"Is Your Character Prepared for War?"

by Stephen Echols

I pose the query "*Is your character prepared for war?"* not as a challenge to or test of one's character, but as an overt opportunity for us, as US Army leaders, to participate in and take seriously the need to raise our self-awareness. A great deal of blood and ink has been spilled throughout recorded military history detailing the various aspects and characteristics of what good military leadership looks like and how it is manifest. In that respect, I intend to say nothing particularly new; rather, I would like to invite the reader on a 500-year-old examination of one's conscience and the practical application of historic spiritual exercises through the lenses of Army doctrine and various experts on human character. More specifically, my intent is to provide readers with a practical tool aimed at developing empathy and humility – as attributes expected of Army leader character[1] – first introduced in the *Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius of Loyola.

Defining Character…and Problems Therein

Pinning down a comprehensive definition of character is next to impossible. Moral philosophers and theologians provide perspectives on character that differ than those provided by the world of leadership gurus, which again differs from perspectives provided by cognitive and behavioral science. It seems as though every field of human behavior expertise wants a slice of the figurative "character" pie.

Leadership gurus the likes of John Maxwell and Stephen R. Covey identify one's character as being essential to one's success in the workplace. Covey notes that a kind of *Character Ethic* has existed for the past 200 years' worth of writing on the topic of success, and that this ethic was reinforced through the learning and integration of certain principles into one's own character. Some of the traits, or principles, Covey highlights include integrity, humility, fidelity, temperance, courage, justice, patience, industry, simplicity, modesty, and the Golden Rule.[2] Maxwell provides a more action-oriented take on the concept of character, noting, "Your character defines who you are," and that you cannot separate "a leader's character from his actions."[3] Maxwell's and Covey's perspectives regarding character are very much in sync with a traditional virtue ethics line of ethical reasoning, wherein one's character is shaped by an array of virtues (or practices and habits) and as one's character is positively shaped inwardly that shaping is reflected in one's outward actions. The Jesuit moral philosopher, Lusas Chan, S.J., defines a virtue as such: "a virtue is an acquired human quality the possession of which tends to enable us to achieve those goods which are internal to practices and the lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goods."[4] The point here is to note that these virtues or traits (or attributes) are aimed at both shaping our character as well as reflecting who we truly are, ideally as Army leaders.

Writer David Brooks provides a helpful nuance to the notion of character development, not only noting that our character is made up of a set of practices and habits, but that there is a kind of human struggle involved and that character development is inherently relational. In his earlier work, *The Road to Character*, Brooks states that "Character is built in the course of your inner confrontation. Character is a set of dispositions, desires, and habits that are slowly engraved during the struggle against your own weakness. You become more disciplined, considerate, and loving through a thousand small acts of self-control, sharing, service, friendship, and refined enjoyment."[5] Brooks clearly makes the case that the development of one's character requires active participation on our part and that it's not necessarily an easy undertaking. The character developmental work involved, notes Brooks, is relational as well, stating, "Character is not something you build sitting in a room thinking about the difference between right and wrong and about your own willpower. Character emerges from our commitments."[6]

Brooks provides a rather seamless segue to the Army's doctrinal understanding of character. *ADP 6-22* states:

> A leader's character consists of their true nature guided by their conscience, which affects their moral attitudes and actions…. Character consists of the moral and ethical qualities of an individual revealed through their decision and actions…. Character attributes that are of special interest to the Army and its leaders are—Army Values, Empathy, Warrior Ethos and Service Ethos, Discipline, and Humility.[7]

While still not comprehensive, *ADP 6-22* identifies key elements from each of the concepts of character already noted. The framework of developing character via various traits or practices, with the aim of making those practices habitual – as noted by Covey, Maxwell, Chan, and Brooks – is clearly captured in the inculcation of the Army Values into all Soldiers, especially Army leaders. Additionally, the Army doctrinal definition of character highlights the centrality of one's conscience (and the moral and ethical shaping of said conscience) and the decisions and actions one makes. Again, the Army's understanding of character agrees with Brooks: character is more than a cognitive thought experiment; rather, it is demonstrative of who one is in decisions and actions as well. Plainly put: our character is not static; it is active and our character can grow or be degraded over time. There are, however, two-character attributes identified in Army doctrine that are dynamic in nature, and much like muscles that are neglected exercise and use over time, these attributes of our character can and will atrophy. Those attributes are *empathy* and *humility*.

