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Seventeen years ago, I was preparing to leave for Mozambique with other confrères where we would start a new Spiritan missionary presence. Those of us appointed to this new mission were having animated conversations about the challenges and struggles that awaited us with the people of that church. An elder confrère who was helping us for a few days before our departure said that “the heaviest thing is not the difficulties, the challenges, and trials that you will encounter; the most decisive thing will be the manner in which you live together through these difficulties. If community is guaranteed, whatever difficulties you meet can be confronted without too much penalty! More than the ‘what to do,’ will matter the ‘whom to be with.’” These words were the fruit of the long experience of an old missionary now deceased. Many times through the years, I have remembered these words for better or for worse. Community—this is the key and the secret of the vitality and fruitfulness of mission, of the balance and happiness of our life!

1. Where We Are

In the third chapter of the Spiritan Rule of Life (henceforth, SRL), we read the citation from the Acts of the Apostles (4:32): “The community of believers was of one heart and mind, and no one claimed that any of his possessions was his own, but they had everything in common.” The first numbers of this chapter give the following explanations: we are called to live our vocation in community (#27); community life is an essential element of our identity, in regard to both our consecration and our mission (#28); the apostolic life is common, also in respect of the sharing of goods and the discernment and execution of common projects (#29); bringing us closer to the human and ecclesial milieu in which we live (#30), and so on. The twenty-two paragraphs that compose this section on community life are very rich and inspirational, full of references to the word of God and to the writings of the Venerable Father Libermann.

Bagamoyo

The Instrumentum Laboris (Working Document) introducing the theme of community had this to say: “community life is one of those topics where experience tells us that there is no direct relationship between the production of documents and the process of change in individuals and institutions.” Subsequent
reflection in the chapter itself began from the presupposition that we do not always live in accord with our convictions.

Reflecting on the obstacles to community life, the *Instrumentum Laboris* was insightful: “There is a general feeling about our failures in our Spiritan community living.”\(^2\) There is individualism, rationalization that justifies unacceptable behavior, clericalism, and the accentuation of the monarchical priest in “his” parish (the document used the term “diocesanisation”) in opposition to a true sharing of the mission project, inability in taking up poverty in a serious and radical way, while sharing the resources generated in community. Further, there is formalism and ritualism in prayers, and a lack of the sharing of faith. The document went on to propose many courses of action and possible ways to address the difficulties and enhance fidelity to community life.

Starting with these, the general chapter developed its own thoughts relative to the challenges to Spiritan community life today. In a short text of two and half pages, it reaffirms the Spiritan community as an essential aspect of Spiritan identity saying that it is “the privileged place for listening to the Spirit and for living in fidelity to our vocation and mission (Torre d’Aguilha 1.1.2).”\(^3\) The community is the proper context for living the great dimensions of our Spiritan identity: the evangelical counsels, the praying community, and our evangelization commitments. In synthesis, “community and mission are two dimensions of the Spiritan vocation which are mutually enriching.”\(^4\)

According to the preparatory document, we do not lack great statements for renewal; what has lagged behind is concrete practice. So the chapter went beyond general intentions to propose concrete steps to revalue and renew community, a simple and succinct method. The first of these is the community project (*projet communautaire*), “a dependable guide for Spiritan life and mission. Here are found the most important options of the community: community action, moments of celebration, pastoral commitments and involvement of and with the laity.”\(^5\)

The other great means emphasized by the capitular document is the service of authority: “Superiors will exercise their ministry in a discerning and loving manner. At the same time they will be firm and rigorous in insisting that every confrere and community carries out the orientations coming from SRL, the General Council and from the circumscription”; in demanding the fulfillment of what is contained in SRL and other orientation documents. There should be particular focus on what concerns living poverty, the budget, the sharing of goods, clarity and
rigor in accountability, “as well as combatting every form of individualism.”7 Internationality remains a “treasure not always made capital of”; the potential of community life to challenge and confront us should be taken advantage of for our conversion and mission.

