beginning of her history [the Church] has learned to express the message of Christ with the help of the ideas and terminology of various philosophers, and has tried to clarify it with their wisdom, too. (...) Indeed this accommodated preaching of the revealed word ought to remain the law of all evangelization. For thus the ability to express Christ's message in its own way is developed in each nation, and at the same time there is fostered a living exchange between the Church and the diverse cultures of people. (Second Vatican Council 1965, para. 44)

Gaudium et Spes (Joys and Hopes), written a half century ago, is explicit about the value of politics and its definition as inseparable from the pursuit of the common good, wherein lies its ‘full justification’:
The political community exists, consequently, for the sake of the common good, in which it finds its full justification and significance, and the source of its inherent legitimacy. Indeed, the common good embraces the sum of those conditions of the social life whereby men, families and associations more adequately and readily may attain their own perfection. (Second Vatican Council 1965, para. 74)

The Church praises and esteems the work of those who for the good of men devote themselves to the service of the state and take on the burdens of this office. (para. 75)

The document’s climax lies in its discussion of politics, in which it calls for appropriate formation for all, especially youth, and those dedicated to it, proposing the moral basis for citizens’ practice as well as the clear-cut general purpose of ‘action against any form of injustice and tyranny’:

Great care must be taken about civic and political formation, which is of the utmost necessity today for the population as a whole, and especially for youth, so that all citizens can play their part in the life of the political community. Those who are suited or can become suited should prepare themselves for the difficult, but at the same time, the very noble art of politics, and should seek to practice this art without regard for their own interests or for material advantages. With
integrity and wisdom, they must take action against any form of injustice and tyranny, against arbitrary domination by an individual or a political party and any intolerance. They should dedicate themselves to the service of all with sincerity and fairness, indeed, with the charity and fortitude demanded by political life.

(Second Vatican Council 1965, para. 75).

*Latin American and the Caribbean Conferences of Bishops*

The successive Conferences of Bishops of Latin America and the Caribbean since Vatican II cover more than four decades of history of the Church and the continent. As the reach and multi-dimensionality of this double-edged historicity are impossible to surmise here, we restrict our intent to identifying the direction of the Latin American Magisterium, regarding the three same dimensions foregrounded in the Council’s documents.

*Social inequality, injustice, and preference for the poor*

The denunciation by the Bishops of the Region of poverty and social injustice is biblical in tone – ‘devastating and humiliating flagellum’ (Third General Conference 1979, para. 29), which ‘cry to heaven’ (Fifth General Conference 2007, para. 395, quoting Pope John Paul II) – and consistent among the four Conferences in its reference to their sources in economic, social and political structures:

The luxury of the few becomes an insult. This is contrary to the plan of the Creator and the honour due to him. In this anguish and pain, the Church discerns a
situation of social sin, of greater gravity as it takes place in countries that called themselves catholic and which have the capacity to change. (Third General Conference 1979, para. 52)

This reality demands (...) personal conversion and profound changes in the structures that answer to the legitimate aspirations of the people for social justice, changes that in the experience of Latin America have not come, or have been too slow. (para. 30)

In Aparecida, almost three decades later, in quite different external as well as Church contexts, the tone and framing has changed, but not the direction of the earlier definitions of Medellín, Puebla, and Santo Domingo:

If we pretend to close our eyes against these realities [of poverty, exclusion and abandonment of many] we are not defenders of the life of the Kingdom and we situate ourselves on the path of death (...) It is necessary to underline “the inseparable relation between love of God and love of neighbour,” which “invites everyone to suppress the grave social inequalities and the enormous differences in the access to goods”... Both the concern for developing more just social structures and the transmission of the social values of the Gospel, are situated in this context of fraternal service to a life of dignity. (Fifth General Conference 2007, para. 358).
Faith and Culture

Two dimensions in the Conferences’ successive tackling of ‘faith-culture’ relationships need to be foregrounded for our analysis: how the above-mentioned Council’s concept of the ‘enriching dialogue’ between faith and culture is thematised, and how the cultural realities of indigenous and popular cultures and their religiosity are signified and valued. Both dimensions signal an ‘other’ that brings important implications for the Latin American Church in its own ‘modern world’ (Larrain 2000).