Empathy and Humility: Character Soft Skills

As has already been noted, a great deal of thought, ink, and energy has been spilled over the last decade making the argument from various perspectives that character development and moral/ethical education is both valued and needed in the United States Army.[8] [9] While the gaining of ethical knowledge is generally a positive and helpful undertaking, the development of soft skills, or those "character traits and interpersonal skills that characterize a person's ability to interact effectively with others"[10] is vital. The Army Values are a fantastic set of virtues for Army personnel to aspire to and live by, and the Warrior Ethos provides a clear baseline expectation for all Soldiers, regardless of rank. However, empathy and humility, as character attributes, are directly linked to an Army leader's capacity for self-awareness.

ADP 6-22 identifies self-awareness as a critical facet of effective Army leader identity, stating:

> "Self-awareness is fundamental to understanding one's abilities. Leaders should know their strengths and weaknesses: what they do or do not know, what they are or are not skilled at, and what is in their span of control…. Being self-aware means seeing one's self as viewed by others and understanding the levels of influence one is likely to have with followers."[11]

Thus, one's ability to be self-aware, according to Army doctrine, is directly linked to one's understanding of self (skills, capabilities, knowledge, etc.) and the capacity to self-reflect, as well as one's capacity for awareness of those around them (fellow leaders, subordinates, higher command, etc.). Empathy and humility, in this sense, provide the means by which one develops a fuller interpersonal common operating picture and enables one to better understand and utilize one's own skills and capabilities as well as address matters of the conscience and skill/knowledge gaps.

Empathy – Understanding the *Other*

Of late, significant work has been put into identifying and addressing the Army's need for empathetic leaders. Chaplain (CPT) Anna Page and Command Sgt. Maj. Daniel Tilghman's work on empathy – "The Empathy Challenge" – rightly articulates that "Effective empathy-informed leadership is developed by teaching and encouraging empathy skill acquisition to personnel at every rank."[12] This means that empathy is not just meant for command teams and staffs at varying echelons, but that the fostering of empathy among all Army personnel is required and that fostering must be intentional. The rationale for the cultivation of empathetic Soldiers is really quite simple: empathy makes one a better communicator that is capable of developing a deeper understanding of

what others may be experiencing[13], thereby enabling them to effectively build relationships and more capable of addressing a multitude of Soldier care issues. Plainly put, empathy also makes a leader more approachable.

Approachability on the part of an Army leader is, however, simply a byproduct of an overall humanizing mindset. In Allison Abbe's work on strategic empathy, she outlines three distinct, yet overlapping dimensions of empathy: empathic concern, experience sharing, and perspective taking.[14] Abbe notes that empathic concern is akin to a positive understanding of sympathy, that is, seeking another person's well-being and the motivation to alleviate others' distress. Experience sharing is a kind of shared understanding with the aim of experiencing another person's emotional state, or in more general terms, feeling *with* another.[15] As a dimension of humanizing the *other*, Abbe notes that perspective taking is most similar to H. R. McMaster's broader understanding of strategic empathy, which is "an understanding of the ideology, emotions, and aspirations that drive and constrain other actors."[16] Whether empathy is directed at a subordinate, a peer, or even a foreign adversary, the intent behind the empathy remains the same: the goal is to ultimately deeper one's understanding of another, beyond mere gathering of information. The intent is to develop real human connection with the *other*.

Importantly, and counter to the general Army cultural understanding of empathy, what is being advocated for is not weakness. Again, Page and Tilghman rightly point out that Army doctrine "implores leaders to put themselves in Soldiers' situations or thought processes before taking action"[17] in response to myriad issues that may affect a Soldiers career. There is, however, not simply a cause-and-effect relationship that empathy provides clarity to: empathy is one of the primary facilitating character attributes for building trust with other people as well as preventing the leadership "sin" of narcissism.[18] Narcissism, here, is not only characterized by an extreme lack of empathy, but "narcissists…often inflate their self-worth at the expense of others,"[19] thereby running counter to the very core intent of empathy, which is aimed at building trust and understanding with others.