In general, the reflection of the Bagamoyo chapter takes seriously the real problems present in the Congregation and sees the community as the place where these problems should be resolved. It is evident that there is need to “raise the tone” as regards the measures to be taken concerning grave infidelities in the areas of chastity, finance, community responsibility, the use of the media, the service of community authority that should address these difficulties and, where necessary, utilize mechanisms with more firmness. Rereading the chapter reflections, one notes a positive approach, full of hope and openness to the future, but also enough clarity about the difficulties and contradictions.

Lights and Shadows

What can one say, then, about the crisis of community life and the “general feeling of failure”? The Congregation of the Holy Spirit, while a large worldwide community, is a plural reality, characterized by a great cultural and ecclesial diversity. This diversity is certainly a richness that can be recognized by many and represents, in fact, one of the most beautiful missionary expressions. Communities with dozens of confrères observe the discipline of community life that includes, according to SRL, the sharing of material resources, common meals and common liturgy on a daily basis. We have both communities with an institutional style and discipline and communities that are more spontaneous and with a familiar style. We have small missionary communities that live the mission as a common project, planning the work, daily sharing a real fraternal and profoundly prayerful life, cultivating effective and affective relationships that become the sustainable source and efficacious expression of vitality and of fruitful missionary life.

However, we do not have in the Congregation only a rainbow of complementarity. We have also a panoply of confusions, with different models, different ways of conceiving and experiencing community life. There are a good number of confrères living alone, exercising their ministry in parishes, and installed in their parochial residences. They keep a fraternal relationship with other Spiritan confrères which, in practice, cannot be distinguished from relationships cultivated among the diocesan clergy in many local churches. You could truly say that in many dioceses there exists among diocesan priests a community sharing and fraternal administration (including the sharing of a
There are Spiritans who want to take from the community every subsidy that they have a right to (and even those they do not have a right to!)

Besides these practical dysfunctions that have no support in the “doctrine” but subsist as simple expressions of the degeneration of living ideas, there are theoretical discourses that try to legitimize or substantiate models which, in fact, were never present in authentic Spiritan tradition, never expressed in any document of our founders or any subsequent text. There are Spiritans who want to take from the community every subsidy that they have a right to (and even those they do not have a right to!) forgetting the solidarity that is their obligation by the same title. The Congregation seems to be an institution that guarantees stability and material security and to which, in the best hypothesis, one gives an accounting of the goods received from her. But one does not give an accounting of the goods received from others; these are “mine.” In enough cases, community is not taken as “ours,” it remains something external with which I relate or from which I distance myself, whichever suits me, demanding in one or other case rights acquired in the name of natural law or the laws of a particular place or culture. “My” way of living community and religious life is justified by my cultural difference. One’s cultural identity becomes in that way the criterion of discernment for the administration of community life and the other dimensions of religious life. Such rationalization makes community an expression of mere spiritual communion and empties it of its power of witness in practice, concretely depriving it of the very renunciation that is appropriate for one who has opted to share resources, life, and the mission project. There also exists the erroneous idea that what is learned during initial formation is not necessarily applicable to the adult community life. It is as if you learn to be a novice, not a Spiritan, during the novitiate. In this type of ideology, the missionary community by being missionary can dispense with many of the demands expressed in the Rule of Life that are very beautiful, but only for teaching novices or scholastics. Formation communities (or those in close proximity) are obliged to live a common house and maintenance of a common life) that is more effective in testimony than among many Spiritans. There also exist communities that, in practice, are nominal communities: a shared roof under which all live, community prayer absent or partially present, meals taken at individual times, the rhythm of life poorly synchronized. Money stays in the pocket of the person who earns it, sharing is at the level of honorable citizens who share the expenses of a condominium, but without the responsibilities of religious poverty or personal divesture. The material administration and economics are marked by evident individualism, with personal cars, personal bank accounts, independent or almost independent projects.
lifestyle consonant with SRL so you do not scandalize those in formation, according to this position.

If we really wish to value differences and promote internationality in the plural space of effective common living and a common identity, we urgently need to correct the confusion and arrive at an understanding of models of common life which we all recognize and with which we all identify. It is this that is recognized in what Bagamoyo calls “Spiritans culture.” This signifies a deep unity that should characterize the style of life of all Spiritans. In fact, beyond legitimate diversity, it is necessary to identify infidelity for what it is.