The questioning nature of popular religiosity for pre-Vatican II doctrinal and liturgical traditions was bluntly stated by Puebla in 1979:

We are in an urgent situation. Transition from a rural agrarian society to an urban-industrial society submits the religion of the people to a decisive crisis […] It shall be necessary to review spirituality, attitudes, and tactics of the elites in the Church with regard to popular religiosity. As Medellín well pointed out, “this religiosity places the Church before the dilemma of continuing to be the Universal Church or becoming a sect, by not thereby vitally incorporating such men who express that type of religiosity. (Third General Conference 1979, Ch. 3.4).

In Aparecida, close to thirty years later, the call to dialogue with the many manifestations of modern culture is widely encompassing and at the same time specific, distinguishing ambits and topics that the evangelizing mission should reach. Pope Benedict XVI, in his inaugural address at Aparecida, repeated the principles and criteria established from Medellín onwards:
Authentic cultures are not closed in upon themselves, nor are they set in stone at a particular point in history, but they are open, or better still, they are seeking an encounter with other cultures, hoping to reach universality through encounter and dialogue with other ways of life and with elements that can lead to a new synthesis, in which the diversity of expressions is always respected as well as the diversity of their particular cultural embodiment. (Fifth General Conference 2007, 3)

The final document of the Bishops at Aparecida is specific regarding the new fields and topics within which the dialogue between faith and culture needs to develop: ‘the world of communications, peace building, the development and liberation of peoples, especially of minorities, the promotion of women and children, ecology and protection of nature, and the “immense ‘Areopagus’ of culture, scientific research, and international relations.” It explicitly declares that this priority should not be seen as ‘abandoning the preferential option to the poor’. Thus “Evangelizing culture, far from abandoning the preferential option to the poor and the commitment to reality, arises out of passionate love for Christ who accompanies the People of God in the mission of inculturating the gospel in history, ardent and tireless in its Samaritan charity”. (Aparecida, 2007, para. 491).

Democratic Politics

Two quotations on the democratic politics of the Fifth General Conference of Bishops, and the special responsibility of the ‘constructors of society’ for this area of development, eloquently express the Latin American Church’s magisterium regarding the ambit that Vatican II defined as both difficult and ‘very noble.’ Further, the Bishops’ last Conference explicitly connected the structures that provoke poverty with a ‘lack of
fidelity to their evangelical principles’ in those Christians who participate in leadership in the fields of politics, economics, and culture. Thus:

We bishops gathered in the Fifth Conference want to be present to those who build society, for it is the Church’s fundamental vocation in this sector to shape consciences, and to be an advocate of justice and truth and to educate in the individual and political virtues. (Fifth General Conference 2007, para. 508)

The disciples and missionaries of Christ must illuminate with the light of the Gospel all realms of social life. The preferential option for poor, rooted in the Gospel, requires pastoral attention devoted to the builders of society. If many contemporary structures produce poverty, it is partly due to the lack of fidelity to their gospel commitments on the part of many Christians with special political, economic and cultural responsibilities. (para. 501)

We shall turn now to the Chilean Catholic schools which serve the elite, to examine the ways this Magisterium informs, or does not inform, their present educational definitions.

**Four educational projects: Principles and criteria**

We started our project with the hypothesis that educational institutions belonging to the two sides of the key divide outlined above – established at the end of the 1960s and still prevalent in the Catholic education of Chile’s Catholic elite – would relate to the Magisterium, both universal and Latin American, and in forms coherent with the origins,
religious and value positions, as well as the history of each congregation’s relationship with the elite. We thought the different projects would have a ‘re-contextualizing relationship’ with the magisterium, i.e., that their differences, and particularly those related to the ‘two sides of the Seventies divide,’ would entail selecting and framing based on the Church’s documents in consistently different ways that could be described through a comparative analysis of the relevant documents.