Humility – Understanding the Self

Humility, as an attribute of Army leader character, is interesting in part because it was left off the list of critical character attributes in the 2012 edition of *ADP 6-22*. When instructing Army Officers at varying levels of professional military education, one of the questions I have taken to asking students is "Have you ever worked for someone that lacked humility?" The follow up to that is the typical chaplain question: "What was that experience like?" or "How did it make you feel?" I usually get a fair amount of nervous laughter, but a key component to the classes I instruct is my support of open and honest dialogue. Candor is both encouraged and appreciated. Student response varies, but what frequently is mentioned is a supervisor's inability to receive feedback or constructive criticism, a higher-ranking officers open resistance or lack of receptiveness of new ideas or to learning anything new, or that the officer in question was arrogant and stifling to work for. These candid responses fully nest with the "deadly sin" of hubris highlighted by Sgt. Maj. Richard Russell and Command Sgt. Maj. Robert Nelson (ret.). At best, a leader with hubris has convinced themselves that they have nothing to learn. At worst, however, "Hubris in superiors can lead to overconfidence and subject Soldiers to unnecessary harm."[20]

The Army's doctrinal perspective on humility is precisely written to address the hubris Russell and Nelson make note of, pointing out that humility, at its core, is the opposite of arrogance. *ADP 6-22* further states that a good Army leader is a willing and open learner, someone that is self-aware and aware of those around them and is emotionally intelligent enough to receive feedback. The Army leader should also be self-aware enough to know what they do and do not know, where the limitations of their abilities and competencies are, and with humility begin to address those limitations.[21] The key takeaway for the Army seems to be that we need leaders that are cognizant of their limitations, are capable of receiving feedback, and can then synthesize the individual limitations and feedback in a dynamic way and with a learning spirit that growth can occur.

Further elaborating on the relationship between humility and one's own self-awareness, in association with one's overall character development, David Brooks identifies humility as the most important virtue in the struggle with one's own weaknesses.[22] Brooks' explanation of humility aligns well with the Army's concept of humility, stating, "Humility is having an accurate assessment of your own nature and your own place in the cosmos…. Humility reminds you that you are not the center of the universe, but you serve a larger order."[23] Though Stephen M. R. Covey approaches humility (and humble leadership) from a business leadership perspective, as opposed

to a more philosophically grounded starting point (e.g., Brooks), their conclusions are remarkably similar. In a discussion on *integrity* Covey cogently states, "Being humble does not mean being weak, reticent, or self-effacing. It means recognizing principle and putting it ahead of self. It means standing firmly for principle, even in the face of opposition….But they do not get caught up in arrogance, bravado, manipulation, or win-lose power plays."[24] Again, Covey approaches the topic of humility from the viewpoint of a business leader, but his focus on team-building, embracing the ideas of other team-members, and recognizing the contributions of others[25] are simply different ways of addressing what humility is meant to address: selflessness on the part of the leader. Humility, and thereby selflessness, requires an Army leader to see themselves not at the center of an organization's universe but as part of a greater whole, to lift up and celebrate contributions of the unit (i.e., team), to recognize that one will never know everything there is to know about whatever it is that they are doing for the Army.

Ultimately, humility and empathy go hand-in-hand, as both character attributes are directly linked to the building of leader self-awareness. The orientation of these two attributes differs slightly, with empathy maintaining a general outward directionality, whereas humility is generally focused on developing a greater sense and awareness of oneself. However, there exists a great deal of overlap between the two. Increased humility will inevitably move beyond one's own self-understanding and will begin to positively affect those around them, as was noted by Covey. Similarly, an empathetic leader seeking to better care for their Soldiers should logically make the cognitive leap of understanding the importance of self-care. Despite what Army doctrine clearly states on the topics of humility and empathy, as well as the myriad business leaders, philosophers, and psychologists that have emphasized the significance of increased empathy and humility among all people – specifically among leaders – there seems to be a scarcity of tools employed by the Army to build these very necessary attributes.