Sometime ago, I was conversing with a young Spiritan in initial formation. I heard him cite different models of community life which, to his understanding, legitimized opposite directions in the way to be situated in a community. There already exists in the Congregation examples for everything, it would be legitimate to opt for the models that I like. I defended the advisability of objective criteria previous to all models in existence and defining the greater or less legitimacy of each model. Who defines these criteria? SRL without a doubt. And what grounds this Rule to make it the actual expression of our charism and a model for our common life?

In the ultimate analysis, it is evident that it is the founders, Poullart des Places and Libermann, to whom we must refer. It is their original intuition and their founding project that will always define us, without which we would not be ourselves. Poullart, the founding pioneer, who left all of his social prerogatives and money to live in a community of the poor putting himself totally at the service of the poor, is our first inspiration. This inspiration must be reread in the light of Libermann who deepened and defined the original charism. And of Libermann there are innumerable texts and sources of inspiration. It is impossible to go through them in an exhaustive way, so I propose that we stay with an unavoidable text, and let us see what Libermann intended exactly for community life—the Provisional Rule, which was started in Rome in 1840, published in 1845, and republished in 1849. This Rule, articulated with glosses, gives us a rich and profound resource to locate the community within the Spiritan identity. We will refer to a few aspects of this framework, focusing on chapter 5 of this Rule.

2. From Where We Came

In a letter to Dom Sallier, dated July 1840, Libermann said that with the Rule he intended “to direct souls to a missionary perfection or to the apostolic state, as I understand it.”8 “As I
understand it” gives us the measure of the importance of this text: if the understanding of Libermann is the foundation of our identity, reference to the Rule that he elaborated is indispensable. Libermann himself attributed absolute importance to the Rule: it is not only a rule, but the principle of regularity: «If there is no rule, there will be disorder; if the rule is not observed, there will be no unity; if it is poorly observed, the missionaries will not be fervent»9 The intention of Libermann was totally radical, he conceived a project which should, by nature, make great demands, «something solid, fervent and apostolic: in other words, a commitment to all or nothing… We don't want timid people joining a Congregation which is completely apostolic. We only need fervent and generous members who will give themselves entirely and are ready to undertake and suffer all things for the greater glory of God.»10

**Community in the Provisional Rule**

In this extremely demanding project, totally at the service of mission, what is the place of community? “It is an important and fundamental rule in the congregation that its members should live in a community, being subject to a common rule, and that they should never work separately and alone outside their community.”11 Isolation favors a relaxing of the Rule and exposes one to lack of fervor, explains Libermann in a gloss of this article. He recognizes that there are situations in which some were sent alone for a mission (James Laval, for example, to whom Libermann explicitly refers), but he did not hesitate to affirm that such a situation is not the rule, people would not endure in fidelity in such a situation – “among one hundred you will not find one.”12 “That is why our missionaries will not be sent to a work where they will be alone.”13 It is fascinating the practical manner in which an extreme realist like Libermann regulates the manner of administering a community. He recognizes that sometimes there will be tasks which demand that the missionaries go alone and stay some days outside community, however, he determined that “it should not always be this way” and “ordinarily let there be an interval of one month between such missions; this will enable the missionary to recover his fervor in recollection and in the observance of the Rules. Also this will prevent him from acquiring habits of freedom of action and so find it difficult after a while to observe the Rule.”14 The Rule later makes a series of detailed prescriptions about the way to organize community life, like daily prayers, common meals (what they consist of and duration), community recreation, etc. In all these practical aspects that obviously follow the context and circumstances of the time, there are however some elements equally valid for all times and cultural contexts. Before all else, community life is the
proper ambient and situation *sine qua non* in which you live and develop Spiritan mission. Libermann adds, “Someone will say, is it not better that I go to hear confessions, to visit the sick, than to stay in recreation? No, it is not! For maintaining regularity is extremely important.” Regularity permits one to keep active that value that one recognizes and accepts; only an extraordinary or urgent situation can justify breaking practical vigilance and the rule of community. And Libermann well underlines the urgent character: it is not enough that it is an exceptional circumstances, it needs to be clear that besides being proportionally necessary it is really a necessity that could not be put off and taken care of later after respecting the community duty.