To carry out this analysis, we selected the educational projects of the four congregations, as they appear on the respective institutional websites, and then compared how they referred to our key selected topics: poverty and social injustice, faith and culture, and politics. The three dimensions, as discussed above, express the fundamental shift towards embracing ‘the modern world’ accomplished by Vatican II in its Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*. They also condense fundamental dimensions of commitment to the ‘other’ that the documents of the Latin American Bishops, despite the changing times, contexts, powers, and ideas, have consistently declared and specified in their practical consequences for more than four decades.

The first finding of our comparative analysis – to our surprise, and resulting in the breakdown of our hypothesis – is that the two new congregations, *Opus Dei* and Legionnaires, do not carry out any ‘selection and framing’ of the Church’s documents, as they do not refer to the Magisterium. The *Opus Dei* educational mission document for its schools never quotes or refers to Vatican II, or to any of the four post-1960 Conferences of the Latin American Episcopate. The Legionnaires’ educational project does mention Vatican II once, but not in connection with any of the three dimensions of our analysis, and not quoting any document.\textsuperscript{xxi}
Conversely, the centuries-old congregations do refer to and quote the Magisterium: both Vatican II and the Latin American Episcopate’s Conference documents. In the case of the Jesuits’ educational project (formulated in 2010), the Aparecida document (2007) is quoted four times; in the case of the Holy Cross’ educational project, which was formulated in 2003, both Medellín (1968) and the Santo Domingo documents (1992) are each quoted twice, and a text of John Paul II to the Bishops of Latin America in 1999 is also quoted.

Despite St George’s College and the Jesuits’ explicit anchoring of some of their fundamentals in the Magisterium, it is worthwhile noting that this occurs in the form of recognizing some principles, more than in any specific translation into the action-principles of the respective projects. For example, there is no reference in either of the educational projects to the specific duties of the ‘constructors of society’ (the elite), regarding unjust economic, social, political structures, which, as we have seen, the Magisterium makes abundantly clear. Although the general principle is consistently declared: the work of each school is to educate to transform society.

What follows is our comparative analysis of the four educational projects. We discern the pattern of differences between visions on the two sides of the divide in the Sixties and Seventies, which translates into, as we shall expose, the ‘worlds apart’ nature of their respective educational missions today.

Table 11.2 presents the results of our comparative analysis. To provide a comprehensive illustration, we have selected all quotes from the educational projects of each of the four congregations that refer to the three dimensions, and that work to express the social dimension of their formative purposes.
Table 11.2: Four educational projects in the Chilean Catholic elite: Key principles and orientations regarding social structures, culture and politics