Ignatian Spirituality – An Approach

As an ethics instructor and Army officer myself, I am deeply opposed to the concept of requiring people to do something relatively complex without equipping them with tools to address the task at hand. To a degree, this is what the Army has done with empathy and humility. The Army doctrinally describes the importance of the character attributes and Officer and Non-Commissioned Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs/NCOERs) hold leaders accountable to the demonstration of these attributes, but we do not currently have a strong track record in providing leaders the tools they need to develop humility and empathy. I am a strong believer in offering useful conceptual tools when applicable, and Saint Ignatius of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* provides a historically proven and remarkably flexible set of tools capable of facilitating one's growth in humility and empathy.

Who Was Ignatius and Why Do We Care?

In short, Ignatius of Loyola was born to Basque nobility in 1491. Having gotten into a bit of trouble with the law, Ignatius decided to join the Spanish army. In 1521, Ignatius was wounded in the Battle of Pamplona fighting the French, wherein he was struck in the leg with a cannonball, having recklessly charged into battle seeking glory. As the many and varied stories about Ignatius go, during his yearlong convalescence at a Benedictine hospital Ignatius set about reading the Bible and various books on the life of Christ and the lives of the saints. Additionally, due to several botched leg surgeries Ignatius now walked with a significant limp, meaning he could no longer serve as a soldier. After his recovery and a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Ignatius found himself back in school at the age of 32, studying in Barcelona and the University of Paris from 1524 to 1534. With a core group of 9 school friends and companions from the University of Paris, at the age of 43, Ignatius founded what would eventually become the Society of Jesus (or the Jesuits).[26]

As a former soldier, now Catholic priest and founder of a religious order, Ignatius intentionally structured the Society of Jesus using vaguely military structures and hierarchies, even including a superior general that reported to the Pope. Similar to many other religious orders, the lives of the Jesuits were to be fairly regimented, yet there were, and currently are, four "ways" or generally overarching tenets that characterize Ignatian Spirituality, most clearly captured in Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises*. James Martin, SJ, notes, "If asked to define Ignatian spirituality, the first thing out of [Jesuits'] mouths would most likely be *finding God in all things*."[27] While this is an overtly religious take on one's relationship with the world, more broadly, points out Martin, "Finding God in

all things also means finding God in all people."[28] Another tenet directly relevant to our discussion is that Jesuits consider themselves "contemplatives in action."[29] This phrase makes them sound a bit like warrior monks, but they are not. What it means is that Jesuits are devoted both to a life of the mind and a life of action. Ignatian spirituality is nothing if not practical. As such, Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises* provides for us an extremely helpful mental/spiritual framework and a meditative tool that can enable one to "connect the dots" between *finding God in all things* and being a *contemplative in action,* which can be aimed at the development of the Army's character attributes of empathy and humility.

The Presupposition – A Mental/Spiritual Frame of Mind

Ignatius's Presupposition to the *Spiritual Exercises* provides for readers and those engaging in the *Exercises* the overall intent of the *Exercises* themselves. Ignatius very clearly posits the mindset with which givers and receives of the *Exercises* are fully expected to enter into, which requires a fundamental shift in how many people view the *other*, or the other people they interact with on a daily basis.

The Presupposition to the *Spiritual Exercises* states:

> That both the giver and the receiver of the Spiritual Exercises may be of greater help and benefit to each other; it should be presupposed that every good Christian ought to be more eager to put a good interpretation on a neighbor's statement than to condemn it. Further, if one cannot interpret it favorably, one should ask how the other means it. If that meaning is wrong, one should correct the person with love; and if this is not enough, one should search out every appropriate means through which, by understanding the statement in a good way, it may be saved.[30]

The Presupposition can, in many ways, be considered life advice and a positive conversational mindset, wherein Ignatius is encouraging those beginning the *Exercises*, as well as all of us, to assume the best of one another. Ronald Modras points out, "To faultfinders and heresy-hunters of any stripe, [Ignatius] gives the humane advice to judge people and their words in a way that presumes the best, not the worst, and gives them the benefit of the doubt. And if correction is needed, he says, do it with love."[31] Similarly, Monika Hellwig draws distinctly helpful connections between Ignatian spirituality and the Presupposition to "the cultivation of critical awareness of what is right and wrong in one's own life and attitudes, one's society and culture, and in specific situations."[32] Generally speaking, a presuppositional mindset inclines one toward a raised self-consciousness, able to understand what one's own motivations and intentions are, and more attuned to the need to actively listen to others.[33]