**Community Poverty**

We come to the fundamental value of poverty, another aspect of the details defined by the Rule: “no one will have anything that belongs to him in his own right. But everything that is for the use of missionaries must be provided by the community to which he belongs, and all shall be wholly detached from the things that are given them for their use. They must be always ready to return them gladly as soon as the superior will judge it proper to use them differently.” Libermann attached great importance to simplicity in community life and interior freedom in the use of goods, sobriety in available materials. Missionaries should be poor, the community should spread evangelical poverty and there should be total vigilance not to let this zeal for a poor and unattached life diminish. “We must take care to practice renunciation and poverty, even in small things. There are those who after they have made great sacrifices to enter a community, seek their ease and cling to trifles - to a cassock, to a particular hat, etc. Attachment to foolish things causes our hearts to shrink; we are no longer worthy of our vocation and it hinders our apostolic action.” It is for this that “we shall profess great poverty regarding everything that is for the use of the congregation and its members. We will avoid in all things that which comes somewhat close to luxury or superfluity.” The lifestyle of Spiritan communities will be identified even by the food, houses and decoration in the manner of the poor of that location, safeguarding the health of the missionaries.

The mission and its demands do not justify individual use of riches or material means: “A wealthy missionary is not permitted to keep the revenue of his property under the pretext that he will give it to the poor of the place to which he will be sent. This would be the occasion for serious disorders in communities.” This means that Spiritan mission, as understood and passionately defended by Libermann, includes poverty as an essential element and as an element of equality.
Community and mission are not articulated as parallel elements, in fact one interprets the other and you cannot conceive one without the other. Missionaries integrate their personal lives and their journey of conversion and sanctification is not something distinct from their missionary concern. This means that not even the mission is secondary in the name of community interests, nor is the community to take second place with regard to missionary commitments. What this means is, community is missionary and mission is communitarian. All that is lived in community has a missionary witness dimension, and all done in missionary work is fruit of community discernment and decision, prolonging the vitality that is received and transmitted in community.

**Community Project**

The community character of mission and the missionaries’ life is reflected in a personal project that is to be defined beginning with the other and, in particular, the community. It is precisely this that Libermann proposes when he said: “Obedience is the renunciation of one’s own mind and will so as to submit oneself to the holy will of God, which is manifested by the Rules of the Congregation and by its superior.” The mediation of the community, the Rule, and instances of authority and coordination is necessary to develop one’s life project that is defined beginning with love: the Other (God) and the others (the community and the Church) are the specific environment of the project of life of the Spiritans. There is a dimension of renouncing one’s self, so dear to Libermann, which is at the service of a positive option for God’s plan, expressed in community.

Personal fulfillment or personal development and the individual’s potential and aptitudes do not occur as parallel to the community project...

**Christocentrism and God’s Primacy**

The challenge of obedience implied in this is another way of stating the theocentric and christocentric character of community. Libermann’s writings are impregnated with this christocentric orientation, which incidentally is strongly present in the life of Poullart des Places and his short written works. Community is
not simply an intersection of personalities and human effort, but an expression of the mystery of God, which prolongs the eternal Trinitarian life in history. Communion, like mission, begins in God and has the mystery of God as its source and reason for being. Missionary theology, developed from the Second Vatican Council from the perspective of Missio Dei already, in fact, underlay the missionary thought of Francis Libermann.

Nothing in religious community life is simply organizational; organization, indispensable as it is, reflects the fundamental mystery of God: all flow from God and refers to God. The community and missionary character come together with the spiritual character of community life. All is part of faith, all is centered on Christ. All of Libermann’s thoughts are christocentric: “We must belong wholly to our Lord; this is absolutely necessary if we desire to be true apostles.”22; “We must be united to our Lord; he is our Master, our Head. Only in him and through him can we have virtue and power. In him we will find the life and the strength which are demanded by the holy apostolate. Or rather, it is he who wants to continue the great work of the redemption of mankind by living and acting in us. Let us convince ourselves that we are not the ones who save souls. Only the Holy Spirit can work that wonder. We are only useless instruments which he deigns to make use of.”23 The concrete relationships that evolve and are organized within the community are concrete expressions of this theology of the Spiritan missionary community: “The conduct of our members among themselves must be that of children of the same family, that is, children of Jesus and Mary. We shall regard as done to our Lord himself all that we do to our confreres, and we shall do towards them what we would have done towards Jesus and his Blessed Mother.”24 The soul of community life is therefore God’s charity; this is explained in a detailed manner by Libermann in the glosses that refer to this theme.