**POVERTY, SOCIAL INEQUALITY & INJUSTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ignatian Schools Society of Jesus</th>
<th>St George's College Holy Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The new society we dream of is just, fraternal, and most respectful of the dignity of all people, with structures that enable solutions to overcome inequity, poverty, discrimination, and exclusion. (EP, par. 37)</td>
<td>We seek to promote among students, teachers, and parents, an attitude that from the viewpoint of ‘faith in action’ allows transforming the society in which they live, thus making visible the values of the Kingdom of God. (EP, section 2.2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our education is at the service of the transformation of our society. We wish to promote in people and in communities a way of thinking able to propose alternatives to trends and ideologies that dehumanize and marginalize the majorities in poverty, encourage radical secularism, and exacerbate the logic of the market and consumerism. (EP, par.46)</td>
<td>On finishing secondary school, boys and girls shall be able to: Take part in committed action for change toward a more fraternal society, through profound social conscience and active solidarity in the context of a community of faith. (EP, section 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legionnaires of Christ Schools</td>
<td>Opus Dei Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever a new school starts there is a clear purpose in mind, with regard to student participation in social action: conscience about Christian solidarity; that is, ‘firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good.’ (John Paul II. Soll. Rei Soc. 38) (EP, p.19)</td>
<td>It shall be attempted that students acquire the spirit of solidarity, gratitude, commitment, and service to others. With this purpose, each school shall promote concrete and specific actions that teach how to discover and resolve spiritual and material needs of the most disadvantaged. (EP, par. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Legionnaires of Christ there are no rich or poor: only ‘man’ exists. Men, with solidarity in sin and in the need for salvation. Just as Jesus Christ, they destine their supernatural mission equally to all men. Christian redemption excludes not one or the others. (EP, p.20)</td>
<td>[The schools of SEDUC], adapting to local realities, attend varied socio-economic groups, both in Santiago and Regions. (Mission)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FAITH & CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ignatian Schools Society of Jesus</th>
<th>St George’s College Holy Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the multicultural context that we live in, we wish to learn, understand, and love those who are different to us, by means of dialogue based on truth, justice, and love. We believe educational institutions are privileged places for inculcating the Gospel and for the evangelisation of cultures. Hence we practice faith-culture dialogue, faith-science dialogue, faith-reason dialogue, and ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. We strive to form ourselves for these major challenges. (EP, par. 52)</td>
<td>Work for the integration of faith, culture, and life, providing an intimate relation between religious knowledge and the various disciplines of human knowledge; animate and liturgically celebrate the gift of life, the mysteries of faith, and community events. (EP, section 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need also to value popular culture, urban-marginal and rural, often times because we are inserted in those contexts, but also because from these we recognize a call to the whole of society, and particularly to our school curriculum. (EP, par. 63). We practice and educate for dialogue among the Catholic faith and cultures, ecumenical dialogue, inter-religious and inter-cultural, non-discrimination, unconditional respect for human rights, essential equality between man and woman, and care for creation and trans-generational responsibility. (EP, par. 133)</td>
<td>We promote the formation of people who critically value national and Latin American culture as their own, seeking to favour a sense of belonging and identity. We are interested in people who may speak proudly of their own cultural roots as well as learn of the traditions of other peoples. (EP, section 4.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legionnaires of Christ Schools</th>
<th>Opus Dei Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We wish to make of our School a place for comprehensive formation through the systematic and critical assimilation of culture. The School is therefore a living and vital encounter with the cultural heritage of our country and the world. It is our purpose to enable students to interpret the voice of the universe revealed by the creator and through the conquest of science, learn more of God and man. (EP, p.14)</td>
<td>Comprehensive education: ‘Comprehensive education pursues a harmonious development of the personality. Therefore, it encompasses and includes the person’s spiritual, intellectual, artistic, athletic, social and civic capacities, all of them integrated into a solid unit of life, at the service of God and other men.’ (EP, par. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDUC promotes the development and supports the operation of schools whose essential goal is the education of free and responsible persons, with a Christian vision of the world and culture. (Mission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLITICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ignatian Schools Society of Jesus</strong></th>
<th><strong>St George’s College Holy Cross</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From our institutions, from our local experience, we feel called upon to contribute to the national system, public policy, national debate, or specific requirements we may receive. (EP, par. 50)</td>
<td>Those of us who belong to the Saint George’s College educational community, aspire to a comprehensive education of the individual, preparing committed Christians and competent citizens. (EP, section 2.1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With humility and determination we strive to carry out joint actions to be present at decision-making instances, offering our experience and potential to contribute to the formulation of public policies, taking on in these the corresponding responsibility. We also promote participation, above all by those who direct the institutions, [of the network], in associations, social movements, and other fora of effective political relevance. (EP, par. 199)</td>
<td>We educate for a lifestyle that values democracy, promotes peace and non-violence; values tolerance, peaceful and respectful coexistence, welcomes diversity, is concerned about the environment, in a collaborative effort integrated by all the members of our community. (EP, section 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legionnaires of Christ Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opus Dei Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This means the person should prepare for collaborative relations in political life, in social life, and in the world of labour, and especially in family relations, relations of friendship, and the relations that constitute religious life. (EP, p. )</td>
<td>Freedom in matters of opinion: ‘Respect for the legitimate opinions of all who are part of each school, and the atmosphere of harmony that is proper to them, require that SEDUC be foreign to all expression of ideas and opinions of political parties or groups. Each one practices their Civic rights and duties outside the school environment.’ (EP, par. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the appropriate formation of conscience it is indispensable to imprint on students a great appreciation for virtues, as for example justice, veracity, cordiality, responsibility, life coherence, nobility, respect for the person; all virtues that sustain civil coexistence. (EP, p. 6)</td>
<td>We hope that our students become persons that stand-out in every ambit and are a reference in Chilean society. (Mission)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty, Social Inequality, Injustice