For our purposes, the Presupposition acts as a reminder of how we are expected to engage with others, especially Army leaders tasked with authority and responsibility, and the care of their Soldiers and Families. The Presupposition, though written some 500 years again, was Ignatius's attempt to encourage empathy and humility of the those about to engage in the *Spiritual Exercises*. This mindset is no less helpful for us today as a kind of relational cognitive cue for what is expected of Army leaders. The Presupposition is not simply a reminder; rather, it also serves as an essential prelude to the tangible tool, or practice we will now discuss.

You've Got to Look Within Yourself – The Ignatian Examen

As I have stated above, I truly believe in equipping people with practical tools, especially tools that may be applied broadly, regardless of the person using the tool or the situation that person may find themselves in. This desire for a practical tool brings us to the Ignatian Examen. The Examen is first and foremost an examination of one's own conscience, which carries with it necessary moral overtones, but as Ronald Modras notes, it is also an examination of consciousness, which "entails looking at what is being done to us: how we are being affected and moved deep in our affective consciousness."[34] This means that there are multiple dimensions of use that are of immediate practical applicability to anyone seriously engaging in the Examen.

There are numerous ways in which to pray or meditate using the Examen, all of which are linked with the original Examen Ignatius required his fellow Jesuits to pray. James Martin offers a remarkably useful approach to the Examen following the five steps below:

First, before beginning the five distinct steps of the Examen, you must remember what it is that you are doing, that this is a prayer form, thus you are called to remember God's presence and ask for God's help in praying.

1. Gratitude: Recall anything from the day for which you are especially grateful, and give thanks.
2. Review: Recall the events of the day, from start to finish, noticing where you felt God's presence, and where you accepted or turned away from any invitations to grow in love.
3. Sorrow: Recall any actions for which you are sorry.
4. Forgiveness: Ask for God's forgiveness. Decide whether you want to reconcile with anyone you have hurt.
5. Grace: Ask God for the grace you need for the next day and an ability to see God's presence more clearly.[35]

The Examen is very clearly a form of prayer, and that's okay. One does not have to be Roman Catholic, or a Jesuit, or even a Christian to get something useful out of this dedicated meditative time.

Martin goes on to make the argument that the Examen can be of great use to seekers, agnostics, and atheists, if thought of as a kind of "prayer of awareness." He offers a simplified take on the Examen, following the same general pattern as the original examen:

1. Be consciously aware of yourself and your surroundings.
2. Remember what you are grateful for.
3. Review the day.
4. Ask for forgiveness, potentially reconciling with someone you have hurt.
5. Prepare yourself to be aware of the next day.[36]

The prayer/meditation patterns listed above – whether they be the Ignatian Examen as a prayer form or a kind of meditation patterned off of the Examen – all maintain very similar outcomes aimed at raising one's awareness of oneself as well as those around us. And, quite frankly, the Examen is an easy to remember and easy to execute tool for developing exactly what the Army desires: more self-aware Army leaders that demonstrate the character attributes of humility and empathy.

Conclusion

The Army leadership community has collectively come to the conclusion that we must foster the development of leaders that are both humble and empathetic, and we must hold said leaders accountable to these attributes of character. Unfortunately, there is no Army doctrine or regulation that tells us how to inculcate humility and empathy into our leaders, regardless of rank and experience. Noted leaders have pointed out the very real dangers that narcissism and hubris present to Army leadership – as qualities opposed to humility and empathy – as well as the risks those qualities present the Army as a whole. What I offer is simply one of many ways that the Army can begin to practically teach tools aimed at raising one's overall self-awareness. The Presupposition to Ignatius of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* and the examination of conscience – the Ignatian Examen – found within the *Exercises* offer examples what "right" *can* look like with regards to means by which to teach self-awareness. Afterall, the Jesuits have put the *Spiritual Exercises* to successful use for roughly 500 years, which strikes me as a sign of relative success in the shaping and molding of character.