3. Where Would We Like To Go

There is reason to be grateful for so many communities and so many confrères who today, like yesterday, reflect in their lives the dream of Libermann, living it with fidelity and dynamism. On the other hand, we were also aware of serious contradictions that this project encounters in the ways in which community life is sometimes organized in the Congregation. We are aware of evidences of how individualism is so strongly in opposition to the affection of communion in which Libermann places Spiritan mission, and how secularism is in opposition to the foundational Christology on which Libermann builds so much for life in common and for mission.

...it is he who wants to continue the great work of the redemption of mankind by living and acting in us.

It is not for lack of documents, reflections, articles and discourses that we lack renewal. The big question is then how to be effectively renewed, make concrete in our life all that we repeatedly affirm as important. We recognize the challenge of conversion and renewal that our sources place before us.

Before this demanding challenge that Libermann leaves us, we could fall into some possible temptations, the first of which would be fundamentalist regression. Since we have gone off course in some way from the initial project, we need to restore it, literally reproduce it. Libermann himself cautioned us against this danger: Spiritan life should be inserted into the proper context of each people and each culture. Another temptation would be opposite of this: eliminate the perceived challenges of applying Libermann’s thought to our present time. In this case, being faithful would be for us only a form of fundamentalism. The radicalism and seriousness of the community project of Libermann were no less challenging or demanding in his time than in ours. If we want to be faithful to this project we need to assume the radicalism and the demands on us. It is not easy, it is not immediate, it does not happen without effort.

Life Project

The life project is life as a project. It is a vital dynamism in which people remember and deepen their convictions and ideals and put them in dialogue with the concrete challenges of their historical situation, defining objectives to be reached and the means to arrive there. It does not reinvent the Rule, but recovers its orientations and integrates them into the concrete reality of the community.25 This should be talked about, pondered and written in a way that it becomes a real instrument of growth and renewal. Ongoing formation is this: a continual process of learning from life and its vicissitudes, allowing the Holy Spirit in this process to make us grow as men, as religious, and as Spiritan missionaries. In a certain sense, the life project is largely identical with ongoing formation, as much in relation to our personal project (the individual) and our community project (the community).

The life project is Christocentric: it starts in Christ and is oriented to Christ. It refers us to the baptismal gift and our common religious profession as Spiritan religious. In this sense, the community life project keeps us from every type of clericalism, intrinsically sinful because not centered in Christ but in adulterated forms of power or domination. Centered in Christ and Trinitarian communion, the life project guards us from all forms of individualism and secularism, and immerses itself in the primacy of God experienced in fraternal communion and

---

Ongoing formation is this: a continual process of learning from life and its vicissitudes, allowing the Holy Spirit in this process to make us grow as men, as religious, and as Spiritan missionaries.
the service of the mission work project, evaluated and executed in a team. The annual elaboration of the life project will allow the recovery of objective community values. Before this memory of our identity, we can ask ourselves: is this what we are living? More important still, is this what I believe in?

**Personal Project in Community**

The community project is articulated in relation to the personal project: it is not enough to know the group identity, but also necessary to again encounter for myself not only the values that my intelligence holds but also the necessities and tendencies that my personality has. Values confessed do not always coincide with values lived. Taking into account the discrepancies and owning them is necessary so that inconsistencies do not slowly carry us to what we do not believe or prevent us from living what we do believe. We need constantly ask ourselves, “what does this have to do with the Spiritan project?” Without a personal project, there is no community project: to conceive and execute a community project presupposes real people who recognize in the Spiritan project an instance in which God has called them to develop their own personal project. Beginning with this discovery a personal project is constructed in permanent reference and subordination to the community project.

The community project as an instance of objectivity is not merely a horizontal construction developed by members of the community to negotiate solutions and reach an agreement. To be authentic, the community project is founded always on SRL and Spiritan sources. Here lies its strength; this objectivity, however, remains dead letter and ineffective as long as it does not enter into dialogue with the free subjects involved in the project.