To examine what we have called the 1970s divide, we will now label the two sides. First, the magisterium-affirming (MA) label will refer to the Jesuits and Holy Cross educational projects from the one side. To denote the Legionnaires and Opus Dei, from the other side of the divide, we will label these as being on the magisterium-ignoring (MI) side. As visibly expressed in our analytical dimension referring to poverty, inequality, and social injustice, Jesuits and Holy Cross declare their educational goal is to prepare their students to transform society and its unjust structures; by contrast, there is no reference to structures but only to persons in poverty or affliction in the educational projects of both Legionnaires and Opus Dei. Thus, the meaning of solidarity is faith in action to build a new society, in one case, and charity for disadvantaged and afflicted persons in the other.

The word ‘poor’ appears eleven times in the Jesuit case, four in the case of the Holy Cross project, three in the case of the Legionnaires, and not at all in the case of Opus Dei. The word ‘poverty’ is mentioned 18 times in the educational project of the Jesuits, and is not mentioned in any of the other three texts. With regard to the word ‘justice,’ the count is: Jesuits, 13; Holy Cross, 9; Legionnaires, 7; Opus Dei, 0.

If we compare the two MA projects, which share a social versus individual or personalized view of life in society and the pursuance of the values of the Kingdom, the Jesuit project is much more specific than the St George’s project on the diagnosis of poverty, discrimination, and inequality, and the structures that therefore need to be acted upon.

Likewise, there is a difference between the two MI projects: whereas in the Legionnaires’ project there is a concept of explicit connection between social action and
the ‘common good,’ thus clearly expanding the notion of solidarity, this is not the case with the Opus Dei definition, which avoids the term social and is consistent in restricting solidarity to personal relationships.

The MA projects express and try to answer to a moral purpose, which is as much about the person and his or her will as it is about the person in relation to society and its inequities (the dimension we have foregrounded). The MI projects focus only on the first term, being, as shown above, and are silent on the social dimension of their otherwise comprehensive and demanding bildung. We have found quite interesting evidence on commonalities in the Catholic education of economic elites in Chile regarding this ‘personal dimension,’ or formation of the will (‘character formation’). This contrasts dramatically with the ‘worlds-apart’ nature of the visions and efforts of the different projects regarding the social and political dimensions of the person. According to a recent study based on interviews with members of the economic elite, there exists no distinction in the answers of top executives coming from the Jesuit and Opus Dei schools regarding notions of self-control, perseverance, discipline, and duty; the notion that the top executives should work hard, be honest, and have a decorous if not exemplary family life is cross-cutting (Thumala 2010).

*Faith and Culture*

The two MA projects coincide on the centrality of their formative projects and the dialogue between their faith and different manifestations of culture: science, other faiths, other cultures. Intercultural dialogue and the evangelization of culture is conceived of in both congregations’ educational projects in terms defined by *Gaudium et Spes*, as we
have seen, and then developed and enriched by the Latin American Episcopate’s successive Conferences. By contrast, the two MI projects frame the problem in terms that resolve the issue: by defining ‘comprehensive education’ and the different dimensions of the person that it needs to address, there is no such thing as faith and an ‘other’ of any kind, nor a basis for any ‘inter’ cultural dialogue.

The two MA projects, while converging in their definitions of inter-cultural dialogue in terms of the faith-reason, or faith-science, dimensions, have dissimilar approaches to cultural differences using class or nation as a foundation. Whereas the Jesuit project selects popular culture (urban and rural) as crucial when dealing with inter-cultural dialogue, the Holy Cross project refers to national and Latin American identities and their cultural basis as an important value of its educational project.