Endnotes

1 Department of the Army, *Army Leadership and the Profession*, ADP 6-22 (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 2019), Chapter 2. Army doctrinal writers both define character and lay out the five character attributes essential to Army leader character in Chapter 2 of ADP 6-22. These attributes undergird the understanding of character captured in the Army Leadership Requirements Model, particularly under the category of what Army leaders are expected to "Be."

2 Stephen R. Covey, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2013), 26.

3 John C. Maxwell, *The 21 Indispensable Qualities of a Leader: Becoming the Person Others Will Want to Follow* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 4.

4 Lucas Chan, SJ, *Biblical Ethics in the 21st Century: Developments, Emerging Consensus, and Future Directions* (New York: Paulist Press, 2013), 83.

5 David Brooks, *The Road to Character* (New York: Random House, 2015), 263-264.

6 David Brooks, *The Second Mountain: The Quest for a Moral Life* (New York: Random House, 2020), 59.

7 ADP 6-22, 2-1.

8 Everett S. P. Spain, Katie E. Matthew, and Andrew L. Hagemaster, "Why Do Senior Officers Sometimes Fail in Character? The Leaky Character Reservoir," *Parameters* 52, no. 4 (Winter 2022-23): 117-138. This article does a fantastic job at highlighting the need for senior leaders to take seriously their own character development as well as a means by which to prevent a failure in character.

9 Timothy Leone and Saythala Lay Phonexayphova, "The Military Moral Education Program: Checking Our Ethical Azimuth," *Military Review* (July-August 2017), 92-99. Leone and Phonexayphova provide a necessary and critical look at the need for moral education across the force, particularly as they lay out a number of "bad arguments" commonly made by Army leaders regarding moral education.

10 Will Kenton, "What are Soft Skills? Definition, Importance, and Examples," Investopedia, August 26, 2024, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/soft-skills.asp.

11 ADP 6-22, 1-17.

12 Daniel A. Tilghman and Anna S. Page, "The Empathy Challenge: Empathy-Informed Leadership in a Doctrine-Shaped Army," *NCO Journal* (November 2023), 2.

13 ADP 6-22, 2-8.

14 Allison Abbe, "Understanding the Adversary: Strategic Empathy and Perspective Taking in National Security," Parameters 53, no. 2 (2023): 23.

15 Abbe, "Understanding the Adversary," 23.

16 H. R. McMaster, "The Retrenchment Syndrome: A Response to 'Come Home, America?," *Foreign Affairs* 99, no. 4 (July-August 2020): 183-186, quoted in Abbe, Allison, "Understanding the Adversary," 23-24.

17 Page and Tilghman, "The Empathy Challenge," 2.

18 Richard Russell and Robert Nelson, "The 7 Deadly Sins of Leadership," *NCO Journal* (April 2024): 2.

19 Russell and Nelson, "The 7 Deadly Sins of Leadership," 2.

20 Russell and Nelson, "The 7 Deadly Sins of Leadership," 2.

21 ADP 6-22, 2-11.

22 Brooks, *The Road to Character*, 262-263.

23 Brooks, *The Road to Character*, 263.

24 Stephen M. R. Covey, *The Speed of Trust: The One Thing That Changes Everything* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 64.

25 Covey, *The Speed of Trust*, 64.

26 Philip H. Pfatteicher, *New Book of Festivals and Commemorations: A Proposed Common Calendar of Saints* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 371.

27 James Martin, S.J., *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything: A Spirituality for Real Life* (New York: Harper One, 2010), 5.

28 Martin, *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything*, 100.

29 Martin, *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything,* 7.

30 Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises and Selected Works*, ed. George E. Ganss, SJ (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 129.

31 Ronald Modras, *Ignatian Humanism: A Dynamic Spirituality for the 21st Century* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2004), 26.

32 Monika K. Hellwig, "Find God in All Things: A Spirituality for Today," in *An Ignatian Spiritual Reader: Contemporary Writings on St. Ignatius of Loyola, the Spiritual Exercises, Discernment, and More,* ed. George W. Traub, SJ (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2008), 54.

33 Hellwig, "Finding God in All Things," 51.

34 Modras, *Ignatian Humanism*, 34-35.

35 Martin, *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything*, 97.

36 Martin, *The Jesuit Guide to (Almost) Everything*, 101.