**The Service of Authority**

It is precisely in this dynamic articulation of subjective persons and objective Spiritan identity that we should put the service of authority. This is not simply a service of coordination among members of the community, but a response to a sending, an order made by Christ in the Church and the Congregation. It is a true mediation between the subjective universe of the individual and the objective universe of the Spiritan religious community made up of concrete and personal subjects. This mediation serves the authenticity of life, as much in persons as in the Spiritan community (whether general, provincial or local). People have the right to be themselves and the Congregation also has a right to be herself. The mediation of authority helps people become themselves in the Congregation, divesting themselves of centrifugal tendencies that alienate them and developing their decisions to be faithful to Spiritan vocation and mission.
Here we suppose, obviously, that discernment about the Spiritan identity of each individual member of the community has been done. If it has not been, there would be no choice of perpetual profession in the Congregation nor would they be admitted. It is true that there are exceptional cases to this discernment that could be revisited when the personal project is structurally shown to be irreversibly incompatible with the community project. The superior is not simply a coordinator; he is a servant of fidelity to our identity. His authority is built upon not only a popular vote, but on the mission received from the authority of the Church and the Congregation (which supposes a discernment process of truth that passes through consultation or election). This mission of the superior is service and is defined in SRL and our charismatic sources. It has a fundamental function in valuing persons and communities and in making life and community projects effective.

**Mission**

Community as conceived by Libermann is not closed in on itself, but is open to the outside and shows the radical apostleship of her members. And it is for this reason that it is necessary to assure the internal quality of life for, lacking this quality and authenticity, the Spiritan project falters, in the quality of mission as in the radicality of its service to the poor, its witness to evangelical poverty and the dynamism of that service, its dialogue with the world, and its unequivocal announcement of Christ the Savior.

The shared mission presupposes missionaries who are organized to work together, programmed, distributing tasks, evaluating. However, community life more than *making* communion, requires *being* in communion, giving itself to know and to welcome the other with simplicity as he is. Fruitful fraternity is lived in docility to the Spirit of God, but is never spiritualist, because this would empty it of humanity. The fraternity of Spiritans tends to become a true sharing of life that does not exclude the delicateness demanded for listening to each other, and does not fear tenderness. It is in this opening to the other where the effectiveness of mission resides: it passes from being simply utilitarian and productive to being gratuitous and relational. It conceives the mission not so much as a sequence of actions done, but in the movement of dialogue, of welcome, and personal encounter.

Only at the level of community can we conceive the sharing of our charism, as much in what refers to hospitality to candidates to Spiritan religious life as to sharing our spiritual and missionary identity with lay people. Recent signals that the Holy Spirit has
given us in the direction of mission shared with and opened to lay Spiritans only confirms the urgency of purifying and consolidating the authenticity of our community and religious life.

A Hypothesis

I sometimes ask myself, because of the changes of our times, whether it would not be necessary to have more creativity in the recovery of our fidelity. In other religious families, more radical forms of community life have arisen that, in practice, function as permanent signs of the radicalism of the charism that is recognized by all. These new forms of community life, communal and praying, which in truth harbor surging renewal and true communal divesture, presuppose accepting the possibility of a diversity of rhythms and styles in the heart of the religious community. Would it be possible to conceive of a radically praying and simple community, inserted in the middle of the poor and intensely fraternal, testifying by its life in common and by its prayer to a close following of Christ that we would all like to live? Would it not be possible to conceive, in the possible diversity of the concrete applications of SRL, a truly daring community project emerging in the style of Poullart des Places and Libermann?

Dialogue among ourselves and profound and tolerant criticism could help us discern ways of renewal. This dialogue can be profoundly fruitful and spring open another dialogue: that of prayer. For the renewal of community life, as asked by Bagamoyo, will only happen if personal and communal prayer were really valued, the Eucharist returned to its centrality, and the word of God listened to in the Church in its absolute authority. This will happen if we dare, in our community programs, to give time to daily communal liturgy and personal prayer.


Translated from the Portuguese by Daniel Walsh, C.S.Sp.
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