Similarly, the two MI projects also differ in this dimension. The Legionnaires’ project refers to a ‘systematic and critical assimilation of culture,’ and mentions science and its connections to understanding the cosmos from a religious standpoint; the Opus Dei project does not, mentioning instead ‘a solid unit of life’ and a ‘Christian vision of the world and culture,’ which does not recognize that there are two terms in this and that, since Vatican II, the relationship between the two is conceived in terms of dialogue and mutual generation.

According to Vatican II historian John O’Malley, (2010), a new language cuts across all its documents, conveying a spirit that means a change from closeness to openness, condemnation to appreciation, and universals to contextuality. These oppositions, we find, apply similarly to our MI and MA educational projects.
Politics

The political domain and preparation for democratic citizenship should stand as very important in everyone’s education, and particularly so in societies – like the Chilean society – with memories of tragic conflict and breakdown of democratic order. Moreover, it is not possible to think about changing structures without involving the political domain. So, how is this crucial aspect of preparation for adult life approached by the four projects?

The Jesuits’ educational project adopts a special standpoint regarding the political and policy domains: it does not define goals and criteria to be communicated to students, but instead defines the interest of schools and their leaders and teachers to participate in the policy-making and decision-making processes of the country with regard to education.

The St George’s educational project is the only one of the four that explicitly refers to democracy and the need for and importance of preparing competent and responsible citizens.

Crossing the MA/MI divide, the Legionnaires’ project refers to the virtues and values required for adult life, and distinguishes between ‘political life’ and ‘civil life,’ implying their value and importance, but not manifesting any normative view with regard to democracy or citizenship and its rights and responsibilities. The Opus Dei document mentions the political or civic domain, only to underline that it is not a matter to be dealt with at school: making it something that is off limits.

Conclusion
In closing, we would like to sum up the main findings of our comparative analysis and put them against a broader canvas. Our main finding was that the orientations of both Vatican II and the Bishops’ documents regarding the three ‘other-oriented’ dimensions chosen for analysis are ignored by the two orders and their schools that began serving Chilean elites after the crisis of the Seventies, in explicit opposition to the path taken by the orders that had traditionally served these groups. The Jesuits and St George’s, in following both the Vatican II and the Medellín Conference of Latin American Bishops’ social orientations, actually broke their historically profound ties to the traditional economic elite of the country. Hence, we see the Opus Dei and Legionnaires’ position in education as strong cases of a ‘context ruling mission,’ whereas ‘mission disrupting context’ could be said to describe the position of the MA projects.

From a sociological viewpoint, the examined contrasting projects relate to different elites within the Chilean upper-socioeconomic strata. The MI projects, issuing from religious congregations whose charisma celebrates the inner-worldly asceticism intrinsic to the sanctification of work (Weber 2003), in addition to their hierarchical view of the social order, appeal consistently to the economic elite (Madrid 2013; Thumala 2010). By contrast, the MA projects, issuing from orders whose charisma celebrates social and cultural diversity and a communitarian view of society, appeal more to the cultural and political elites of the country. Thus, the doctrinal divide revealed by the mission statements, and which so clearly relates to the ‘traditionalists’ and ‘progressives’ that were confronted at the Council a half century ago, can also be interpreted in terms of differences between the elites of the country and their value preferences; this concept of difference also goes with the ideas, interests, and *habitus* that correspond to their
belonging to the economic, political, or cultural fields (Bourdieu 1984, 1998; Joignant and Güell 2011; PNUD 2015).

Finally, the silence discovered in three of the examined educational projects on politics and citizenship as a critical dimension of the learning opportunities to be offered, i.e., cutting across the key ideological divide that affects them, needs to be noted. As mentioned above, only the St George’s project is explicit about formation for democratic politics and its importance. This contrasts dramatically with the meaning granted to this domain by Vatican II, and, consistently thereafter, by the Latin American Bishops’ conferences. Thus, silence on citizenship and democratic politics, in a world of radical socio-cultural pluralization and increased complexity of issues to be worked out in the public sphere, raises questions about the relevance of the formative experiences of these elites, and makes one wonder about the probable long term effects on Chilean democratic politics.
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